



**MEDIA AND TECHNOLOGY:
INNOVATIVE JOURNALISM IN A
CONTESTED POLITICAL SPACE**

NOVEMBER 15-17, 2018, PRAGUE

Conference Organizers:



Prague Media Point is an annual international conference, dedicated to discussing the changing media landscape in a professional, political, economic, and social context. The aim is to gather leading scholars, journalists, media executives, and other experts to exchange experiences, establish new relationships and debate the challenges facing both traditional and new media. The issues are presented in an international context with a focus on the Central and Eastern European regions with their particular issues to solve.

The project is co-financed by the Governments of Czechia, Hungary, Poland, and Slovakia through Visegrad Grants from the International Visegrad Fund. The mission of the fund is to advance ideas for sustainable regional cooperation in Central Europe.

This conference has been financially supported by the Czech-German Future Fund. Copyright

KEYNOTE, s.r.o. 2018

Partners:



Norwegian Embassy



Embassy of Sweden
Prague



m'CT

Media Partners:



Project Syndicate

Conference Proceedings

<u>INNOVATIVE MEDIA IN A CONTESTED POLITICAL SPACE.....</u>	<u>0</u>
<u>EMERGING DIGITAL TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENTS IN MEDIA</u>	<u>6</u>
<u>“NETWORKS OF OUTRAGE”: MAPPING RIGHT-WING MOVEMENTS IN EUROPE</u>	<u>8</u>
<u>AN INDUSTRY IN FLUX: MASSIVE CHANGES TRANSFORMING THE MEDIA</u>	<u>10</u>
<u>TECHNOLOGY IN THE EMPLOY OF JOURNALISTIC WORK.....</u>	<u>12</u>
<u>DESIGN THINKING FOR MEDIA PROFESSIONALS.....</u>	<u>14</u>
<u>THE IMPACT OF DIGITAL STORYTELLING</u>	<u>16</u>
<u>TRANSFERRING KNOW-HOW INTERNATIONALLY: THE EXAMPLE OF DENÍK N.....</u>	<u>18</u>
<u>THE MEDIA WELFARE STATE: NORDIC PSB IN THE DIGITAL AGE</u>	<u>19</u>
<u>THE LEADING EXAMPLES OF INNOVATIVE DIGITAL-AIDED MEDIA STRATEGIES IN V4 COUNTRIES</u>	<u>21</u>
<u>SMART PHONES AND SOCIAL MEDIA: A MIXED BAG</u>	<u>23</u>
<u>THE MYTHS AND TRUTHS OF MULTIMEDIA JOURNALISM.....</u>	<u>25</u>
<u>ENGAGEMENT THROUGH DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES</u>	<u>27</u>
<u>WOMEN IN THE NEWSROOM: BREAKING MALE DECISION-MAKING POWER.....</u>	<u>29</u>
<u>THE FUTURE OF AUDIO</u>	<u>31</u>
<u>PUBLIC SERVICE MEDIA IN CENTRAL EUROPE: WHAT ROLE SHOULD THE STATE ASSUME?</u>	<u>33</u>

Innovative Media in a Contested Political Space

In cooperation with the Czech-German Future Fund

Thursday, November 15, 2018, 18:30 – 20:00, Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany

Welcome:

Christoph Israng, Ambassador to Czechia, Germany

Opening Remarks:

Jakub Klepal, Executive Director, Forum 2000 Foundation, Co-Chair, Prague Media Point, Czechia

Jeremy Druker, Executive Director, Transitions Online, Founder, Press Start, Co-Chair, Prague Media Point, Czechia/USA

Panelists:

Lenka Kabrhelová, Journalist, Czech Radio, 2018 Nieman Fellow at Harvard University, Czechia

Yulia Savchenko, International Broadcaster and Anchor, Current Time, Voice of America, USA

Filip Noubel, Innovations Adviser, Prague Civil Society Center, Czechia

Moderator:

Michael Heitmann, Journalist, Germany

With fake news and troll factories on the rise, media are constantly seeking creative ways to engage with their audience while remaining credible. Experts from media and civil society organizations discussed possible approaches to these challenges. They reflected on issues surrounding new technology such as disruption, audience engagement, and finances while emphasizing the fact that “it can harm and it can help,” as Filip Noubel pointed out.

