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At a recent journalism conference in Perugia, Italy, a panel was asked to consider whether there would be journalists in 2050. The fact that the session spilled out the door summed up much about the tumultuous state of journalism today. Much has happened since the phone hacking scandal began over a decade ago. Those revelations – leading to the Leveson Inquiry and report in 2012 – severely dented trust in journalism, and investigative journalism in particular. Alongside the crisis of funding for traditional models, the pursuit of speed over substance, and more recently the global rise of so-called fake news and “alternative facts”, it is understandable that there should be reflection and scrutiny upon what journalism means and what it should look like.

In all this lies a clear opportunity. The pillars of a fair and just democratic society remain: justice, equality, freedom and representation. They are steadfast – but not indestructible. Strong and responsible investigative journalism is vital to their continued survival. Fighting for quality journalism is a fight for the values that society holds dear.

With this challenge have come new types of journalism that break many of the rules that came before, new kinds of journalists and ever more diverse ways of financing this work, including the rise of non-profit journalism supported by philanthropic organisations. In the future, all manner of media will likely cater for more clearly defined communities, or seams running through different groups, hyperlocal areas, disseminated from multiple channels. It’s an exciting prospect, but one that will still demand focused and objective reporting. The democratisation and plurality brought about by social media and technological advancements only goes so far without proper investment in the content.

As Cameron Barr, managing editor of the Washington Post, has said: “[Investigative] journalism is uncovering something that wasn’t known before, is in the public’s interest – and that someone doesn’t want you to find out.” But transparency and accountability don’t come for free. High quality, responsible journalism that informs, exposes, questions, and holds truth unto power, takes time, resources and continual effort to uncover issues not in the public domain and against forces that would benefit from their remaining hidden. Who can conceive of a society that is satisfied with only scratching lightly on the surface where the truth lies somewhere deeper?

The Conversation UK, a comment and analysis site authored by academic experts in collaboration with journalists, aims to disseminate academic research and ideas to the wider public. A non-profit with charitable status, initial funding was from 12 founding universities, now grown to more than 70 members. Philanthropic organisations, including the Esmée Fairbairn Foundation, the Wellcome Trust and Lloyd’s Register Foundation, have provided funding. The Conversation Africa received funding from the Gates Foundation to support their efforts based on a common interest in disseminating more African voices. It is one good model among others that will continue to emerge. What is clear is that philanthropic organisations, individuals and charities have a much greater role to play in supporting
not-for-profit journalism and tapping into its potential to bring about social change. Indeed, it could serve to unshackle serious journalism from the stifling pressure of financial return.

Some newsrooms are already benefitting from operation as non-profits, ProPublica in the US is a notable example. The Institute for Nonprofit News has more than 100 US non-profit media organisations on its books including the International Consortium of Investigative Journalists, the global network behind the Panama Papers, which is currently seeking non-profit status. In the UK, philanthropy funds some activities but it is by no means comprehensive or consistent.

A 2012 report from the House of Lords Committee on the future of journalism suggested that charitable status for investigative journalism could encourage philanthropic investment for the “wellbeing of democracy”. Increased access to funding opportunities alongside tax relief would provide more security. But there needs to be greater clarity in UK legislation – and legislation and regulation are slow creatures. And as Jenny Harrow and Catherina Pharoah argue strongly in this paper, whether or not investigative journalism is ever given charitable status, the time is ripe for much more non-profit support of journalistic activities, if journalists are willing to work within the existing framework of charitable purposes.

Philanthropy is growing and is part of the mix of funding that can secure good journalism. Recognition of the power of independent, trustworthy journalism and why it must be supported should be a going concern. It should not be limited in scope to education and training but have a greater involvement in its continued quality and survival. Without it our understanding of the world will be much poorer and for all the aims and efforts of philanthropy in society, they will all count for much less.
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SECTION 1

Introduction to the landscape of journalism

Journalism and journalists in the UK are both enabled and constrained, supported and challenged by the socio-political and economic landscapes within which they are located. Significant technological, cultural and economic change continue to widen the scope and the boundaries of what is understood by ‘journalism’. The staying power of resulting socio-economic transformations, such as the growth of hyperlocals, small on-line news operations, with limited resources, focusing on local geographical areas, is variable, sometimes to the point of individual self-sacrifice. However, further increasingly prominent qualifiers – ‘citizen journalism’, ‘participatory’ journalism, most recently ‘constructive journalism’, point to a myriad of civil society contexts, where the legitimating frames for news journalism vary from broadly consensual to highly contested. ‘Who are journalists’ has become as important a question as ‘what is journalism?’

The demise of traditional media business models and the domination of a limited number of international news organisations in the UK is itself a central focus for critique by civil society institutions; while the remaining dominant news media business organisations claim UK news media as “an engine of original news content and democracy”. Their commissioned report (December 2016) shows that despite reaching large audiences through the combination of digital and print, news media organisations have experienced falling revenues over the past decade. The industry’s total revenue in 2015, an estimated £4.8 billion in revenues from circulation and advertising, is approximately half its 2003/04 level. These revenues “translated into an estimated £4.3 billion of expenditure … spread across wages, suppliers and taxes ... half ... to suppliers and more than one-third to employees, most of them in the UK”. Of the 87,500 FTE jobs reported for this sector, an estimated 11,200 FTEs were directly involved in journalism and content creation. For those news media organisations surveyed, c. £5.8 million was spent on employee and apprenticeship training in 2015.

Fragility in the provision of regional news appears a constant; with devolution shaping the distinctiveness of the news media, and the local news agenda in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, alongside marginalisation of Scottish, Welsh and Northern Irish news by London-based and international news organisations. The viability of the regional sector, and whether digital journalism is ‘killer or saviour’, is unresolved. Nevertheless, the argument is also made that with such increased public access to political information and debate, the political communications crisis (“if it ever existed”), is passing in the UK, in favour of an enhanced, healthier public sphere. While credit must be given to civil society actors and philanthropic organisations for their growing contributions to this ‘enhancement’, it is noticeable that no fully composite analysis exists for all aspects of their economic contributions, in any way comparable to that for the news media (major employer) bodies. The Carnegie UK Trust report for 2014 on Neighbourhood News presented a broad but composite figure for public (ie government) and charitable interventions in local news as “worth more than £250 million per annum – supporting local newspapers, community radio and local TV”; including an estimated £45-50 million paid to local newspapers for mandatory advertising of statutory public notices. Other noteworthy aspects include studies of ‘due impartiality’ legal requirements for broadcasters, showing a shift over recent years from a political system shaping impartiality towards more of a news value-driven system reliant on editorial judgements; of the implications for local radio news of changes in the commercial radio industry, including rationalising the process of news gathering, whereby ‘hubs’ make economics of scale, to increase profitability; and of newspaper journalists covering a major terrorist incident (The London 2005 events), employing a generic reporting template to reproduce copy so ordered as to respond consensually.

How then is the UK’s journalism landscape assessed, in terms of external media pluralism judgments and continuing conceptual location? Hallin and Mancini’s original ‘Liberal Model’ for the UK continues to pertain where it emphasises the media’s role seen more in terms of providing information to citizen-consumers, rather than representing social groups and ideological diversity; a negative view of the state’s role and the media’s targeting of a mass mark; though this model continues to be reviewed and refined.

