



WIE SMART IST TV?

»Fernsehen allein konsumieren zu müssen ist eine moderne Metapher für qualvolle Einsamkeit.« Meint Franz Manola, Leiter des Plattformmanagements im ORF. SEITE 64

THE NEED OF PROACTIVITY

It's the perfect moment to work not only for the citizens but also with them – by Roberto Suárez Candel. SEITE 71

KDO JE ŽE POVPREČEN?

Avstrijci in Avstrijke govoriijo slovensko, madžarsko, hrvaško, slovaško, češko, romanes ali nemško – in to je dobro. SEITE 38



Wie erfüllt der ORF seinen öffentlich-rechtlichen Auftrag? Was ist seine originäre, von kommerziellen Medien unterscheidbare Qualität? Der »Public-Value-Report« gibt Auskunft.

2012/13

PUBLIC VALUE REPORT

ZUKUNFT . ORF . AT



Wo bleibt der Aufstand?

Soziale Spannungen, Demonstrationen und Regierungskrisen in ganz Europa: Gleichzeitig erobern populistische Slogans die Politik, Boulevardmedien boomen. Ist die Krise des Qualitätsjournalismus auch eine Krise der Demokratie? Was haben gesellschaftliche Konflikte mit Medienqualität zu tun? Welchen Nutzen bringen Medien – und vor allem: wem? Forscherinnen und Forscher der Universitäten Antwerpen, Oxford (USA), Wien und Zürich analysieren das Verhältnis zwischen Medien und politischer Kultur.

SEITEN 20, 37, 47 UND 56



Schalko

über Kleingeist und Größenwahn, die Verrohung der Sitten, die Ausrottung des Land Lebens und »Braunschlag«. SEITE 10



Warum vertrauen?

Unabhängigkeit von Politik und Wirtschaft ist die wichtigste Grundlage seriöser Information. Mehr zu Eurokrise, Korruption und Qualitätsjournalismus auf den SEITEN 4, 6 UND 48



Empowering Society

How Public Service Media will change: Perspectives, Visions and 6 European Core Values. SEITEN 36 UND 57

DIE FÜNF QUALITÄTSDIMENSIONEN DES ORF

INDIVIDUELLER WERT

MEHR AUF DEN SEITEN 4 – 21

GESELLSCHAFTSWERT

MEHR AUF DEN SEITEN 22 – 37

ÖSTERREICHWERT

MEHR AUF DEN SEITEN 38 – 47

INTERNATIONALER WERT

MEHR AUF DEN SEITEN 48 – 57

UNTERNEHMENSWERT

MEHR AUF DEN SEITEN 58 – 71



Brot und Salz des Lebens

Von französischer Poesie, Slumdogs und Max Weber: Annäherungen an den »Kulturbegriff« von Martin Blumenau, Angelika Doucha-Fasching, Sharon Nuni und Barbara Rett. SEITE 24



Innenleben

ORF-Redakteurinnen und -Redakteure über Features, innovative Nachrichten und Qualität, die nicht am Reißbrett entsteht. SEITE 60



Mein digitaler Alltag

Das ORF-»Nachrichtenuniversum« auf einen Blick. Information in Fernsehen, Radio und Online. SEITEN 8 UND 62

The visual made verbal

JOEL SNYDER

President, Audio Description Associates, LLC (USA); Director, Audio Description Project, American Council of the Blind

I describe Audio Description (or »AD«) as a literary art form, a type of poetry – a haiku. Using as few words as possible, we provide a verbal version of the visual – the visual is made verbal, and aural, and oral. We use words that are succinct, vivid, and imaginative to convey the visual image that is not fully accessible to a segment of the population – new estimates by the American Foundation for the Blind now put that number at over 25 million Americans alone who are blind or have difficulty seeing even with correction. But description is also valuable when the visual image is not fully realized by the rest of us: sighted folks who see but who may not observe.

Or – those of us with 20:20 vision might well have difficulty making out small print on a screen or we might just be in another room while the television is playing – we can »hear« what we can't »see«. Indeed – audio description is for people who are blind »and« those who simply don't have access to the visual image, for whatever reason.

AUDIO DESCRIPTION - A DESCRIPTION

Audio Description is a literary art form. It's a type of poetry – a haiku. It provides a verbal version of the visual the visual is made verbal, and aural, and oral. Using as few words as possible, words that are succinct, vivid, and imaginative, we convey the visual image that is not fully accessible to a segment of the population – and not fully realized by the rest of us: sighted folks who see but who may not observe (we who are »light dependent«). It's useful for anyone who wants

to truly notice and appreciate a more full perspective on any visual event but it is especially helpful as an access tool for people who are blind or have low vision. You'll find AD at arts events but I've also provided the service at weddings, parades, rodeos, circuses, sports events ... and even funerals. Let me help you see what description can do by asking you, figuratively, to close your eyes and listen to an excerpt from the soundtrack of the feature film »The Color of Paradise«. There's no video – just audio.