With new technologies, the age of information has receded into the “age of disinformation,” as Michael Heitmann put it, in the form of disruption. These disruptions range from valid competition to bots and trolls. Fake news was also considered a disruption, but with the understanding that there needs to be a “dividing line between fake news and disinformation.” Yulia Savchenko gave an example of disruption when her organization considered shutting

down its Facebook page in Russia because they “felt like [they] were contributing to those unhealthy discussions” due to the amount of hate speech the page received.

This example intersects with the next point discussed: audience engagement. Many of the panelists felt pessimistic about audience engagement because of the aforementioned examples, therefore, they queried “how do you engage them [the audience] in a civil way?” One answer was regulations such as pre-moderated comments and photo verification systems which have been put in place in some instances. Another issue regarding audience engagement is the lack of trust. Lenka Kabrhelová questioned the rationale behind this distrust, asking, “How far are we from the audience? How do we seem to them? We are losing our humanity as journalists because communication is not on a close scale.” The solution she suggested was for journalists to walk among their audience to bridge the gap. The panelists discussed these questions but were unable to come to a conclusion about what actions to take.

The last point addressed in the panel was the financial situation of journalism. Newspapers are declining, but new technology is not replacing lost revenue. The “clickability” of articles is one way to generate income, but Savchenko explained the downside of it: “Content suffers because we are driven by the idea that it needs to sell, and what sells doesn’t necessarily have enough substance.” Traditional advertising, Noubel claimed, “should not be dismissed.” Other alternatives like paywalls, which keep content locked until one pays a fee or subscribes, and crowdfunding were discussed as well because “people are fed up with the abuse and people who can afford it are willing to do a huge mental cultural shift” to allow for alternative models.

In conclusion, social media’s place within journalism is comprised of a variety of factors like disruption (which is positive and negative), audience engagement and its consequences, as well as the finances that social media is producing or lacking. Possible solutions to these problems include regulations to moderate hate speech, paywalls for content, and closer communication between journalists and their audience. All the panelists agreed that technology is not neutral and has the potential to both harm and help those who use it.

Emerging Digital Technology Developments in Media

Friday, November 16, 2018, 9:00 – 10:00, Goethe-Institut, Conference Room

Opening Remarks:

Robert Kvile, Ambassador to Czechia, Norway

Panelists:

Stuart N. Brotman, Professor of Media Management and Law, Professor of Journalism and Electronic Media, University of Tennessee, USA

Geir Terje Ruud, Chief Development Officer, Norwegian News Agency (NTB), Norway

Moderator:

Jeremy Druker, Executive Director, Transitions, Founder, Press Start, Co-Chair, Prague Media Point, Czechia/USA

The participants discussed the impact of emerging digital technology on the media. Robert Kvile opened the floor with anecdotal passages regarding recent events highlighting the importance and fragility of freedom of expression. He followed with an observation that right wing populists are delegitimizing the current media. Lastly, he outlined the importance of access to information, and highlighted Norway's leading role in facilitating a free and transparent media.

The focus then transitioned to the panelists. Stuart Brotman presented an overview of emerging digital technology trends. Firstly, he outlined "tipping points" in media—when we have one reality switching into a new reality, never to go back. He argued that the "Web to App" tipping point is the latest development of its kind, where people are more inclined to access information through apps rather than the web. Other developments include the shift from "text to video," as well as "4G to 5G." He then discussed the Internet of Things (IoT), or devices talking to devices over a vast network. Moore's Law, network effects, and broadband are important factors in the ecosystem of technological developments. Brotman then outlined Social Studio, which is used primarily for commercial purposes to understand exactly what its customers are saying by tuning in to their social media. This highlighted the importance of not only uploading content on social media, but the consumption of information in order to better understand trends. He also discussed augmented reality and how it can change the nature of press conferences through real-time information feeds. Brotman concluded by sharing his ideas on Artificial Intelligence

(AI), explaining that AI provides journalists with the opportunity to pursue more investigative reporting and that it can be stepping stone to integrate local and international journalism.