The Media Pluralism Monitor report for 2014 found a low/medium risk for the country overall, while highlighting the risks and potential risks of media concentration and limited attention to cultural and geographical pluralism issues. Commercial influence on editorial content was not prevented by regulations or self-regulatory codes; and
weaknesses were identified in aspects of local public broadcasting (such as the obligation to have journalists from a range of geographical groups). Concerns regarding ‘draconian security legislation’, including restricting freedom of expression and impacting on confidentiality of journalistic sources are cited for the RSF Press Freedom index 2016, ranking the UK at 38, below its ranking of 34 in 2015.\(^4\) The highest risks to media pluralism were, unsurprisingly, economic ones, so that consideration of philanthropy’s actual and potential resourcing role within the broad journalism landscape is timely.
SECTION 2
Framework for philanthropic funding of journalism

Legal situation

Charity law entails that to achieve charitable status, and eligibility for charitable tax reliefs, organisations must meet the requirements of the charity regulators for independent governance and for their objectives to fall within one of the legally recognised ‘public benefit’ charitable purposes. Investigative journalism per se is not a recognised charitable purpose, and consequently has limited access to the funding opportunities and tax advantages of charitable status. In drawing attention to how technological and behavioural change is creating profound economic, legal and regulatory challenges for investigative journalism, the 2012 House of Lords Select Committee on Communication recommended that government reconsider investigative journalism as a charitable purpose, to attract more funding to the field. Its view was that ‘Responsible, high quality, investigative journalism matters; it is a vital constituent of the UK’s system of democratic governance and accountability. At its best, it informs and educates us, enhances our democracy, and is a force for good.’ The call was declined, and has not been re-addressed.

In this situation it is therefore unsurprising, as TOWNEND points out, that there are few examples of charities running journalism and news services as part of their central activities. Nonetheless a body of journalism-related initiatives (often part of wider projects) has received philanthropic funding under one of the existing charitable public benefit purposes in recent years. The main categories used are the advancement of education (and training); of human rights, conflict resolution or reconciliation or the promotion of religious or racial harmony or equality and diversity; and of citizenship or community development. This reveals journalism holding a place within philanthropy around training and standards, and the key role it plays in a pluralistic society, informing the public and giving voice to diverse, misrepresented or marginalised groups, most of which have little appeal to commercial outlets because of their contentious or minority nature. There are also a number of media-led charities such as the Media Trust, the Media Society, the Ethical Journalism Network and the Guardian Foundation which focus specifically on training, and building professional standards and support infrastructure for journalism. What is not clear, however, is whether the framing of current philanthropic support for journalism is determined as much by the constraints of public benefit criteria as by donor preferences and needs on the ground.

Lack of legal charitable status does not necessarily mean investigative journalism cannot attract philanthropic funding. Charitable foundations can and do fund non-charities, depending on their terms of reference and trustees. The Bureau of Investigative Journalism has seen its application for charitable status rejected twice by the Charity Commission, most recently because no evidence was presented that ‘the company’s input to investigative journalism translates into participation/engagement either in terms of decision-making or participation in democratic processes’.

However, it receives philanthropic funding from various sources. Moreover, investigative journalism is only one of many areas not specifically mentioned as charitable purposes which receive funding because of the flexibility and breadth within existing public benefit criteria. The Gates Foundation has made a major investment in supporting journalism and digital communications platforms which can draw public attention to humanitarian issues and make an impact on change. Moreover, the Charity Commission’s judgements on public benefit can be challenged, and changed. Full Fact, a press fact-checking and public education initiative, successfully challenged the Charity Commission after three rejections. In fact, a Reuter’s Institute report on a five-country comparison notes that ‘not for profit media with charitable status exist more in the UK and US than in Australia, Canada and Ireland’. Dependence on fluid boundaries, however, is not necessarily a strong position. The scope to fund non-charities, for example, was recently challenged after allegations that charitable funding had been used to support a terrorist.
An important new space for philanthropic engagement in journalism relates to the more general value of non-profit entities in industry regulation. The unresolved struggle between government and the news industry for control over press regulation in the wake of Lord Justice Leveson’s judicial public inquiry into the practices and ethics of the British press led to the establishment first of the Independent Press Standards Organisation (IPSO), the independent regulator for the newspaper and magazine industry in the UK. Financed by the Regulatory Finance Company, which is funded by member organisations, ‘IPSO carries out its work separately and completely independently from its members’. 

The actual independence of IMPRESS from government is fiercely contested by many journalists, and this issue highlights a more general challenge to philanthropic support of investigative journalism. It would fall to charitable Trustees to ensure that journalistic outputs are compliant with charity law, and non-partisan and non-political except where they support the charitable mission. While there are mechanisms for addressing initiatives which cross the non-political boundary, issues of advocacy and voices for change present an increasing source of anxiety and uncertainty. The Commission on the Independence of the Voluntary Sector notes the ongoing ‘chilling effect’ of the minefield surrounding the interpretation of valid political campaigning since the Government’s introduction of restrictions in the Transparency of Lobbying, Non-party Campaigning and Trade Union Administration Act, 2014. Political constraints could make philanthropic funding essentially unattractive to investigative journalists, while funders might baulk at having to deal with higher levels of uncertainty and risk, or governance tensions between editorial autonomy, the persuasions of the funder, and the obligations to comply with charity law. The Charity Law Association has highlighted that even if investigative journalism were accepted as a broad category, individual applicants would need to show on a case-by-case basis that their particular approach to investigative journalism would advance citizenship, by equipping people with knowledge to help them engage.

State and Public Funding

State support for public service media (PSM) in the UK is considerable, including the license fee revenue for the BBC Group, the historic licenses granted to Channel 3 (encompassing ITV, STV and UTV), and grant support for S4C TV (whose funding is transferring to the BBC and will reduce by 25% annually). The massive cultural shift towards receiving news and information through digital media is generating huge competition. TV and radio broadcasters have seen declining advertising revenues and a real terms cut in the most recent BBC licence fee settlement. The BBC Group, largest of the UK public service media (encompassing BBC TV and Radio national and local channels, the World Service, and high online news reach) gets 82% of its revenue from public sources, worth £3.7 billion. It is under significant pressure to reduce costs, and its public revenue fell by 2.5% in 2015. C3 derives huge legacy value from its licenses, including brand value and strong relationships with audiences, advertisers and media buyers. Channel 4 is state-owned and commercially-funded, and its analogue-digital switchover was funded by the BBC. Additional state support includes zero-rating of VAT on all newspapers, journals and periodicals, a cost to government of £1.7 billion per annum in tax foregone. This level of state aid is a source of governmental concern as it makes market entry difficult and insulates PSM from commercial pressures and opportunities to change and adapt to the digital age. Philanthropic funding could present a new funding route which preserves the public ethos. The Big Lottery Fund, whose income is awarded by government from the proceeds of the National Lottery, and NESTA represent indirect state support. Over the last decade, millions of pounds have been donated to journalism and media-related initiatives, including the Media Trust, the Community Media Association, the Institute for War and Peace Reporting, Diver FM, Heart and Sound Fife, and the Public Services Broadcasting Trust. Much of the funding is for youth media and journalism training, and community media platforms. An additional slice of UK, EU and other European country state funding is channelled through charitable or non-profit foundations and charities (see examples in Section 3). There is, however, a huge financial challenge. Current charitable sector and public (local advertising, quango funding) financial support for local media in the UK accounts for only 1% of the annual financial intervention in the local media market by Government.
SECTION 3
Mapping the Funders

The landscapes of journalism and philanthropy within the UK offer, broadly, some core similarities. Both emphasise independence as a key element of their identity and purpose, and propose a value-base rooted in ‘publicness’: for the former, ‘the public interest’, for the latter, ‘the public good’. Both assert or reflect strong normative dimensions to their activities, for example as ‘watchdogs’ and as social change agents. Regulatory and self-regulatory environments of both are under scrutiny. However, it is within the field of journalism that major and continuing technological shifts are changing the landscape radically.

Is it possible to map the landscape of philanthropy’s interest in journalism? As is shown below, this is not straightforward, because what emerges is an intricate, disparate and interlinked set of pictures of philanthropic choices and actions, rather than a single, coherent landscape that everyone recognises. It is clear however that this landscape is not at all dominated by philanthropic support for specific journalist endeavours and projects, while interest in journalism in its widest sense is pervasive within the philanthropic space.