→ <http://youtu.be/HJhfQPsVuWs>

What's going on? Birds chirping? Seagulls? It's a seashore scene! But was there a groan? What could that mean? Clearly, without access to the visual images of a film, confusion abounds, lack of clarity reigns and arguments may ensue ... Audio description to the rescue! Listen to the same excerpt once again but this time only with the addition of an audio description soundtrack:

→ <http://youtu.be/4zZKbATmGO>

Did you listen to the audio description carefully? This clip is from the middle of the film. The main character's »visage« was described

Numerous studies have shown the value of captions (subtitles) to children in the development of literacy. In a similar vein, I propose that a comparable benefit might be observed in children exposed to audio description. In my work with The Children's Center in New Haven, CT, I experimented with small children and reading teachers on what I think represents a new application for audio description: its application for and effect on literacy. During my time at The Children's Center I developed an audio described tour for this interactive, multi-sensory museum and I also trained teachers experimenting with more descriptive language to use when working with kids, picture books and media. As you might imagine, some »picture books« for toddlers are deficient with respect to the language skills they involve – they rely on the pictures to tell the story.

THE ORANGE BALL

But the teacher trained in audio description techniques would never simply hold up a picture of a ball and read the text: »See the ball.« He or she might add: »The ball is orange – just like an orange. I think that ball



earlier. But based on the description of the character's interaction with the environment – with the tree, in particular – can you imagine any physical characteristics of the character? If not, it will become quite clear to the sighted viewer once you have seen the video for about 20 seconds:

→ http://youtu.be/61i6Dvwc_Uc

If you use the following hyperlink, it will take you to an annotated version of the audio description script.

→ <http://www.audiodescribe.com> (...)

is as large as one of you! It's as round as the sun – a bright orange circle or sphere.« The teacher has introduced new vocabulary, invited comparisons, and used metaphor or simile – with toddlers! By using audio description, these books (or children's videos) are made accessible to kids who have low vision or are blind and simultaneously all kids develop more sophisticated language skills. A picture is worth 1.000 words? Maybe. But the audio describer might say that a few well-chosen words can conjure vivid and lasting images. (...) Effective describers must –

1) learn to »re-see« the world around us – to truly notice what is perceived with the eyes; 2) express the pertinent aspects of those images; 3) with precise and imaginative language; and 4) vocal techniques that render the visual verbal. In America there are over 25 million individuals who are either blind or have trouble seeing even with correction – that amounts to almost 8% of our population. Whether one speaks of public or commercial broadcasting, why would a broadcaster ignore such a significant proportion of the population. There is simply a lack of awareness of the need and a misunderstanding of the public benefit that could result from reaching out to this population, not to mention the financial benefit that might be gleaned from this untapped market.

I recount a true story: a blind fellow visiting a museum with some friends was once asked, »Excuse me, but what you doing in a museum? You can't see any of the exhibits.« His response? »I'm here for the same reason anyone goes to a museum. I want to learn, I want to know and be a part of our culture.« His inability to see shouldn't deny him his rights – his access to a public institution. I believe it is the responsibility of all public institutions to be as inclusive as possible. It's not simply about ease of access to »entertainment« – it's about access to our culture, and that is everyone's right. There simply is no good reason why a person with a particular disability must also be culturally disadvantaged.

But the bad reasons remain – and it may be that those who control access to our cultural venues and resources will loosen their grip on excuses for non-action only when folks demand the access that is their right. To paraphrase Star Trek, demand the opportunity to go where everyone else has already gone. It is the responsibility of public institutions – and to their great fiscal and social benefit – to be as inclusive as possible. Ultimately, I believe that here in the United States, in this tremendously prosperous nation, with all of its bountiful resources, there shouldn't be a state in this nation or a television network or a cable channel or a movie theater that doesn't offer full access to culture. The United States is founded on the principle that all people are created equal. We all have a right to equal access – that's what brings truth to the notion of universal equality. Even folks who have a quote-unquote disability.

Here in the United States the principal constituency for audio description has an unemployment rate of about 70%. I am certain that with more meaningful access to our culture and its resources, people become more informed, more engaged with society and more engaging individuals – thus, more employable. With a focus on people's abilities, we will come much closer to greater inclusion and total access. •

SENDUNGEN MIT UNTERTITELN/ IN GEBÄRDENSPRACHE:

10.546

Sendestunden wurden in ORF eins und ORF 2 Untertitelt.

190

Stunden mit Gebärde wurden in ORF III ausgestrahlt.

777

Ist die ORF-TELETEXT-Seite der Untertitel.

60,03%

aller in ORF eins und ORF 2 ausgestrahlten Sendungen wurden Untertitelt.

AUDIODESKRIPTION UND AUDIOKOMMENTIERUNG IN DEN PROGRAMMEN DES ORF

752

Sendestunden Audiodeskription im Jahr 2012

432

Sendestunden davon live

815

Sendungen, in ORF eins, ORF 2 und ORF SPORT+ sind für blinde und sehbehinderte Menschen zugänglich.

320

Sendestunden davon in Form von Hörfilmen

More action please!

UNIV.-PROF.^{IN} DR.^{IN} KATHARINE SARIKAKIS Universität Wien

Is there room for pleasure in public service media, and what is the place of public service media (PSM) in our pleasures? The role of PSM is deeply engrained in Europe's public and normative debates as one for mediating rational public spheres, understood to be the primary spaces for democratic praxis. Information and education figure predominantly as the major contributions of PSM; »to entertain«, as its third function, is often an afterthought and to be realised under strict conditions. Private media are unhappy when PSM offer entertainment and upset when this proves popular. Conditions, guidelines, »mission« and dilemmas can certainly take away all the fun of creativity and do not seem to leave a lot of room for pleasure in the public media. Doing the »right« thing is probably not about joy. Or is it?