Geir Terje Ruud brought the theoretical into perspective by discussing how automation has improved the Norwegian News Agency's (NTB) ability to report on more issues in more ways. NTB consists of 170 media customers and 130 employees. The company has been using automated journalisms for three years thus far. Automated journalism has been used for football reporting, resulting in a nearly 300 percent increase in the number of games reported on from 2016 to 2018. He predicts that game reporting could increase from 1,000 to 170,000 in 2019, with each game reported on with two separate angles for each team. Automated journalism has also improved reporting on the stock exchange as well as overall reporting for the Norwegian population with the ability to report in multiple languages. Ruud stated that the future of automation can include more research, stories on house sales that can benefit local media companies, increased stories on election night, national statistics, and picture recognition for journalism. As a result, automation in reporting is able to not only increase value and efficiency, but also strengthen democracy through research and tracking possible corruption.

Questions from the audience followed. One attendee asked, "isn't the Internet a story of fragmentation?" Brotman agreed that it was, and noted the importance of social media listening as a means to defragment the Internet. When asked, "how can we ensure the lasting partiality of AI," Ruud emphasized the importance of ethics and transparency in ensuring this process, and Brotman added the necessity for journalists to sit down with technologists and others alike to facilitate this development in the right direction. Brotman concluded the panel, saying that: "I think it's very important for journalists to have a seat at the table and not view technology as something that's done by technologists.... Financial sustainability ultimately reaches journalists."

“Networks of Outrage”: Mapping Right-Wing Movements in Europe

Friday, November 16, 2018, 10:15 – 11:30, Goethe-Institut, Conference Room

Presenters:

Noura Maan, Foreign Desk Writer, Der Standard, Austria

Markus Hametner, Data Journalist, Addendum.org, Austria

The presentation started with a brief overview of the “Networks of Outrage” project and an acknowledgement of its main supporters and funders, the *Alexander von Humboldt Institut* and the *Volkswagenstiftung*. Noura Maan and Markus Hametner proceeded to describe the project’s beginnings in 2015, when a similarity in the structure of multiple right wing movements was first observed, notably through the example of Germany’s “Pegida” and Austria’s “Identitare Bewegung”—both extremely hostile to the left and against immigration. The project’s goal was to gain a better perspective on right wing movements’ online activities, communication, and coordination, through a process that involved both data based analysis and on-site research. The result was a project with both scientific and journalistic outputs.

As shown by the example of Pegida’s and Austrian Vice Chancellor Heinz-Christian Strache’s online activity, one of the main research challenges proved to be the transformation of abstract into structural data. In order to surmount this obstacle, a custom coder was built specifically for the project. During the last Austrian presidential election, the Facebook pages of candidates were monitored to observe the difference in moderation patterns between the left and right wing candidates’ pages. *The Wall Street Journal*’s “Blue feed, Red feed” model was also used to map the political bubble effect observed during this polarizing election.

After collecting six gigabytes of information on connections between different right wing political sites, the speakers observed a significant overlap of audience. Almost half of the Identitarian’s audience was active on the German “Alternative for Germany” (AfD) party’s Facebook page, and AfD page followers overlapped with Strache’s Facebook page audience as well. The presentation of interactive maps further outlined this phenomenon.

Most of the data used was available through Facebook’s public page API, but in the aftermath of the Cambridge Analytica scandal, Hametner observed that “Facebook changed stuff.” No user

details for comments on public pages could be provided, and API content collection was restricted as well, hampering research efforts.