Geographical mapping of philanthropic interest is of limited value, since many foundations are not circumscribed by their particular location, working across the UK. Although the capital-centricity of newsprint and media ownership is mirrored by some concentration of foundations in London, pan-UK working is mostly the norm; with a number concentrating on solely international work. Not only can a comprehensive ‘funding map’ not be developed, as discussed in Section 1, but the contributions of individual donors as well as foundations are not fully known, nor those from less formal means of donating.

The main barriers to setting out a single comprehensive ‘funding map’ are set out below. Varying perceptions of the nature of ‘media’ and the nature of ‘journalism’ affect the ways in which ‘journalism’ is funded, as well as what are widely seen as bars to such funding, arising from non-charitable status in its own right. The existence and importance of indirect funding can also be inferred, but are difficult to track (for example, university-led initiatives, which have first been funded by grants for journalism education or for research in areas such as citizens’ communication). Funders’ reporting (for example in annual reports) may not cite or include grant-making for journalism, even where this has occurred, since they incorporate it within other fields of giving, such as education, or community development.

While there are a very small number of relatively large founding donations for particular activities or creation of institutions to combine practice and research, the model of funding characterised by the Gates Foundation’s support for the Guardian’s web-based global development news platform and by the Guardian’s other partnerships with foundations such as Mama Cass to produce professional and high-profile journalism on issues of mutual interest, is largely US-based and rare in the UK. The compatibility of ethics and approach between the media-provider and the funders is an important success factor within this model.

Philanthropic donors in the UK are therefore responding to a complex range of ways in which journalism, its nature, purposes and likely achievements are transacted and valued. These include:

- the support and growth of the profession of journalism, groups and individuals (as in education/training/ethics/service);
- the protection and enhancement of the role of journalists and journalism in the field (e.g. danger zone issues, enabling free speech, encouraging creativity such as photojournalism);
- the encouragement of particular types of journalistic practice; notably investigative journalism as in-depth, systematic and original research and reporting;
- journalism as a route to the growth and enhancement of civil society and democracy, especially public accountability, through national, regional and local investigation;
- community-development and community action enabled or supported by ‘community journalism’ or ‘citizen journalism’, emphasizing the importance for news of the hyperlocal;
- journalism as an integrative part of education or health support and provision; whether as a therapeutic tool or useful vehicle, to raise self-esteem, help discover identity and improve life chances among disadvantaged groups including young people or people with disabilities;
- support for journalism through higher education programmes, research funding and staffing, concentrating on universities.
• journalism as a means of conveying and furthering faith and principles and beliefs, and communicating faith-based social action;
• the absorption or linking of journalism activities into wider multi-purpose projects, such as regeneration or arts funding programmes, with journalism part of the development mosaic.

With these multiple facets, philanthropic support for journalism shows some clustering (for example around education), some overlap (for example, where health and education combine for ‘wellbeing’); and some limiting of scope (for example concentrating on support for individuals or for faith interests). Philanthropic support for journalism is also fragmented, disparate and wide, and there is no direct way of identifying all the foundations and other grant-makers involved in the field. The approach taken here was to begin with searches of public registration records of charities and trusts, using a set of relevant search terms. Searches of the records of the Charity Commission for England and Wales and the Office of the Scottish Charity Regulator highlight additional search complexities such as identifying charities with combined purposes, providing direct services together with grant funding, as well as the challenge of interpreting a charity’s philanthropic purpose from its chosen name. The Charity Commissioner for Northern Ireland (NICC) is the newest of the regulators, where charity registration is a work in progress, with organisations being called forward to register in tranches. The picture is thus less complete than that for England, Scotland and Wales.

For England and Wales, searching for the term ‘journalists’ among charity registrants identified 20 organisations, many a variety of benevolent organisations for journalists’ personal support. Among these was a former charity which has long ceased to exist, ‘Journalism and Europe’ (1982-2002), promoting and furthering journalists’ European studies around the European Economic Community and its member countries. The term ‘journalism’ produced 8 organisations, of which 5 concentrated on the provision of scholarships, training and personal development. A notable closure among these organisations was ‘The Journalism Foundation’, registered in 2011 and removed from the register in 2013. Established ‘to promote the right of freedom of opinion and expression within the meaning of article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, particularly as it relates to journalism in all its forms’, it was welcomed by the House of Lords 2012 Inquiry into the future of investigative journalism. Its arrival and demise was reported widely in the national press (see Section 4).

The ‘news’ search term produced a majority of organisations supplying rather than funding different news aspects: of the 125 organisations, 47 were faith-based outreach organisations, local, national and international, while 41, mostly highly localised, made news provision for people with disabilities, especially those visually impaired (the ‘talking news’ services). The fragility of community news endeavours was reflected in the record of the ‘Community News Partnership’, which developed capacity and participation amongst disadvantaged people in Redcar and Cleveland through community newspapers and print materials. It was registered in 2006, closing in 2007. The term ‘broadcasting’ identified 127 organisations, most of which were for (local) hospital radio provision (mostly entertainment rather than news-directed). These also included faith outreach organisations, which were not necessarily exclusively faith-directed. The Sikh Channel Community Broadcasting Company, for example, has purposes which include providing news for the Sikh community as well as advancing knowledge of the Sikh faith. Newer equality-focused organisations in the broadcasting group include the Campaign for Broadcasting Equality; registered since 2014 to raise awareness of the lack of racial equality in broadcasting and television through providing activities, and not grant-making. In contrast ‘The Channel 5 Trust’ is not, as its name might suggest, a broadcasting-focused grant-maker, but a renamed charity (previously the ‘Independent Broadcasting Telethon Trust), raising and disbursing funds for charitable purposes. Further searches using the terms ‘communications’ and ‘media’ yielded a small number of additional organisations which provided funding for journalism-related projects.

For Scotland, a search on the term ‘news’ produced 110 organisations of which 33 were charities offering news access for people with disabilities and a further 27 were faith outreach bodies. Within the ‘broadcasting’ search, 11 of the 36 organisations were hospital radio providers. This category highlights Scotland’s special features (and challenges) of distance and geography, for example, including the Highlands and Islands Community Broadcasting Trust and Bute Community Media. The terminology for ‘journalism’ and ‘journalists’ produced a single instance, a UK-wide benevolent organisation for journalists.

NICC searches show no listings for ‘journalism’. In the 35 listings for ‘media’, the majority are broadly arts and social development organisations, and are fund-seeking rather than fund-providing. Among these, a small number offer multimedia provision (skills, training, knowledge) and community radio for community advancement, using and developing volunteers. The latter include organisations with a focus on Irish language broadcasting such as Lionra Uladh Teo and Raidió Fáilte Teo.
Examples of funders and recently-funded journalism-related projects

A short indicative list, selected to show the breadth of funders’ aims and range of approaches to supporting journalism in the UK is set out in Table 1. It includes both funders whose funding is a total and continuous commitment and those whose funding is occasional or ‘one-off’. In drawing up the list, the aim was to illustrate examples of funding as well as indicating the funders’ general charitable objectives which, in a number of cases, are considerably wider than is indicated by the examples.