A lot of assumptions are made in this preceding paragraph: that entertainment equals pleasure and that information most probably does not; that pleasure is a private affair, perhaps best entrusted in the hands of private media, while citizenship is public and based on reason; that public and private are clearly separated with the primacy of the former also clearly established; that citizenship therefore is a public matter with very few private elements; that reason and pleasure do not usually meet in the same sentence or act. That pleasure is subjective, personal, individual, superficial, private, commodified and occasionally anti-intellectual, uncritical, in other words, low in quality, relevance and priority. It is important to return to the examination of the role of pleasure, not in the meaning of »Vergnügen« but as enjoyment in democratic praxis and the possible role of PSM in creating the spaces and possibilities for it.

FOR THE SAKE OF NOBLE ACTS

The act of deriving and expressing pleasure from cultural goods and its role in creating oppositional, critical and emancipatory readings is neglected during anxious discourses about public media. Pleasure is at the heart of creativity, discovery and worth. From science to politics, some of the greatest minds have spoken of the joy of creativity and knowledge, of »finding things out« (Richard Feynman) and creating something new, and the joy of actively contributing to communal life. Aristoteles, in the Nichomachean Ethics, argues that Eudaimonia – »the good life« or living well – is a flourishing, active life, not one simply of happiness, but one of moral strength. This is connected to qualities, such as self-control

and tenacity but also, to the quality of knowing what ought to be done and acting in accordance to it. In this sense, good life is one of public participation but also one of actively engaging in all aspects of life, including home life. The existence of institutions, and in particular of the state, is not simply to provide communal life but »for the sake of noble actions«.

Eudaimonia is a state of existence fueling the direct kind of democracy the Athenians enjoyed, which not only allowed for efficient administration of the state, but also provided financial mechanisms for the Arts and especially Greek drama, as well as great public works, such as the construction of the Parthenon. Translating eudaimonia into institutional responsibility requires us to think of ways in which creative and substantial contribution to all aspects of life is facilitated and enabled not only through the provision of fora for the airing of »expert« views and »cool-headed« discussions. It is also for the construction of spaces and making available of resources for the integration of everyday, non-expert, non-professional impact onto the cultural and political life of a society. Pursuing »noble acts« is therefore neither the privilege nor exclusive right of highly educated elites, but indeed a right and act of the »lay man«. What might these

»noble acts« be and how may they be connected to pleasure in PSM? The work of the soul in accordance to excellence is for Aristotle the epitome of Eudaimonia. For this to take place, citizens must be enabled to live an enlarged citizenship, one which, according to the works of T. H. Marshal and Ruth Lister would involve the satisfactory cover of material as well as legal conditions, economic, social and cultural dimensions in addition to the – rather limited – political ones. Where the symbolic dimensions of cultural texts (whether sound, images or actual text) do not directly allow for the development of such dimensions, where the cultural environment does not directly speak of people's experiences and hence the possibility for action, for creativity and joy, people create their own cultural environments that provide alternatives to existing ones, speak directly against them or modify them.

In other words, people create their own symbolic spaces from where they can derive pleasure. These are not limited to spaces of entertainment genres, but of cultural offerings, including »factual« programmes, rational debates, evidence-based »texts«. This is what John Fiske called productive pleasure in resistance culture making. His thesis is based on the observation that overall, elites possess the resources for culture making of myths and values, whereas society at large has more limited options, and that because of this discrepancy culture is always a terrain of conflict and compromise, a struggle to »fit« and see oneself belonging. Mainstream institutions would therefore tend to reflect these values and omit ideas and experiences of the majority. Indeed, one of the most prominent criticisms against PSM has been their elitism, patronising approach to culture and top-down values. This point of critique is a common point between reformers of public media and proponents of for profit media – beyond that understand-

»Der ORF hat ein differenziertes Gesamtprogramm von Information, Kultur, Unterhaltung und Sport für alle anzubieten. Das Angebot hat sich an der Vielfalt der Interessen aller Hörer und Seher zu orientieren und sie ausgewogen zu berücksichtigen.«

ORF-GESETZ § 4. (2)

ings of what opening-up of narratives and democratisation of culture making entails, become blurry. For-profit media are concerned with the functional monetary outcome, which is thought to be secure, if cultural »recipes« for mass cultural products are followed. Popularity therefore is conflated with pleasure and entertainment of one particular character, that of escapism. Such pleasure does not derive from creativity and active participation but from withdrawal. For Fiske however resistance produces a special type of pleasure productive pleasure.

PATERNALISTIC APPROACH

Not to repeat ourselves tiringly, but to remind ourselves briefly, the media are different and changing, their usage is more complex and creative, audiences are

ing the control over culture making is a real and mature need. PSM must become broader, more complex and more flexible, so that they can be involved in genres of direct intervention, cross-media creativity, multiple story lines and multiple authors and options for narrative development. Especially in early citizens, such as children and young adults, the need for an ethos of public service must be coupled with excitement about creativity and expression, and certainly play.

How are our arts and educational needs debates and decisions taking place in our societies, where the disconnection and loss of trust in major institutional pillars of European societies are the shaky ground? Culture making has born conflicts of ideals and purpose within it, as well as marginalisation or legitimisation of the work, distance and proximity to a critique of social conditions under which citizenship is to be acted. Often, »popular« cultural creativity has been characterised either as folklore or as vulgar in the worst cases or unsatisfactory in the best. The debate over public media has been dominated by a paternalistic, »civilising« approach exclusively reserved for the experts and skilled over cultural processes deriving from non professional, precarious, and other forces. When these latter groups gained spaces on TV they were under conditions of ridicule, as the spectacle of savages and other »curiosities« or were enthroned to the tip of the mountain of happy-go-lucky and similar clichés. Plenty such examples are to be found in reality tv or entertainment shows and the news. Wisdom of mosaic truths are then trivialised, and ultimately denied.