Maan further elaborated on the difficulties and opportunities of cooperating with scientists, noting that despite the differences in interests and timeframes, “what did work out great was our international communication,” and the project’s interdisciplinary character.

The speakers were then asked a series of questions by the public. When asked about what aspect of the research surprised him the most, Hametner responded that “I think for me the big thing that I didn’t know before was the audience overlap on Facebook.... I didn’t think users from Austria would be so active on German sites.”

On whether the project revealed any patterns of systematic cooperation between right wing movements, Hametner commented that “we had content, but we did too little with it,” while Maan added “we would have just needed more time, more money, more local partners.” The speakers were also asked about the relationship between journalists and academics, and the practical differences that had arisen when analyzing data. Maan pointed out that “things that were not surprising for us at all, [academics] thought they were really interesting,” and Hametner noted they had more descriptive methods and outcomes.

On possible suggestions for academics working with journalists, Maan stressed that “we have the same data, we use it, and then we have different stories.” The speakers emphasized the importance of being clear on expectations and having foresight.

In the concluding questions, the speakers were asked about the gender perspective of their study, and Hametner admitted that “we should have looked into that, it would have been a cool analysis.” On the use of the German term “Lügenpresse” instead of “fake news,” Maan observed that the term is too politically incorrect, and even Pegida had stopped using it.

An Industry in Flux: Massive Changes Transforming the Media

Friday, November 16, 2018, 10:15 – 11:30, Goethe-Institut, Foyer

Panelists:

Krisztian Simon, Visiting Lecturer, Eötvös Loránd University, Hungary

Džina Donauskaitė, Postdoctoral Researcher, Faculty of Public Communication, Vytautas Magnus University, Lithuania

Lynette G. Leonard, Associate Professor and Department Chair, Journalism and Mass Communication, American University in Bulgaria, USA

Katerina Avramova, Student, Journalism and Mass Communication, American University in Bulgaria, USA

Moderator:

Douglas Arellanes, Lecturer, School of Journalism, Anglo-American University, Czechia/USA

Krisztian Simon began by examining how online news startups can survive in a hybrid regime—specifically, in Hungary. This question was raised in the framework of political economy and media capture. Simon argued that journalism is viewed as a public good and as such, readers are reluctant to pay for news. Therefore, governments often subsidize media. This will not work in hybrid regimes. Since 2010, Simon pointed out, the Hungarian government has been taking over media organizations, shifting “public service broadcasters into state propaganda broadcasters.” Startups, which Simon defined as organizations with less than 50 employees founded after 2010, have emerged to fill the empty space. Discussing possibilities for audience revenue, Simon considered subscription, donations, and membership. He argued subscription is problematic given the context, as if an organization wishes to fight the government’s message, they should not put themselves behind a paywall. Donations have been the main form of audience revenue since 2011, and Simon held there is untapped potential here. The problem is that audience revenue is not sufficient to fund the investigative stories needed to hold the government to account; other sources, such as donors, are required. Ultimately, he concluded that “if you want to survive in countries such as Hungary you have to rely on different forms of revenue. The most sustainable mix is to rely on audience revenue and donor revenue.”

On a similar note, Džina Donauskaitė considered the effects global intermediaries—which she defined as organizations that act as gatekeepers between local news producers and

audiences—have on Baltic digital-born newsrooms. She highlighted the two reasons why tension arises between local and global intermediaries. Firstly, to have influence on a local level, global intermediaries need content which they do not produce. Secondly, they can run advertisements at a cheaper rate than a local intermediary. This is exacerbated by the fact that Google and Facebook, the most influential intermediaries, do not reveal how much they take in revenue from local markets. Considering the impact of global intermediaries, Donauskaitė focused on digital innovation; local organizations follow what Facebook and Google do and imitate these strategies to appeal to local advertisers. Furthermore, the journalistic space is shrinking because journalists are required to market and so have less time for journalistic work. She concluded by stating that local intermediaries are becoming more like global platforms.