Table 1: Examples of UK charitable foundations which make grants with a journalism focus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trust/Media/Charitable Trust</th>
<th>Support for independent non-profit press regulator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Mosley Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Support for a centre for investigative journalism, within an education and civil society focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David and Elaine Potter Foundation</td>
<td>Within a human rights focus, professional development support for young African journalists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Astor Journalism Awards Trust</td>
<td>Funding for Guardian Education Centre and Archives, the Scott Trust Bursary Scheme, and an international programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guardian Foundation</td>
<td>Grants for citizen journalism, digital technology, data journalism, especially for local media in Africa to develop civil society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indigo Trust</td>
<td>Grant funding for the International Broadcasting Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJ Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Education, training and awards to improve the standards of investigative, business and financial journalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorana Sullivan UK Foundation</td>
<td>Grant support for fact-checking in press and journalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M J Samuel Charitable Trust</td>
<td>Financial assistance for students and interns in financial and economic journalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marjorie Deane Financial Journalism Foundation</td>
<td>Media training through awards to young professional journalists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick Lewis Memorial Trust</td>
<td>Grant towards research, journalism and reporting in areas of international conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sigrid Rausing Trust</td>
<td>Promoting understanding of disability through arts and journalism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steven Bloch Image Of Disability Charitable Trust</td>
<td>To improve excellence in financial journalism, annual awards, research grants and an annual memorial lecture are funded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, a small number of non-charitable, non-profit trusts make grants for activities ineligible for charitable funding, which may include journalistic projects or activities, for example, the Joseph Rowntree Reform Trust (making grants for political, campaigning and lobbying purposes) and the Andrew Wainwright Reform Trust (working for a just and democratic society and to redress political and social injustices). An alternative form is the non-charitable trust, owning a journalistic enterprise or business. The Scott Trust is one example. A limited company since 2008, this trust is sole shareholder in the Guardian Media Group, to secure and preserve the financial position and editorial independence of the Guardian.
Some short portraits of funders’ roles

Collaborative work with other funders is an important feature for some trusts’ and foundations’ work, sharing expertise as well as resources. (This makes tracking and attributing project funding sources complex.) For foundations from the corporate media world, with a global media presence core to their business model, these collaborations are as likely to be with international or trans-national as UK funders, whether charitable, governmental and business. Some UK-based projects also attract funding from non-UK based foundations, although these are relatively few in number. The following accounts illustrate the variety of funders’ roles, and the inter-connectedness of their work. The first two examples show one foundation which is UK-based, and one US foundation, working internationally, though with significant links to and within the UK.

The Thomson Reuters Foundation

The Thomson Reuters Foundation's 2015 Annual Report records their teaming up with the Omidyar Network (the US-based global philanthropic investment group and foundation.) This will expand coverage into land and property rights, a crucial issue with ramifications ranging from women’s rights to global conflict. The Foundation is also expanding coverage of trafficking and modern day slavery (including launching a new platform on their website dedicated to trafficking), aided by a grant from the C and A Foundation (based in Switzerland, working internationally). Their first large-scale Russian programme is “Perspektivy”, a professional development programme for journalists and editors from Russia, Eastern Europe and Central Asia, funded jointly by three major foundations in Germany (Robert Bosch Foundation), Norway (Fritt Ord Foundation) and UK (Thomson Reuters Foundation).

In the UK, the Foundation has from 2006 provided core funding for the Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism (RISJ) at the University of Oxford, a collaborative commitment between the Foundation and the University of Oxford to create an international research centre in the comparative study of journalism. RISJ is a member of the European Journalism Observatory, a network of 14 non-profit media research institutes in eleven countries, aiming to disseminate research on journalism and global issues, to foster professionalism and press freedom. EJO’s English website is a joint venture between RISJ and the Institute for Media and Journalism at Università della Svizzera Italiana (USI), Lugano. Major support for the EJO has been provided by the Robert Bosch Foundation and the Stiftung Pressehaus NRZ (Germany), Fondazione Fidinam (Switzerland), and the Fondazione per il Corriere del Ticino, (Switzerland).

The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation

With its prominent focus on global health and international development issues, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation looks to journalism from the perspective of its commitment to improve and enhance the news media’s coverage of those demanding global challenges. A US tax-exempt private foundation, BMGF has based its European office in the UK. Its website shows 388 grants awarded within the UK between 2009 and 2017. While the majority of these are in the public health field, to UK universities, the importance attached to journalism within the Foundation’s ‘Global Policy and Advocacy’ programme is also shown. In 2011, funding to the Guardian Media in the UK supported a web-based global development site, giving new space for discussion and interaction on the challenges of the developing world. Subsequent grant-making of $2.5million aims, in the words of the Guardian’s website, ‘to help the initiative flourish in the longer term’, including covering many of the ongoing costs associated with running this site such as editorial resources and technical development. Another longer-term commitment media-funding project is the Innovation in Development Reporting Grant Programme operated by the European Journalism Centre, that aims to better enable quality journalism to
produce original and well-researched global development stories. Winners from the November 2016 IDR eighth round (with funding of EUR 245,000) included one entrant all of whose media outlets are UK-based: Channel 4 News, The Independent and Public Radio International. The project, ‘On The Front Line In The Fight For Women’s Rights’, will explore women in three remote parts of the world, pushing forward a global call for gender equality. The most recent example, in early 2017, is a $20,000 award to London’s Evening Standard newspaper, to showcase young people’s ability to catalyse social change and improve lives across the world.

The creating and sustaining of a core project to encapsulate and build journalistic values and practices provides an alternative picture where multiple funders contribute, some intermittently while others embed their commitment for long periods or the foreseeable future. The UK’s Centre for Investigative Journalism is a good illustration.

The Centre for Investigative Journalism (CIJ)

CIJ is a charity that champions critical inquiry, in-depth reporting and research along with defence of the public interest. It is dedicated to in-depth professional training and education of journalists who care deeply about public interest issues. Founded in London in 2003, with a grant from the Lorana Sullivan Foundation, its key event is its annual Summer School, formerly held at City University London and from 2014 held at Goldsmiths, University of London. It acquired charitable status in England and Wales 2007 and is funded by foundations and donors, with no government or corporate involvement. It has access to 501(c)3 tax-deductable status in the US, through NEO Philanthropy (New York).

CIJ reports that it has been supported by a number of foundations inside and outside the UK including: City University London, Democratie en Media, the Lorana Sullivan Foundation, the Open Society Institute, the Park Foundation, the Reva and David Logan Foundation, the David and Elaine Potter Foundation, the Roddick Foundation and several smaller private trusts. Its current funders (website as at March 2017) are the Lorana Sullivan Foundation (twin charities in New York and in Britain with an endowment from Lorana Sullivan’s will to enhance the role and education of women in business and financial reporting, and improve the standards of investigative journalism), the David and Elaine Potter Foundation (a UK charitable grant-making foundation, established in 1999 to encourage a stronger and fairer society, and supporting education and civil society, granting over £17 million since its outset to registered charities in the UK and abroad); the Reva and David Logan Foundation (a Chicago-based family foundation, funding the arts, investigative journalism, scholarship and programmes to promote social justice); Stichting Democratie en Media (a Netherlands foundation investing in independent, critical media and a democratic state) and Goldsmiths, University of London, providing office, technical and space facilities, and close co-operation with its media studies and communications department. CIJ draws in wider funding sources and partners. Its Logan Symposium (first held in Berlin in 2016), received support from the Rudolf Augstein Foundation and Der Spiegel (Germany). Similarly, its training initiatives on illicit finance, financial secrecy and asset recovery was organised with the Tax Justice Network, which secured project funding from the Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust.

The UK has few operating foundations (namely those both funding and undertaking activities directly or with partners, in contrast to only grant-funding others’ work), though there is increasing interest in this model, especially where new donors seek active engagement in social change initiatives. The Carnegie UK Trust provides one such example. This trust aims to use its funds to improve well-being by influencing public policy and changing lives through innovative practice and partnerships. Its strapline, ‘changing minds, changing lives’. Founded and endowed by the philanthropist Andrew Carnegie in 1913, it is one of twenty Carnegie foundations worldwide. The trust brings a broad frame of reference – community, local identity, citizen voice – to its contributions in this field, rather than a specific interest in journalism per se.\textsuperscript{118}
‘Standouts’
Two contrasting foundations can be considered ‘standouts’. The David and Elaine Potter Foundation has been making grants for education, research, human rights, civil society, health, law and the arts since 1999. Its major founding gifts to the Centre for Investigative Journalism and the Bureau for Investigative Journalism are only part of their particular emphasis on ‘education’ and ‘civil society’. For the latter, the Foundation focuses on ‘transparency, accountability, anti-corruption and good governance, also human rights, drones, investigative journalism, the rule of law, democracy, citizenship, equality, and misuse of natural resources’ – the critical core of the media, journalism and communication worlds. The Foundation also supports relevant international organisations, such as Global Witness, the International Press Institute, the Index on Censorship, and linked scholarship at Kings’ College London’s Centre for the Study of Media, Communication and Power. Importantly, in a philanthropic world marked by attention to individual and ‘one-off’ projects, the Foundation is committed to core support, multi-year grants, and programme support among its grantees.