CREATIVITY IS SOCIAL

I have written elsewhere about the restrictive and limited agenda through which debates on PSM are being held, certainly not only through policy debates but also in scholarship and socialisation of the role of PSM in contemporary societies. Preoccupation with the national as the departing point and destination, is not one of expansion of intellectual horizons, if it does not entail genuine commitment to reflection, enlarged thought and empathy with the world »beyond« the national. This should not be taken to mean simply the world outside country borders, but indeed the diversity of experience and perception, within borders, and the ways of connection. Creativity is a social process, intangible for its most part and vulnerable to cultural and intellectual openness, dependent on institutional provisions and availability of resources. Not as a »creative industries« buzzword to roughly include sectors meant to make up the new knowledge economy, but in its more substantial meaning of thinking in new ways, engaging different perspectives, discovering how things work, making something from which one communicates but also others can take and further or integrate existing products or thoughts. Creativity means moving beyond the standard ways of doing things, opening up new ways of seeing, allowing more knowledge to build on knowledge. For-profit communication industries largely rely on the individualisation of pleasure and its definition as gratification, as an instant- and anonymous part of a consumerist-purchasing act. For Public Service Media the script would read a little like the words of Sir David Attenborough about the beginnings of the BBC »We thought too that we could play a key role in modern democracy by enabling a stockbroker in Surrey to understand what a fisherman in the north of Scotland might be feeling – and vice versa. We would be able to broaden horizons, introducing people to subjects that they might have never encountered and bringing them new pleasures and delights«. •

Added value in small communities

HILDE VAN DEN BULCK

Prof. Communication Studies, University of Antwerp, Belgium

Public service broadcasting today can look back on a ninety year old tradition of providing added value in media landscapes in Europe and beyond.

Public service broadcasting today is contested, particularly its legitimacy in moving towards public service media which prompts commercial competitors, politicians and other stakeholders to question public service broadcasting's added value: i. e. its remit, function and position in the media market. This can be witnessed in large media markets of big countries such as Germany and Great Britain, but also in smaller media markets and communities such as the Austrian or the Flemish – the Northern, Dutch speaking part of Belgium. This contribution wishes to discuss some issues relating to the »added value« of public service broadcasting in contemporary media markets, in the lives of citizens and in wider society, focusing on small communities and illustrating this by making reference to Flemish public service broadcasting institution VRT (...).

ROLE IN PEOPLE'S LIVES

In the run-up to VRT's 2012 – 2016 management contract, the Flemish Media Council – by law required to generate policy advice to the media minister – commissioned a comprehensive and representative consultation of the Flemish population enquiring after their views on public service broadcasting.

Results show that over 90 % of Flemish citizens support a holistic PSB project and relate this specifically to VRT. While respondents believe VRT has a duty to deliver services distinctive from commercial offers (74,2 %), they explicitly support a wide remit encompassing entertainment and disagree with the assertion of certain stakeholders that the publicly funded public broadcaster has an unfair advantage vis à vis competitors.

These and more specific results reflect a continued relevance of public service broadcasting with a broad remit in the lives of individuals. For one, public service broadcasting is seen to have a long standing tradition of providing trusted information. When the credit crisis broke in the autumn of 2008, the main 7 pm news programme on VRT's general interest television channel één saw an increase of 10 % in audiences, while the 7 pm news programme of main commercial competitor VTM did not see a similar rise in viewing figures. This confirms the crucial issue of the trust people have in the quality and reliability of the news of public service broadcasting. Similarly, research shows that on a 7 point liker scale, VRT's Flemish drama series are rated one point higher than that of commercial competitors in terms of quality, entertainment value and similar aspects. The trust in and support for public service broadcasting also extends to its online services. The above-mentioned survey showed that 65 % of Flemish citizens thought VRT should add online information to its radio and television activities; 55,2 % favoured thematic websites on news, sports and culture;

73,7 % were in favour of an »extensive news website«; and 70,4 % thought VRT has a responsibility towards guiding children's new media behaviour.

ROLE IN SOCIETY

At the same time, public service broadcasting continues to play a central role in wider society. One of the longest standing aims in this regard, is its contribution to the creation, maintenance and reinvention of national identities. From the outset, public service broadcasting had a unifying, nation building goal, bringing together anonymous individuals under the umbrella of a collective identity. This was and is of particular relevance in smaller communities and cultures which, more than large communities and nations, struggle to maintain their own cultural and social identity in a world pushed towards globalisation and dominated by large international economic players that influence the cultural experiences of the individual members of these communities. (...) Particularly in small communities and in a situation of economic crisis, the arrival of many new people from different cultures creates tensions. Other minority groups too, such as those based on sexual identity or mental of physical disability, need to obtain their position in society. In this regard, VRT has signed and operates by a charter of diversity that helps guarantee the representation of all minority groups on and behind the screen.

ROLE IN MEDIA ECOLOGY

The role of public service broadcasting is not only realised through its own programming and services but also through its position and relations in the wider media landscape. In the contemporary media ecology, public service broadcasting has a role to play vis à vis the other players in the market. First, the institution is vital in the media economy of the community aimed at guaranteeing a healthy audiovisual industry. This is not

only achieved through PSB's role as a creative employer, providing work for a considerable number of media workers and infusing creativity and high level experience into the professions, but also by investing in other players in the audiovisual industry. Flemish VRT's management contract stipulates that part of VRT's production needs to be commissioned to the independent Flemish audiovisual production sector.