Lynette Leonard and Katerina Avramova examined the AT&T and Time Warner merger, and how mergers and acquisitions in the media industry will determine the future of content distribution. Whereas AT&T is a distributor of content, Time Warner is a producer of content, Avramova explained. Significantly, both companies have engaged in anti-competitive behavior in the past. Avramova identified the central question as whether this will be a successful merger. From an economic perspective, Avramova highlighted that whilst divestitures tend to create value, mergers often fail to do so. Secondly, it does not make sense from an ethical perspective, within the stockholder or stakeholder framework. Few people will gain a significant amount of profit and it could lead to less competition and innovation, restricted choice, higher prices for consumers, and a decline in quality. Concluding the talk, Leonard emphasized the need to “start paying attention on many different levels to these kinds of mergers” and their potential impacts.

A key theme which emerged in the discussions was how the forces of large and small corporations could end up balancing each other out—for example, through innovation. The consensus which emerged was that innovation is occurring but that framing it as a balancing act is perhaps misguided. Donauskaitė argued that smaller firms are constantly innovating, but this should be viewed as a transformation rather than a balance, whilst Simon highlighted it is only startups which are innovating but not legacy outlets. A further idea was the need for a public conversation on what independent meaningful media means in order for the idea of the audience as a source of revenue to have any traction.

Technology in the Employ of Journalistic Work

Friday, November 16, 2018, 10:15 – 11:30, Goethe-Institut, Lecture Room

Panelists:

Walid Al-Saqaf, Malin Picha Edwardsson, Senior Lecturers in Journalism and Media Technology, Södertön University, Sweden

Andrej Školkay, Research Team Coordinator, School of Communication and Media, Slovakia

Tomás Dodds, PhD Student, Institute of Cultural Anthropology and Development Sociology, University of Leiden, the Netherlands

Moderator:

Tony Curzon Price, Economic Advisor to the Secretary of State for Business, Energy, and Industrial Strategy, Director, Open Democracy, United Kingdom

Each panelist presented their research in the first part of the panel. Walid Al-Saqaf and Malin Picha Edwardsson did a joint presentation on blockchain in relation to journalism as a business. Andrej Školkay compared various AI-based solutions for fact-checking and detecting fake news. Lastly, Tomás Dodds presented on technology's effects in Chilean newsrooms. Afterward, the panelists answered questions from the moderator, Tony Curzon Price, and from the audience.

Al-Saqaf and Edwardsson discussed blockchain, a platform that uses cryptocurrency and keeps information from being altered with time stamps and peer reviews—characteristics providing “relative advantage” for journalists, compared to other forms of media. Relative advantage, according to Edwardsson, is “the degree to which an innovation is perceived as better than the idea it supersedes.” They looked at a blockchain called Civil and its structure to see if journalists could use blockchains to create decentralized news sources. People could buy Civil tokens in increments of one thousand dollars which would allow them to form a smart contract and participate in community voting. Once information is approved, it would be published on the blockchain, but can still be challenged. If the newsroom being challenged loses, the licensing cost is split between the challenger and those who voted for the challenger, but if the newsroom wins they earn the money that was put at stake. However, Edwardsson and Al-Saqaf acknowledged there is still a human element involved in the appeal process if a newsroom believes it has been wrongly challenged. The issue of centralization also remains a part of Civil

because the organization which started the project would still have the most power, and during the appeal process there is also human intervention. Al-Saqaf also put forth the question: “If someone still needs to hold them accountable, why use blockchain to start with?” Civil is looking to find enough members to become decentralized, but the future remains uncertain.

Andrej Školkey explained how AI is being used in fact-checking and fake news detection. He explained the major issue in studying these technologies is the lack of access to them. Because the owners do not have to allow researchers to analyze the programs, this area is understudied. Each program has the potential be in a different stage of development as well. In the nine programs Školkey had access to, he analyzed each program’s comprehensiveness, accuracy, and usefulness. One of these programs in particular, Fight Hoax, gained traction from politicians and was even presented to the European Parliament before it was discovered the program did not work very well, and in Školkey’s studies it ranked the lowest of all the programs tested.