A second example is the operating foundation, the Carnegie UK Trust (see above) whose funding for small, innovative community news organisations has provided valuable demonstration projects. There has been no significant take-up by other grant-makers of its project models and innovative pilots in community news. The Trust’s interim evaluation report on its Neighbourhood News project noted a ‘gap in the market’ for a media-neutral funding mechanism for well-organised projects rooted in communities across the UK. This report went on to stress that ‘there are many funders of community action in the UK who could take an easy step into what is new territory for them by taking up the CUKT Neighbourhood News model’.

While the funding role of the Big Lottery (as noted in section 2) reflects a public or quasi-public response to community news needs and media experience in localities (see Table 3), other foundations and community action funders appear not to have ‘stepped up’ to this particular opportunity. From this perspective, paraphrasing the House of Lords’ Communications Committee, 2012, which hoped to see charitable sponsoring for investigative journalism replicated more widely, there has been no marked replication of the lead taken by the very limited number of foundations already firmly in the field.
Table 2: Sample of major community media and journalism grants by Big Lottery Fund

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Fund Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taking Charge 2008</td>
<td>Media Trust</td>
<td>£2,734k</td>
<td>Providing young people with placements and volunteer opportunities with The Media Trust’s corporate partners such as BBC, ITV, Channel4, BSkyB, Guardian Media Group, Daily Mail, MTV, Bebo and News International.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Community Hubs and Newswire 2011</td>
<td>Media Trust</td>
<td>£1,995k</td>
<td>Grant for a UK network of local community news hubs combining broadcasting and online; scale up impact and reach through integrating local and UK-wide news services and media outlets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghan Humanitarian Reporting and Journalist Training Programme, 2003</td>
<td>Institute for War and Peace Reporting</td>
<td>£798k</td>
<td>Funding to help create a free press which can disseminate reliable information on humanitarian, social and political developments affecting the Afghan people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voices for Change 2012</td>
<td>Headliners UK</td>
<td>£600k</td>
<td>Funding to run the Voices for Change creative journalism &amp; media projects for young people in Limavady, Strabane, Londonderry &amp; Belfast not in education or training; in or leaving care, or involved in anti-social behaviour or crime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverse FM Community Media &amp; Training Project 2015</td>
<td>Diverse FM</td>
<td>£380k</td>
<td>Through outreach and referrals, disadvantaged young people in Luton are signposted to educational workshops and seminars with motivational speakers. There is a volunteering, mentoring and leadership programme, and the opportunity to join up to 25 vocational and developmental courses with qualifications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart and Sound Community Media, 2017</td>
<td>Heart and Sound, Fife</td>
<td>£150k</td>
<td>Heart and Sound Community Media and Recording Studio, Fife.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Role of UK Universities and other organisations

Universities

While attention has been given above to the diverse nature of philanthropic giving for journalism, the UK universities present a consistent and important feature of the landscape, as both recipients of funding, and in some cases providers of indirect support (for example, City University, London, previously for the Centre for Investigative Journalism and for the Bureau of Investigative Journalism; Goldsmiths, University of London, for the Leverhulme Media Research Centre). As at March 2017, there were 147 postgraduate journalism courses, in 51 institutions. The level, relevance and expertise of work in journalism in UK universities, funded and capable of attracting further funding, can be gained from the UK Government’s Research Excellence Framework documentation. In its latest iteration, REF 2014, 125 impact case studies for journalism are recorded. Examples include

Table 3: Examples of Impact Case Studies on news and journalism, UK Universities’ REF, 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Research</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cardiff University</td>
<td>Research on broadcast news’ failure to reflect devolution landscapes, recommendations adopted by BBC, news coverage better reflecting UK post-devolution politics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City University</td>
<td>The Initiative on Journalists in Danger: Impunity and the Rule of Law, agenda-setting in campaign including non-governmental and inter-governmental bodies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldsmiths College</td>
<td>Research on journalism in the digital age, developing civil society engagement and recommendations to media and public policy makers on media reform</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Support for journalism through universities continues through a variety of routes. These include funding student scholarships and chairs. For example, The Marjorie Deane Financial Journalism Foundation has provided gifts to create professorships in financial journalism in City, University of London and New York University. Funding has also been awarded to broad research areas and topics which go well beyond journalism *per se*, to include disciplines such as politics, geography, history, sociology, English. The Leverhulme Trust, for example, has supported the founding of the Media Research Centre at Goldsmiths, University of London.

The growth of interdisciplinary scholarship offers further research and practice advantages and opportunities. At City, University of London, for example, the Centre for Law, Justice and Journalism is the first major interdisciplinary centre to develop the inter-relations between law, justice and journalism in society. At the University of Lincoln, its School of English and Journalism brings together two areas concerned with how the world is understood and interpreted. Finally, smaller scale research/intervention university-based projects also attract funds, for example, the Joseph Rowntree Reform Trust funding a pilot project at the University of Lincoln to establish a charitable news organisation.

**Mixed purpose organisations**

The importance of mixed purpose organisations is increasing. These variously incorporate elements of charitable or *pro bono* social action and funding, social and commercial consultancy, research, technical training, technical innovation and commercial production. In some projects where funding remains relatively small-scale, organisations seek dual funding streams, business-led as well as philanthropy-led. Social business models, such as the social enterprise form, are thus increasingly prominent. Recent examples include City Matters, the City of London hyperlocal newspaper, aiming to provide training and employment opportunities to armed forces veterans and City of London residents who have special educational requirements. A longer-established example is People’s Voice Media, a charity and social enterprise based in Salford which has been operating its flagship ‘Community Reporter Programme’ across the UK and Europe since 1995. Notwithstanding these organisations’ development of commercial links and commercial antennae, the role for philanthropy to support social enterprise, whether through grants or social investment, remains.

A leading example of a private firm with mixed purposes is Talk About Local, a private company limited by guarantee whose work ranges from consultancy for large international organisations to individuals, communities, charities, voluntary groups, national and local government, and helping people with digital inclusion. Offering a strong public service ethos and local network links, Talk About Local undertook the major evaluations for the Carnegie UK Trust, and describes itself as more about people and public service than technology platforms and advertising, while its commercial investors and customers enable its public-directed work to thrive.

Funding for this organisation also comes from mixed sources. For example, its Local News Engine (LNE) was announced as one of five UK projects to receive funding in 2016 from Google’s *Digital News Initiative* (DNI), a collaboration between Google and news publishers in Europe. The DNI reports Google’s establishment of a fund of EUR 150 million for projects that demonstrate new thinking in digital journalism. Three were publisher/press based, and the other two were LNE and the Bureau for Investigative Journalism’s ‘local journalism project’, to ensure...
better accountability in the way taxpayers’ money is spent. A key partner of Talk About Local is the Online Centres Network, a series of community partners brought together by the Good Things Foundation (formerly the Tinder Foundation) which aims to improve the lives of digitally excluded people through digital technology and community action. It provides direct services as well as grant-making to achieve its aims, and is in turn funded principally by UK government departments including the Department for Education, the NHS and Her Majesty’s Revenue and Customs, and by charitable trusts. The changes in the journalism landscape appear to have left many of the general public unaware of the continuing needs of journalism as a focus for charitable giving, and of the high costs of high quality journalism.

The media are only at the beginning of seeking subscription funding for online and offline media access, or inviting donations for this purpose (the public as consumer and/or donor); yet public expectations of no-cost media access are strong. Crowdfunding is creating new forms of funding engagement (for example, Positive News, see section 4); and is increasingly prominent across the UK, for example, in appeals for resources for community radio. As emphasised earlier it is also not known how many individual donors also in fact support activities such as community news production, with time as well as money. Both of these may be substantial, and some anonymous. Nevertheless, it is not evident that journalism, whether broadly or narrowly understood, ranks as a giving priority with the British general public, or at least not yet. In the next section, further examples of funded journalistic projects are described in more detail.