Second, public service broadcasting can push the media market by setting the bar in terms of quality and technological and content innovation. Public service broadcasting keeps commercial competitors on their toes, pushes them to match quality with quality, innovation with innovation. We mentioned

»Der ORF als eine Institution der österreichischen Öffentlichkeit ist das elektronische Leitmedium des Landes, Träger und Förderer österreichischer Identität, Kultur und Qualität.«

ORF-LEITBILD

the way in which public service broadcasting's stress on local content has pushed commercial competitors to follow suit, but the notion of setting the bar also applies to these other aspects of quality and innovation. In the latter instance, public service broadcasting can prove a heaven for innovation as, less than its commercial counterparts, it has a somewhat larger margin for failure and experimentation, the positive outcome of which can subsequently benefit the other members in the media ecology.

Finally, and more recently, public service broadcasting has been developing its role

as a partner with other players in the media ecology, collaborating with its commercial competitors to help guarantee the survival of the local audiovisual industry. This is of particular relevance in small communities and media markets where the push from global companies such as worldwide distributors is threatening the local roots and character of the audiovisual market.

In conclusion, the added value of public service broadcasting does not only reside in the value for the individual and society it creates in its own right but also in collaboration and relationships with other partners, including commercial competitors, civil society organisations and others. •

VOLKSWIRTSCHAFTLICHE EFFEKTE DES ORF-FERNSEHENS

890.000.000

Euro generiert das ORF-TV an Bruttowertschöpfung

1,3

Jeder Gebühreneuro, der für TV ausgegeben wird, schafft zusätzliche 1,3 Euro in Österreich

10.360

Arbeitsplätze schafft und sichert das ORF-TV in Österreich

TV-Ökonomie

MAG. DR. OLIVER FRITZ, PHD Wirtschaftsforschungsinstitut

Zwar kann im Rahmen der volkswirtschaftlichen Gesamtrechnung der Beitrag einer Wirtschaftsbranche zum Bruttoinlandsprodukt gemessen werden, doch darüber hinausgehende ökonomische Effekte entziehen sich oft einer Quantifizierung und werden nur qualitativ diskutiert. Eine erste Annäherung für das ORF-Fernsehen gestaltete das WIFO 2012.

Die Produktion von Fernseh- und Radiosendungen ist mit dem Einsatz von Produktionsfaktoren verbunden, also Vorleistungsgütern wie Energie, Materialien etc., Arbeitskräften, Kapitalgütern. Die Nachfrage nach diesen Faktoren lösen nun sogenannte indirekte und induzierte Effekte aus: Die indirekten Effekte ergeben sich aus den durch diese Nachfrage ausgelösten Zulieferungen und durchlaufen mehrere Ebenen des Produktionssystems. Die induzierten wirtschaftlichen Effekte des ORF entstehen, indem bei

jenen Wirtschaftsbranchen, die von den direkten und indirekten Effekten profitieren, zusätzliches Einkommen (in Form von Löhnen, Gehältern und Gewinnen) etc. geschaffen wird. Um die aus diesem Wirkungskreis entstehenden ökonomischen Effekte messen zu können, bedarf es eines Simulationsmodells, das jenen Wirtschaftskreislauf abbildet, der im Mittelpunkt der Analyse steht – im Fall des ORF ist das die österreichische Volkswirtschaft bzw. sind das die Regionalwirtschaften der Bundesländer.

Dabei wurde berechnet, dass die TV-Ausgaben des ORF mit rund 890 Mio. Euro an Bruttowertschöpfung sowie einer Vollzeitbeschäftigung von rund 10.360 Personen verbunden sind; auf einen ORF-Beschäftigten kommen fünf Beschäftigte in anderen Bereichen der österreichischen Wirtschaft.

Während ein überwiegender Anteil der ORF-Aktivitäten im Bereich des Fernsehens auf den Wiener Standort konzentriert ist, führen die indirekten und induzierten Effekte zu einer regionalen Umverteilung der Gesamteffekte. Der Anteil Wiens an der Bruttowertschöpfung fällt auf unter zwei Drittel der Gesamteffekte, während NÖ ca. 15 % erreicht, OÖ ca. 7 % und die Steiermark ca. 5 %.

Selbstverständlich ist zu erwarten, dass der ORF darüber hinausgehende Effekte durch seine Produkte – also: Programme – erzielt, man denke etwa an Tourismuseffekte durch österreichische Serien, Wohlfandeffekte durch mediale Bildungsangebote, Informationskostenreduktion durch vertrauenswürdige öffentlich-rechtliche Information usw. – das Feld der zu unternehmenden Forschung bleibt weit aufgespannt. •

Empowering Society

HANS LAROEES

Chair of the Task Force that created the Charta of Values for the European Broadcasting Union

Tripoli, the end of June, this year. Almost 40 young Libyans are gathered. They really want to become journalists. They are very eager to learn how to, especially in a country that for almost 40 years only saw manipulated information. A country that even did not know that »journalism« was a word that meant independent reporting on stories that matter.

And now there we are. Six journalist from all over Europe and North-Africa, trying to help them. Sent to Tripoli by the European Broadcasting Union. I am amongst them and very happy to be able to do some »hands on« work in a country that is re-inventing itself.