Dodds discussed the newsrooms and state of journalism in Chile, focusing on the use of WhatsApp in journalism. Dodds explained he chose to study Chile because of the deregulation of media that has happened since the 1980s and that he decided to look at newsrooms from an anthropological lens because he wanted to study the “relationship between the human and the object ... how both shape each other.” The organization of a cross-media newsroom has social media reporters in the middle of the room because they are the first to find out the news and could communicate it to the rest of the newsroom by “screaming” it out to others. He stated this was often the best way to be the first organization to cover an event. WhatsApp is the preferred way to contact sources in Chile. The use of WhatsApp is breaking down economic barriers to sources, allowing smaller news outlets to cover the same events as larger news outlets. Dodds reported that, due to the nature of WhatsApp, the boundaries between friendship and professionalism blur. WhatsApp also works counter to most journalistic work as well, with WhatsApp conversations officially being off the record instead of on, which is standard practice amongst other forms of communication. WhatsApp does not have high security, but journalists who use it feel it does because of the double blue check mark and immediate responses; they do not think about the risks inherent with the low level of security the app has.

Design Thinking for Media Professionals

In cooperation with the Czech-German Future Fund

Friday, November 16, 2018, 11:45 – 13:00, Goethe-Institut, Conference Room

Presenters:

Josef Dvořák, Senior Innovation Designer, Direct People, Czechia

Marcel Bachran, Designer, Edenspiekermann, Germany

Moderator:

Jeremy Druker, Executive Director, Transitions, Founder, Press Start, Co-Chair, Prague Media Point, Czechia/USA

This presentation examined collaboration between designers and journalists. Jeremy Druker opined that people working in media tend to be too stubborn to find out what the audience wants and what they think they want. The participants discussed their work on a media project.

Josef Dvořák presented a project for the Economia publishing house where he worked on a news subscription system for HN+, an online premium content subscription service of Economia's flagship *Hospodářské noviny* daily economy newspaper. Dvořák mentioned that there are differences in how designers and journalists see the same problem so they have to work together and test possible outcomes. Economia's goal was to monetize their content. In the case of HN+, the result was a subscription that contains the most valuable content readers would not find elsewhere.

Marcel Bachran works with digital newsrooms. He detailed how at Edenspiekermann they redesigned the whole family of German Zeit online. He spoke about workshops with journalists that help them and design professionals reach a common understanding in designing the final product. Bachran held that these workshops are great for understanding clients' problems and for understanding the role of users. He emphasized human need as a crucial point in designing products. It is important to invite users of the product for testing, get their feedback, and reflect upon it. Bachran pointed out that sometimes a client has an idea that the designer needs to point to and say that what they are saying is not actually what user needs—that the outcome of it would be that clients are trying to change users, which is not a good approach. It is necessary is to understand what people actually want and design something that they will want to use.

Bachran said that a shared goal in design thinking for media should be to develop intelligent tools for rich storytelling based on the knowledge of context and usage. He considered the role of designer agencies to get editors excited to try new types of storytelling: good storytelling and its “decorating” is not enough to get readers’ attention. It is best to offer clients a custom toolbox of small and large methods based on the specific needs of a media organization.

The discussion following the presentation opened with a question on how to get people to really stick to new design models and use them in practice. Dvořák held that “the transformation can succeed only when there is enough business motivation.” One journalist asked what are users’ most common needs are. Bachran replied that “it is the need to receive news in a different way for different times and locations.” Users consume news differently when they commute to work—they prefer reading shorter news on mobile than, for instance, when they get home and have more time to go into the topic and use bigger devices like laptops or tablets. He pointed out that it is good to have this in mind so media can provide better products to fit users’ needs.