Reception of such funding in the journalism sector and among the public
Gauging reaction to funding of this intricacy is difficult. Fund-seeking civil society organisations of course welcome it. The public, however, is often unaware of philanthropic funding for social institutions and, as this paper shows, there are very few UK philanthropic foundations giving significant funds to journalism and its developments, or doing so consistently over time.
SECTION 4

Current examples of philanthropic funding

As has been noted, there are not many instances of investigative journalism itself being supported by philanthropy, except in specialised areas, as most philanthropic funding is awarded to education and training, or to standards or youth opportunity, particularly related to the encouragement of local news platforms. Some of the latter are making innovative and developmental use of citizen journalism and new technologies. One emerging and dynamic area is in the development of international news and information services as tools for citizen empowerment and democracy in developing countries, allied with innovative digital applications and platforms. Although, however, the number of projects involved in producing journalism is small, they are generating a new non-profit and philanthropic space which is characterised by technological advance, challenging thinking and organisational innovation. It is a space of experimentation where the power of mass media and communications technologies are being brought to achieve social action and change.

The examples of funded projects in this section illustrate strengths and limitations in philanthropic funding, successes and failures. They also illustrate the diversity and individuality of the interests of philanthropic funders, and by no means a coherent body of initiatives. Philanthropic funding does not substitute for public funding, and is not necessarily needs-led but expresses the choices of a multiple and fragmented set of funders, with varying resources and constraints, and working within the parameters of charity law.

Bureau of Investigative Journalism

Turned down twice for charitable status by the Charity Commission, the Bureau of Investigative Journalism (BIJ) is an independent, not-for-profit media organisation that ‘holds power to account’. It is one of the tiny group of significant agencies for investigative journalism in the UK, and its case drew high-profile media and parliamentary attention to the issue of the status of, and the funding for, investigative journalism. Its mission statement sets out what could be seen as a model for investigative journalism. ‘We pursue in-depth investigative journalism to inform the public, with no corporate or political agenda. Through fact-based, unbiased reporting, we expose systemic wrongs, counter misinformation and spark change.’ It was set up initially with a large philanthropic grant from the David and Elaine Potter Foundation, whose charitable objectives emphasise education, research and understanding towards a plural, rational and tolerant society, and strong civil society. With an emphasis on international issues, the contribution of the work of the BIJ is recognised in the support from several major charitable foundations which it has received, and continues to receive, alongside pro bono and in-kind help from companies including Google and Shutterstock. It has no funding from governments. Like other agencies emerging within this field, the BIJ emphasises the role of data-based investigative journalism and reporting as key tools of social change in a modern world increasingly shaped by the power of mass communications and digital technologies. Accounts of its impact include exposure of the poor treatment of vulnerable clients in a care home which led to the resignation of senior staff and two local authority enquiries. More broadly, BIJ is also tackling the issue of misinformation and fake news, and supporting the role of local media.

Code4SA

In communities where data and information is still a scarce resource, journalism can be a particularly powerful tool for empowerment and social change. Innovative work allies digital technology with access to open data. Code4SA is a ‘data journalism project’ in South Africa which uses new technologies and existing data to create knowledge bases which enable journalists and citizens to raise awareness and mobilise action for change. Funders include the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and the Indigo Trust. One example of its work is an open data mobile phone app that enables citizens to identify the voting district and wards to which they belong. This was used by the Mail & Guardian to create the ‘Know Your Hood’ tool, through which people can find out previous voting patterns based on their ward data. A further tool is a Parliamentary Monitoring Group which tracks the progress of bills through parliament and publishes audio files of committee meetings on a daily basis. Gates Foundation funding is supporting newsrooms first in Kenya, Nigeria and South Africa, and following that Tanzania to collect and disseminate data and information digitally, and respond to the queries of investigative journalism. Multiple applications of the approach and the technology are emerging. A key priority is the dissemination of health information, and projects using data.
drones and sensors are being built to promote health and development journalism across the continent. The re-use of technologies enable such projects to be built cost-effectively, but challenges to rolling them out lie in the support for open data and access to mobile phones.

**openDemocracy**

openDemocracy is also a web-based independent global media platform, using digital journalism to encourage democratic debate and help people across the world establish their rights. Its organisational structure is designed to encompass the separate requirements of hard-hitting investigative journalism and journalistic projects compliant with the non-partisan criteria of charity law. This is a structure which echoes the model of a number of non-profit organisations such as Amnesty International which have both charitable and non-charitable arms, to ensure a hard boundary between political and non-political campaigning. The publisher, a private limited company, carries out both non-charitable projects which are not politically restricted, and charitable projects funded charitably and in line with the public benefit criteria. It is wholly owned by a private not-for-profit, the openDemocracy Foundation for the Advancement of Global Education, while philanthropic funding is granted by the OpenTrust, a charity. Web content focuses on social and political issues, raising challenging questions around justice and democracy. Its technological infrastructure consists of a main site with a central editorial team focussing often on current issues which involve questions of rights and equality, while a number of editorially and financially independent sections address specific topics. It publishes up to 60 articles a week, attracting over 8 million web visits per year.

**Richard Beeston Bursary**

The potential of a carefully targeted partnership between a philanthropic trust and a mainstream newspaper can be seen in the annual bursary (worth £6000) available from the Richard Beeston Trust to develop high quality foreign correspondence journalism in areas of conflict and tension. It supports an experienced professional British or UK-based foreign correspondent to spend 6 weeks abroad, researching and reporting on a foreign news story, in association with the Times newspaper. A further award is available to a professional journalist based in Israel, Lebanon or the Palestinian territories to undertake a fellowship on The Times foreign desk in London. In its first year (2015) this allowed a multi-media journalist who specialises in the Middle East to report from Baghdad and Ramadi, and supported a journalist from Gaza City to work in The Times, publishing nine pieces during her period there and continuing to write for the paper now that she has returned to Gaza. In its second year, the out-bound bursary went to a London-based journalist specialising in politics and terrorism, with a particular focus on the Indian sub-continent, while a journalist based in Israel, who comments widely on Israeli politics for several international broadcasters, as well as participating in interreligious dialogue groups with Palestinians was based at the Times.

**Positive News**

Crowd-funding is also appearing as a successful form of philanthropic funding for journalism. Positive News is a ‘constructive journalism’ magazine, focussed on reporting positive solutions-oriented initiatives for social change, rather than the more traditional academic focus on problems and issues. It is a model that NCVO, the representative member body for UK charities, is adopting for its new ‘Constructive Voices’ project to promote positive journalism about the voluntary sector, and redress the balance away from the negative coverage it has recently been receiving. Positive News is published on paper and online, and is available in a number of countries. Its founder, Shauna Crockett-Burrows who died in 2012, established the Positive News Trust as a charity aimed at promoting awareness of the positive achievements and ideas of young people, and involving young people in journalism. Events in the lives of charitable funders often have a profound impact on the charities they create, and after the founder's death Positive News faced a funding crisis. In 2015, it ran a crowd-funding share offer to convert into a consumer cooperative. Over £250,000 was raised, and Positive News is now owned by 1526 readers, journalists and supporters who have a say in its shape. How successful the new model will be remains to be seen.