It's on moments like these that I realise how important independent journalism is – and how we are tempted to take this for granted. How important it is to have a broadcaster you can trust in the stories and programs it brings on TV, and the way it operates. For me this is a very welcome illustration, even proof, of the true value a really reliable broadcaster can have. You can see it in the eyes and the hearts of the Libyan journalists-to-be: they want to tell stories that matter, play some role in rebuilding the country they love and that just was handed back to them. »Tripoli« came just a couple of days after the members of the European Broadcasting Union put their signatures underneath an important document called »Empowering Society«. It is a declaration on the core values of public service media. Or, to use different words: it wants to explain how we, public service media, are making a difference. Compared to others: competitors on radio, tv, the internet, or in print.

It is not about us saying that we are doing a better job, it is to explain who we are, what we promise, how we are willing to be held accountable. It is the »grand total« of the values we share that are making a difference: universality, independence, excel-

lence, diversity, accountability, innovation. Of course there are other organizations that are independent. Or innovative. Or excellent. But it is the combination of the six values that is making a difference. Only public service media, for example, are diverse. »Our audiences consist of a diverse range of interest groups; differing generations, cultures, religions, majorities as well as minorities. So we strive to be diverse and pluralistic in the genre we are programming, the views we are expressing and the people who work with us«, it says in Empowering Society. It is just an example. As this is: »We want to be open. We listen to our audiences and engage in a permanent and meaningful debate«. And this: »We want to be trusted programme-makers, trustworthy in all fictional and non-fictional programming, in all genres and formats, from news to entertainment, from science to sport, from culture to education«. This springs, in my view, from our reason to exist: we were created to serve society. We are not there to make a profit, it is about our return on society.

THE COLD WIND OF WINTERS

Let's be honest. There are solid reasons to reinvent and redefine ourselves. Public Service Media throughout Europe are facing difficulties. Some are really facing the cold wind of winters, some are better off, but almost nowhere public service media are applauded, supported, liked whole heartedly and given a live-long support. We are, for example, losing audiences, especially amongst younger generations. So, where is our legitimacy? Why do the audiences have to pay for us through license-fees or taxes? Of course we are facing tremendous competition. There are strong other, non-public competitors, also doing a fine job. Quality, independence, are no longer the exclusive territories of PSM – if they ever were. Non-traditional third parties become heavy forces of information-gathering and sharing, like Google, YouTube, Facebook. The political climate is changing, and

as a catalyst by professional journalists to motivate them toward a more global perspective, without compromising integrity, factual information, or moral ethics.

That being said, how does Public Broadcasting play a part in this black hole of never-ending information? By remaining just what it is, PUBLIC Broadcasting. The voice of the people is what journalism is all about. No matter what part of the spinning globe you live on, you are a person who deserves to hear and read objective, unbiased journalism at its best. And Public Broadcasting is and always has been a venue where John Q. Public can hear and be heard, without the perpetual leanings that a lot of news media has today. In the States, you can watch Fox and immediately you know which side of the voting lines they are standing on, same for MSNBC. The days of dispassionate reporting seem to have disappeared on the prime time

so is the way societies look at public services as a whole. They are certainly no longer above suspicion. They could be the Bastilles of the 21st century. And above all, the digital revolution is changing everything. Journalistic organizations are losing their monopolies on, for example, news production, »breaking« news, even news-definition. For me this leads to a clear message: We had to find new answers – or become extinct, in the end. We have to connect with digital generations that can »bypass« us; do not need us to be informed and opinionated.

OPEN THE BLACK BOX

Especially the digital revolution and the underlying change in expectations from our audiences, as a group or as individuals, poses a big challenge. But a challenge it is, not a threat. It creates new ways to communicate with everyone, to reach these corners of society that are hard to reach, or not very profitable for commercial organizations. It means a way to open the »black box of journalism«, and explain and debate the choices we are making. »We understand that our audiences are also participants in our activities, and even at times contributors of news and programming«, we describe in »Empowering Society«. These are the key words: »We accept the challenges of the digital revolution, which has changed and enriched our relationship with audiences at mass and individual level.«

Just as important is the role we want to realize in all our different countries and in Europe as a whole; »We want to play a defining role in guaranteeing freedom of expression and pluralism of views. We believe in an open and transparent world of communication for the common good, beyond the profit motive.«

WORDS ARE NOT ENOUGH

We know words are not enough. It would be a terrible thing to come up with a declaration like »Empowering Society« and then put it away and forget about it. Deeds have to follow words. There is a lot of work to do.

networks in the United States. However, an evaluation done by Dr. Tim Groseclose, a professor of political science and economics at UCLA, found that PBS NewsHour was the most objective news program on television. (...) As journalists for Public Broadcasting, and broadcasters for the people's network, the experience you provide, however, must be memorable. It must be something that will grab viewers and urge them to tune in again, whether it's radio or TV. And the digital tools that are available to all journalists of today and the future may just be the key to elevate that experience.

I have always said, as far as print and digital are concerned; the two can work together. I also believe that Public Broadcasting can utilize the Internet to bring their message to a broader spectrum. In Europe, the media landscape is not so influenced by ratings and advertising dollars. The result is an

On changing the organizations. In the way we work, the way we connect with our audiences, the way we are leaving the bright and shining mountain-top we were sitting on and while now becoming part of uncountable networks in digital world. It is a constant effort; it never stops. In the end, we know that the only capital we as public service media have is the trust of our audiences, the trust of society. Trust has to be deserved, every day again, and the only way to deserve trust is to produce quality, to be open, transparent and accountable, to correct mistakes. To be efficient and managed according to the principles of good governance. This is not an abstract idea. It has to be reflected in everything we do, every choice we make, everything we broadcast or bring into the digital domain, every penny we spend. We have promised we will monitor our progress permanently in a spirit of honest and open reflection, while we do realize that our organizations, throughout Europe, have different backgrounds, histories and possibilities. The BBC cannot be compared with the public broadcaster of Bosnia, ORF from Austria is quite different from its counterpart in Montenegro.