The Impact of Digital Storytelling

Friday, November 16, 2018, 11:45 – 13:00, Goethe Institut, Lecture Room

Panelists:

Vladimir Bratic, Associate Professor, VA Communications Studies, Hollins University, USA

Elsayed Darwish, Journalism and Media Professor, Zayed University, UAE

Moderator:

Gregory Bruno, Associate Editor, Project Syndicate, USA

Vladimir Bratic examined the case study of *Charlie Hebdo*, explaining that after they tweeted a caricature of ISIS leader Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi, two ISIS members killed 12 people at the magazine's editorial office. This conflict divided the public into two groups: one believed that *Charlie Hebdo* provoked the conflict because it insulted the feelings of readers; the other supported the publication and readers even organized series of meetings in the streets of Paris supporting the freedom of speech. Bratic emphasized, "I've studied a lot of conflict, but I've never studied anything as complex as the *Charlie Hebdo* case."

He outlined how there are two entities of media. The first assumes that "media is an agent of conflict and propaganda." Freedom of speech can easily turn into hate speech, and "incite more violence [rather] than build peace." The second believes that media is entertaining and socializing, therefore it is an "instrument to build peace." The history and culture of *Charlie Hebdo* dates back to 1700, when humor publications and satirical press first appeared. In 1905 the secularity became popular. Bratic explained that *Charlie Hebdo's* mission and philosophy was that they were social activists and anti-racist; they were not in a "particular religion" and were against far right politics. Bratic's final claim was that "they wanted to improve society and work for peace." But the global audience continues to view *Charlie Hebdo* as an entity defined by conflict. When a member of the audience asked, "can magazines like *Charlie Hebdo* exist now in the global audience," Bratic answered, "For such magazines without a clear context, there would be a danger for the audience to misunderstand." Bratic was also asked if the conflict was a provocation and Bratic replied that, "*Charlie Hebdo* didn't consider provocation, but rather they were against an extreme interpretation of Islam, but not against Islam itself."

Elsayed Darwish then presented about mobile journalism in Arab media. Darwish described that mobile journalism has significant benefits. It allows reporters to interconnect and work at live events. It captures footage in real time, and can put the writer at the heart of action. It is also easier and faster than traditional forms of journalism. However, the way mobile journalism is approached in Arab media is ineffective because of a lack of knowledge of the tool and overall media literacy. The most pressing issue is that Arab professors do not teach students how to use mobile journalism and how to integrate it into mainstream media with Arab values. Darwish stressed, "there should be a link between new and old journalism." He claimed that most of the Arab media does not adapt new practices, and predicted that they will not any time soon. Darwish's final claim was that mobile journalism will die in Arab media if they do not create a new way of thinking and develop a curriculum to take on mobile journalism, and if mobile journalism does not respect current values. When Darwish was asked about his thoughts on *Al Jazeera*, he answered, "they are paid for spying on other countries and they are biased."

Transferring Know-How Internationally: The Example of Deník N

In cooperation with the International Visegrad Fund

Friday, November 16, 2018, 13:00 – 13:10, Goethe-Institut, Foyer

Speaker:

Pavel Tomášek, Editor-in-Chief, Deník N, Czechia

Pavel Tomášek began his address by mentioning the centennial of Czech and Slovak independence, and made a reference to the popular conception of Slovaks as “younger brothers” in Czechia: “They are [seen as] less experienced, less knowledgeable, less wealthy.” He then continued by pointing out that “Slovaks are older brothers to us at *Deník N*,” as the paper’s subscription model and content management system are borrowed from the Slovak *Denník N*, as well as some managers and IT personnel.

Tomášek outlined four key lessons learned from the Czech *Deník N* experience. He highlighted that a subscription model covering all costs needs a secure paywall. Secondly, he stressed that there should be “no holes in the paywall system.” Thirdly, Tomášek suggested writers should not shy away from long, attention-grabbing articles for the web, as the longest articles on *Deník N*’s website are the ones that garner the most subscribers. Lastly, Tomášek urged editors to “write and publish only two types of articles”: very long ones and very short ones. He continued: “Do not add to the big gray zone of articles on the web that are similar on all websites.”