**Full Fact**

Preceding the era of ‘fake news’, Full Fact is an independent fact-checking charity in the UK set up, perhaps prophetically, in 2011. It provides free tools, information and advice for the public to check the claims made by politicians and the media around contentious, misrepresented or under-represented issues. After struggling to achieve charitable status and, initially, funder interest, it has received ongoing support from foundations such as the Barrow Cadbury Trust, Esmee Fairbairn Foundation and Nuffield Foundation. Full Fact has established itself as an authoritative source used by many mainstream journalists and broadcasters, government, and parliament. Its activities have widened out from fact-checking in particular news instances to live fact-checking during the BBC's live ‘Question Time’ debates, which involve leading political and other figures, and audience members in debate on topical issues and concerns, and Parliamentary Question Time. One challenge to the organisation is the sheer quantity and breadth of news to be covered, and the need to prioritise. The organisation has demonstrated its value, but as with many other non-profits and charities, seeks to extend philanthropic funding with other income.
and Full Fact is diversifying its income streams, for example providing consultancy and training to other charitable organisations around generating effective and authoritative narratives, for both a philanthropic foundation and Facebook, around ‘fake news’. The huge importance and challenge of establishing integrity and evidence in public discourse should not be under-estimated, as a glance at an open blog querying the objectivity of the truth-seekers will illustrate.

Internews Europe

Internews Europe is another organisation using communications and information channels as tools for propelling change, particularly in rights. It is a large international non-profit organisation which aims to build up local media though linking them into up-to-date global news and information, and to strengthen people’s voices particularly in areas of humanitarian crisis by gathering on-the-ground feedback from people in crisis situations. Internews is a UK registered charity and non-profit association with considerable funding from many national governments, but is also supported by a number of UK and other European philanthropic funders and partners which help mobilise its initiatives on the ground in different countries. Its ‘In The Loop’ project is a weekly newsletter which documents online and offline feedback gathered from refugees and migrants on a daily basis, and provides this documentation to humanitarian organisations. It also collects information on rumours amongst refugees, identifying misinformation and responding with factual information. One example of a rumour which it addressed is that ‘all Iraqis were being rejected for asylum within the EU’. Internews Europe is using information channels to build humanitarian communities, and to integrate refugees and migrants into the wider information ecology so that they are more empowered, and that there can be more accountability for the dire situations in which many find themselves through no fault of their own.

Journalism Foundation

It is salutary to include a mention of the rise and fall of the Journalism Foundation in any review of the potential of philanthropy in supporting journalistic activity. The Journalism Foundation was established by Evgeny Lebedev, head of the UK publishing operation including the Independent and the Evening Standard. Lebedev’s ambitious vision was for an organisation that could fund investigative journalism around the world. The initiative was led by Simon Kelner, former editor-in-chief of the Independent, and announced as linked to the journalism course at City University. But it relied on further funds becoming available and these did not materialise. The foundation was wound down only a year after it began, having managed to support a grassroots website aimed at hyperlocal engagement in Stoke-on-Trent, to promote radio training and two community journalism projects in the UK and overseas. At its closure, the non-profit sector press reported its understanding that this foundation had received initial support of £600,000 from the Lebedev family, and a foundation spokesman’s comment that it had proved very difficult to raise external funds. The experience of the Journalism Foundation serves as a reminder of philanthropic vagaries and challenges.

The Thomson Foundation

The Thomson Foundation, an independent charitable trust and operating charity, was established in 1962 by the newspaper and television proprietor, the first Lord Thomson of Fleet, to support educational, technical and vocational training. Like several other projects, it has focussed on the media in developing countries and emerging economies. It undertook a programme of strategic review and change in 2010, moving to London from Cardiff, and re-launching its website and brand. This was partly in response to changes in the external environment which meant the Foundation had to ‘widen (its) approach to training and consultancy to support the growing number of individuals and organisations entering digital journalism’. A key focus was its long-standing relationship with the government’s Foreign and Commonwealth Office, and the Foundation was successful in attracting new funding from the FCO’s larger strategic funds, in particular the Human Rights and Democracy Fund (which supports freedom of expression initiatives) and the Conflict Pool (which supports media-related projects as a conflict prevention tool). The UK FCO remains a long-term partner on projects to promote media freedom and high journalism standards; for example the programme to improve the skills of Sudanese journalists, delivered in partnership with the British Council, which is also a UK charity.

The Foundation’s 2015 Annual Review reported the award of a four-year project by the European Union to support independent media in 17 of its neighbouring countries, (Algeria, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Egypt, Georgia, Israel, Jordan, Lebanon, Libya, Moldova, Morocco, the Palestinian Territories, Russia, Syria, Tunisia and Ukraine). The programme will train newspaper managers, informing cross-border debate partly through staff exchanges. The EU Media Hub contract, worth nearly €8million over the life of the programme is reported as the largest ever awarded to the Foundation. It has also been a consortium partner with the European Journalism Centre on EU-funded work on professional development. Collaboration with international foundations includes support from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, through which the Thomson Foundation implemented the ‘Africa Means Business’
project, aiming to improve the flow of critical information on economic issues to both policy makers and the public. The two-year long project worked through a unique collaboration between journalists and economists in Kenya and Ghana to share skills, pool knowledge and deliver more business and economics stories.
SECTION 5

Reflections and Recommendations

Building a picture of philanthropic responses to the complex and growing needs across the landscape of journalism in the UK has involved capturing organisational funding decisions, actions, programmes, projects and their inter-relationships. As already noted in Section 3, the fact that philanthropic funding related to journalism in the UK is generally subsumed within one of the formal charitable purposes and therefore difficult to identify, that it is often only part of funder’s wider funding portfolio, or only a part of the total funding package for journalistic projects, or transmitted through further funding intermediaries all make it very difficult to track its value. An attempt to make a rough estimate, however, has been made in order to provide an initial benchmark for the annual amount of philanthropic funding within journalistic activities, and a baseline for better data.

Value of philanthropic funding

Using the most recent accounts available (mainly 2015 and 2016 calendar and financial years), figures were extracted for:

- annual spending by philanthropic grant-makers on projects related to journalism (including one-off grants as well as the total spending of those wholly dedicated to journalistic purposes)
- operating/service-providing charities in the fields of news provision and journalism which fundraise or generate income from their charitable activities.

Double-counting between philanthropic grant-makers and the recipients was eliminated wherever possible, but there are gaps in the data where it was not possible to identify an amount for journalism from the published accounts, and in some cases estimates were made.

With these caveats, from scrutinising the accounts of approximately 100 organisations it was possible to identify an annual spending of around £30 million on journalism-related projects in the UK. These range from amounts of £1000 or under for individual awards and tiny local projects, to a very small number of grants or total spending amounting to £1 million or over. It should be noted that no ‘typical’ amount of support was found across this range, and funding depended on the nature of the activity or organisation. There are organisations making a number of small awards or prizes, and organisations devoting all their resources to one or two initiatives. The funding pattern reflects the diverse individual interests which currently characterise this field. Based on this approximate estimate, philanthropic funding for journalism-related activities appears to be equal to 1% of the spending of philanthropic foundations in the UK.\(^5^0\)

The key features of the place occupied by philanthropic funding prompt a number of reflections.

Reflections on the field

Emerging and expanding field The examples of inter-foundation collaboration and networking, with each other and with governments, of the multiplication of locally-based initiatives across the country, and of the expertise and international credibility of particular funders all indicate that this is not only an emerging but an expanding field for philanthropy.

Limited philanthropic funding A limited number of foundations and other donors are active in the field of journalism, with only a few foundation ‘landmarks’. The existence of a small number of specialised foundations dedicated to journalism as centres for excellence is a particular characteristic of the journalism landscape as few funders in the UK are specialised in this way. Paradoxically this might give the impression that the field is well-covered, though in practice there are few foundations with which incoming philanthropic interests might collaborate and against which they might benchmark themselves. Moreover, among those UK foundations which have broad rather than
specialised parameters for providing public benefit, there appear to be minimal numbers prioritising areas such as civic engagement through and access to the media above other issues.

**Philanthropic funding and wider journalistic landscape** Existing philanthropic funding for journalistic activities is concentrated in a few fields related principally to the charitable purposes of education and training (professional and young people), ethical and professional standards and the promotion of democracy, civil society and community empowerment. While there is clear scope for more and wider philanthropic activity in the field of journalism, the very sense of debate (or disagreement) as to what journalism currently is and where it is headed gives potential funders a very wide choice of priorities. Is it about professionalism and super-professionals, digital technology expertise and channels, activists, amateurs, ingénues, citizens, lobbyists? Is it about gender, diversity, regionality, about the centrality of the global – or ‘glocal’ - world?