But all of our members expressed their will to make progress, to assist each other if needed, and to report on the progress they made. It's about trust, as I said, and everyone realises trust is vulnerable, not something you can play with. So in »Empowering Society« we explain who we are and what we will do. Promising to do our very best to make a difference. But we also ask something in return: a solid base. We need robust legislation and adequate and sustainable funding.

ENRICH SOCIETY

It is like the young journalists-to-be in Tripoli. They are determined to learn, do a fine job, tell the stories that are important. The stories of everyone and everywhere. They want to create trust, to enrich society. They want to make a difference. Like we want, in the digital age. Not because we have been there for a long time, but because we understand what current society needs and expects from us, today and tomorrow and every day after that. •

engagement with the people that Public Value Media can bring with them as they hone their journalism skills more diversely in this digital age.

Multi-media journalism can converge more with Public Broadcasting and enhance the experience they provide their viewers. I believe targeting the individual and the societal needs of viewers is the first step. And bringing Public Broadcasting journalists and broadcasters to a learning table of new media skills and venues, such as more live-streaming of interviews, Facebook, Twitter and advancing, the already healthy transparency that lies between European Public Broadcasting and their viewers, to an even higher level, could only amplify the experience for their audience.

Public Broadcasting is a very robust and needed outlet for media. And the future, at least for now, looks bright. •

»Für Österreich ist die Einbettung in Europa, das Verhältnis zu seinen Nachbarn und seine Verbundenheit mit diesem Kulturraum wesentlicher Bestandteil seiner Identität. Ein Europa ohne Grenzen, in dem die Gemeinsamkeit im Vordergrund steht, stellt keinen Widerspruch zu einem Europa der Regionen dar.«

ORF-PROGRAMM-
RICHTLINIEN

Robust and needed

SAMIR »MR. MAGAZINE™« HUSNI, PH.D.
The University of Mississippi

Big Bird can breathe a sigh of relief now that Mitt Romney is NOT the president of the United States of America.

As with everything these days, social media and the digital age cannot help but have an impact on Public Broadcasting. The citizen journalism that is flourishing on the web is a source of unverifiable proportions, but it cannot be ignored. Instead, it must be used

The need of proactivity

DR. ROBERTO SUÁREZ CANDEL

Hans-Bredow-Institut für Medienforschung, Hamburg University, Germany

From January 2010 to February 2012 I had the opportunity and the privilege to be in charge of the project PSB-Digital (www.psb-digital.eu), which was funded by the European Commission by means of a Marie Curie Fellowship and hosted by the Hans Bredow Institute, one of the most recognised research centres in the field of media in Germany. The project analysed how public service broadcasters adapt to the multiplatform media scenario. As a result, the challenges, opportunities and risks that they will need to tackle were identified. The national cases of Germany, Poland and Spain were compared, trying to obtain lessons from different markets and different models of public service broadcasting.

After carrying out the project, which included a wide array of interviews to high and medium-level managers in the three countries; and after having the opportunity to exchange many ideas with other researchers in multiple international conferences, I would not hesitate to state that public service media are still very alive. However, at the same time, I would also express my concern about their ability to communicate efficiently with the citizens. Consequently, the latter are not able to understand what public service stands for and what is included in its remit. As a result, the audience's expectations with regard to public media performance are vague or simply do not match with the public service offer. Moreover, in a context of increased availability of contents, and in which the Internet seems to be (wrongly) the solution for everything, the citizens doubt about the need for public service media. More frequently, people from all kinds of demographic groups ask themselves why they should pay a license fee or why the state should allocate part of its budget to those »old corporations« that do not give them what they want, when they want it. These facts widen the gap between society and public service media, becoming a crucial risk for the future of the latter.

PUBLIC SERVICE MEDIA HAS A FUTURE

Nevertheless, this does not mean that public service media do not have a future. On the contrary, their role in the new communication scenario becomes crucial to ensure that values like quality, universality or social representativeness, among many others, are still relevant. Moreover, despite of the dominant discourse about how free competition and technology solve any previous market failure that justified public intervention in the field of media, the reality of the communication market looks different. As the British Ofcom has recognised, not only traditional market failures are still unsolved but new ones appear as a result of the evolution of the market (internationalization, concentration, etc.) and technological innovation (convergence, media literacy, etc.). Therefore,

if we want to ensure that the potential benefits of development in the field of media reach the entire society, public service is still necessary.

RECOVER THE TRUST OF THE AUDIENCE

Nevertheless, as the analysis carried out within the PSB-Digital project shows, public service media institutions need to take into consideration those changes experienced not only by the market but also by the political sphere and the society. Overall, I would emphasize the need for public service to recover the trust of the audience. To achieve that, better communication, better accountability and better performance become essential. In the following paragraphs, I briefly describe those issues that public service operators need to address urgently.

Although not always recognised openly, public service is still used as an instrument serving political interests in many countries. Its management and performance are sometimes strongly influenced by politicians, politics and public policies. Thus, it is urgent that public service media improve their independence and autonomy. To do so, first of all, it needs to be considered that fragmentation, excessive complexity and redundancy in the field of regulation should be avoided. Not only do they not contribute to making the public remit more clear, feasible and accountable, but they result in bureaucratization, create interpretation conflicts and reinforce the lack of autonomy. A complex and inefficient legal framework results in higher political dependence for public media.

Moreover, budget definition, allocation and control need to be detached from politics. Their intimate relationship tends to result only in uncertainty that hinders autonomy and quality. The budget also needs to be adequate to enable public operators to provide society with those benefits derived from technological innovation and highly professional standards. Otherwise, the resulting poor performance will only create a vicious circle, combining audience's decep-

tion, lack of social support, weak political support and, again, insufficient budget and a poor performance. In addition, governmental control should be reduced in favour of supervision/assessment by a professional independent authority exclusively integrated by highly qualified professionals.

To enable those changes, politicians as well as the citizens need to change their vision about public service media. The latter should be regarded as a mechanism to invest in technical and professional development, and thus as a tool to improve the well-being of our society by providing positive externalities. If public service is perceived only as a cost and not as an investment, it will never have the innovative profile we expect and claim from it.

Therefore, three things are essential. First of all, politicians need to support public service in a clearer and more explicit way. Reinforcing the role of its operators as public interest enablers would avoid sterile debates about their legitimacy, which harm their public image and social support. Secondly, as indicated above, public service media need the appropriate budget to be able to carry out the necessary adaptation to the multiplatform media context. Otherwise, they will not be able to follow the evolution of the audience and they will become irrelevant. Third, public service operators need to assume their responsibilities in this issue, facing evolution with a strong commitment and including the citizens in that task.

CLEARER PUBLIC COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES

In the current scenario, in which the legitimacy of public service and the extension of its activities are strongly contested by commercial media, public operators need to be more proactive in advocating their role in society rather than showing defensive attitudes or adopting inactive behaviours. In some cases, strong legal protection or comfortable budgets, not negative per se, can result in attitudes of self-satisfaction and no reaction to the negative discourses or the hostile actions carried out by other market players. Such a position does not contribute to promoting a positive image of public service among citizens and jeopardizes social and political support. Therefore, besides elaborating a more effective public discourse, it also would be advisable for public media to propose solutions to those controversial issues in which they are involved: accountability, funding, political interference, etc.

The changes requested in the previous paragraphs imply the need for managerial culture to evolve, incorporating a more comprehensive perspective of the challenges, opportunities and risks resulting from the configuration of the multiplatform scenario as well as of the needs of the citizens. Furthermore, this new management culture is necessary to deal with technology innovation and changing market logics. Parallel, implementing a better internal communication to promote collaboration rather than competition among departments becomes also essential. In times of change, building a richer and stronger company culture is the only way to address change successfully and to create those synergies that have a positive effect on performance.

Public broadcasters need also to adapt their organizational structures and working flows. Nevertheless, though higher efficiency is

desirable, the quality and distinctiveness of the offer as well as the working conditions should not be compromised. In order to be successful and maintain their high quality standards, public operators need to rationalize and adapt their producing, distributing and programming strategies in accordance with their technological and budget capacity. They should assume that they cannot do everything possible but they need to focus on what generates a highest social benefit. In that sense, while maintaining a front-runner position in the field of innovation, it is essential to provide the citizens with value, avoiding rushed and excessively ambitious plans that might fail and compromise the public image of the operator. Nevertheless, by combining innovation and quality, public service media should not miss the opportunity to become a reliable guide/reference for the citizens in the new communication scenario, in which uncertainty grows rapidly. That role would enhance their leadership and reinforce social support.

Furthermore, public service operators need to implement better internal monitoring mechanisms to evaluate the fulfilment of their remit, especially in the field of online activities, as well as their capacity to innovate. This will enable them to improve their strategic planning and performance as well as to build a solid discourse about the benefits they provide society with. In fact, public service operators are among the most innovative around Europe and their services are in many cases the »Flag-ship« that creates a critical audience and drives the private initiative. However, this is not how they are frequently perceived or portrayed. Therefore, public service operators need to continue exploring the opportunities that technology offers to enable new ways of connecting with their audiences and promoting their participation. In that sense, it is absolutely necessary to leave behind paternalistic attitudes, making the most of professionalism in order to serve the citizens and empowering their participation in the media sphere. This is also expected to increase audience support and engagement. In that sense, connecting with young viewers becomes an urgent task.

In the field of innovation, public service media need to establish alliances with other public service providers like libraries, museums, etc. In addition, collaboration with market players will avoid marginalization and dependences. Especial attention should

»Das Gesamtprogramm hat sich um Innovation zu bemühen.«

ORF-GESETZ § 10. (3)

be paid to equipment manufacturers as well as standardization issues. Thanks to their long-term know-how, public service broadcasters are ready to lead multidisciplinary initiative or public-private partnerships that might result in valuable benefits for the society. That would certainly increase their prominence. To conclude, it is

necessary to acknowledge that all the challenges and changes commented place public service media operators in a difficult position. That cannot be denied. However, I also believe that they are in the best position to face the necessary adaptation and to provide society with positive externalities, as they have been doing for decades. My only concern is whether, in some cases, the »attitude« of the institutions is the right one. As previously indicated, and as many other scholars state, paternalism should be replaced by partnership.

The trip from public service broadcasting to public service media is the perfect moment to work not only for the citizens but also with them. •