**Expansion in philanthropic rationales** Characteristically in a fast-moving field, there is an expansion in the areas seen as meriting philanthropic attention. For example, the case for community news support contributing towards societal democracy is developing into exploration of “reciprocal journalism”, whereby reciprocal practices between community journalists and community members may lead to “sustained reciprocity” over time. Such expansion is reinforced by charities generally becoming aware of the immense power of mass communication and its potential role in social change, of which advocacy for ‘constructive journalism’ is an example.

**Emerging tensions and controversies** The philanthropy of journalism contains several examples of inner conflicts. Research has shown some of the innate tensions that arise in community news development in under-served or disadvantaged communities, as well as the willingness to tackle those tensions. For example, studies have found “a strong tendency among many community sites to want to produce news that paints their local areas in a positive light, but this does not generally mean they shy away from writing critical stories where necessary”.

The term ‘hyperlocal’, which is understood and valued by many may also be disliked by others, who do not promote themselves in this way. It may itself be exclusionary, especially when colonised by its own set of technical questions, and technical capabilities.

The disagreements that have surfaced around what is meant and can be delivered by ‘independent press regulation’ may particularly concern foundations for whom their own independence is a critical issue, where UK foundations (as well as fundraising charities) have found themselves facing media hostility towards their grant-making choices and the overall experience of a ‘bad press’. Moreover, philanthropic norms and journalistic norms may contrast as well as coincide. For example, see discussion of the case for impartiality in the context of donors seeking to enact change. In this instance donors’ orientation towards impact and targeting policymaker-practitioners may constrain journalists’ ability to be critical where there is a risk of alienating those they hope to influence.

While consideration of the implications of disagreements between donors’ and journalists’ values focus largely on international philanthropy, these considerations have relevance too in national contexts.

**Multiple models** Philanthropic funding is distributed within a complex terrain of organisational structures, where private, public and non-profit funding streams are inter-woven or co-exist, and where organisations often effectively blend charitable and non-charitable, public and commercial purposes and structures. The value of mixed, entrepreneurial social business models within the field of journalism is demonstrated in the examples, and could potentially have particular appeal to funders pursuing social investment approaches, while presenting a barrier to others with more purely philanthropic approaches.

**Issues and barriers to entry for new donors** The case examples in this report confirm the levels and range of expertise among the existing funders. What are the potential issues or barriers to the entry of further donors into this field? One aspect is uncertainty about the required scale and level of intervention. The significant resourcing levels and commitment over time shown by the David and Elaine Potter Foundation signal for some the importance of the philanthropic ‘long haul’, and the strategic recognition that building capacity and achieving impact is an embedded and not instant feature of foundation life. Yet the majority of UK foundations are not large ones and there is limited value in comparison with the commitment of US foundations whose spending can be estimated at more than ten times that of the UK. Alternatively, the Carnegie Foundation’s small-scale, localised and successful demonstration projects also raise more general questions about the risks of exit when projects are small or depend on the dedication of volunteers, not to mention funders’ willingness to pick up and run with others’ ideas. Such issues, combined with awareness of how fast the multiple journalism worlds are changing, may make for philanthropic super-caution and lack of involvement.
Journalism and charitable status

How far is lack of status as a charitable purpose a barrier to philanthropic support? Clearly journalism is disadvantaged in terms of some of the charitable tax-breaks which accrue to recognised charitable purposes, and the value of some gifts for journalistic activities could be enhanced if tax-relief could be collected. Charitable status could also bring a practical advantage in making life easier for organisations which decide to apply for charitable status. The philanthropic landscape, however, shows that dedicated funders have found a way towards supporting journalism within the existing framework of charity law, and that even if charitable status were achieved, it would not suit all kinds of journalistic activities because of charity law requirements and could pose tricky governance challenges. It is not apparent that the acquisition of charitable status would be a game-changer in itself, but it could draw attention to, and galvanize debate around the value, and need for, objective investigative journalism in a democratic society, its role in community development and the conditions under which it flourishes. In an era of ‘fake news’ and increasingly rapid information flows, this is likely to become increasingly important. It might prompt more generic funders to incorporate some funding for journalistic purposes within their funding portfolios.

The position has already been well-articulated by BJ: ‘The Bureau relies on donations from pioneering foundations and individuals who know the value of investigative journalism in a fast-changing world’. In its submission to the House of Commons Select Committee inquiry into ‘fake news’, launched in January 2017, the Centre for the Study of Media, Communication and Power (CSMCP), King’s College London, stresses that any responses to fake news need to acknowledge and understand the much broader and deeper problems in our digital news and information environment. Its director (founding director in 2006 of the Media Standards Trust), is clear that market-driven corrections are not likely to alleviate the problem but also that hasty responses by governments to the problem of fake news are likely to have unintended, potentially damaging consequences. In asking “is there a role for governments?” the submission is emphatic that if the functions ‘previously associated with the Fourth Estate’, that are ‘central to a working democracy, are to be sustained, then market failure should be acknowledged and progressive interventions considered’. CSMCP concentrates only on governmental action, but the evidence in this review of the role of philanthropy in journalism suggests that rather than looking only to government, such interventions are precisely where independent grant-makers can excel individually, collaboratively and by many more such organisations than those cited in this report.

Finally, it needs to be recognised that philanthropic funding is not a substitute for other kinds of funding. It is essentially private funding for public good, and has its own characteristics, with which fund-seekers need to be prepared to work. As shown in some of the examples in this report, philanthropy can open new doors but also be unpredictable in funder preferences, amounts, directions, fashions and collaborations. Leadership challenges might arise where the independence of journalism finds itself at odds with the independence of philanthropy.

Recommendations

The complexity of the picture of philanthropic funding flows to and through non-profit organisations for journalistic activities, and its emergent nature within the fast-developing field of journalism itself, mean that few recommendations to develop the role of philanthropy are ‘single-issue’ matters. A small set of recommendations is set out below which aim at creating a stronger and more persuasive environment for philanthropic funding of journalism in the UK, addressing issues of clarity and definition around purpose, of the type of funding needed, of new areas for grant-making and of strengthening governance to address journalism-related funding. Some US guidance on governance issues has recently become available from the American Press Institute.

For fund-seeking organisations in journalism

There should be more open discussion between key stakeholders in the field of non-profit journalism and philanthropy to clarify and define journalistic purposes and objectives as it relates to philanthropic funding. Organisations within the field of journalism which are seeking philanthropic funding should consider how far it is the most appropriate funding for their purposes within a range of options, and be prepared to work within the parameters of funder preferences.

For Funders

Funders need greater guidance on how philanthropic funding can add to current funding around journalism most appropriately, and how it can meet charitable purposes, whether within the existing or an amended framework of public benefit.
The need for authoritative, objective and independent information is increasing in a society of fake news and deliberate misinformation, and funders new to this area should consider whether it should be given greater priority, specifically in relation to citizen empowerment and democracy.

Philanthropy could play a significant role in investing in the mixed mode or social enterprise models which are emerging within the field of non-profit journalism, and more models of good or promising practice should be disseminated by social investment stakeholders.

More attention should be paid to the emerging opportunities to address digital exclusion through making grants for the extension and expansion of digital communications technologies to digitally-excluded and voiceless individuals and communities such as young and elderly carers, or people with special needs or disabilities, or living in geographically isolated or deprived areas.

Foundations which want to get more involved in funding investigative journalism and other journalistic activities related to citizen empowerment and education should review board composition to ensure they have access to trustees with specific interests and expertise in addressing governance issues which might arise around editorial autonomy, the persuasions of the funder and the obligations of charity law around non-political or partisan purposes.
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