Tomášek also discussed a tool *Deník N* uses that calculates the conversion rate from clicks to subscriptions, showing the differences between the Czech and Slovak markets. He held that subscriptions demonstrated that “people appreciate quality” and are willing to pay for it.

In his concluding remarks, Tomášek made special reference to *Deník N*’s success in gaining a following, since the webpage is currently one year ahead of its projected subscriber count, at seven thousand subscribers. “So far, so good,” he remarked. He nevertheless mentioned that the site’s long-term goal remains financial self-sufficiency, which will require approximately twenty thousand subscribers. Tomášek then thanked the site’s five investors for their “contribution to the freedom of the press in the Czech Republic,” and expressed his belief that “the risk our investors and 40 editorial staff took was worth taking.” The Editor-in-Chief concluded by pointing out that the habit of paying for news must be cultivated in the public.

The Media Welfare State: Nordic Public Service Broadcasting in the Digital Age

Friday, November 16, 2018, 14:00 – 14:30, Goethe-Institut, Conference Room

Speaker:

Gunn Enli, Professor of Media Studies, University of Oslo, Norway

Gunn Enli explained various aspects of the Nordic “media welfare state,” including facets enabling public broadcasting to work and innovations made possible because of the welfare state’s public nature.

The Nordic region is comprised of five countries (Finland, Iceland, Denmark, Sweden, and Norway) with “specific cultures,” but a “shared political history and collaboration” among them. Enli also described the region as one of “both/and,” not “either/or.” It is a region of paradoxes. For example, its countries are characterized by a high rating of happiness, but a high suicide rate; a low crime rate despite lax criminal penalties; and high book readership, but also high social media use.

The media welfare state is similar to the UK’s BBC and serves as the region’s public broadcasting agency. The media welfare state “makes the links between other institutions in society.” It also serves as a universal communications system with institutionalized editorial freedom, meaning it has political legitimacy, as the government does not “interfere in editorial decision making.” The last facet of this system is the “consensual and collaborative policy making” within and outside of public broadcasting. For example, “policymaking among political parties across the spectrum agree on basic ideas and arrangement for the welfare state.”

The last point of Enli’s presentation was innovation. The media welfare state presents an opportunity for innovation where the private market does not. One example is “gamifying” the news by mandating readers take a comprehension quiz before being allowed to comment on news articles. This was used to regulate comments originally, but the quiz turned out to be more popular than commenting. Factisk, which is a fact checking program, was created by public broadcasting in partnership with the private sector, particularly Facebook. Perhaps the most prominent example of innovation is the Norwegian drama titled *Skam*, which means “shame” in English. This television show is told in real time as text messages are sent in actual time,

whether it is 2 AM or 4 PM. The characters also have Instagram profiles fans can follow. However, this use of social media extends past storytelling. Enli explained that public broadcasting thought younger people wanted instant access to news, therefore they started broadcasting on Snapchat and Instagram. These innovations are happening in the media welfare state because, as Enli stated, “They have the economic leeway to do it; they have security; they can take higher risks.” The commercial sector is “more conservative” and needs “long-term planning and the right resources” to do the same innovations public broadcasting can do because they do not have economic freedom.

The Leading Examples of Innovative Digital-Aided Media Strategies in V4 Countries

In cooperation with the International Visegrad Fund

Friday, November 16, 2018, 14:30 – 15:45, Goethe-Institut, Conference Room

Panelists:

Piotr Pacewicz, Editor-in-Chief, OKO.press, Poland

Matúš Kostolný, Editor-in-Chief, Denník N, Slovakia

Gábor Kardos, CEO, 444, Hungary

Michal Klíma, Media Entrepreneur, Former Chair and Director General of Vlatava Labe Media, Czechia

Moderator: *Wojciech Przybylski*, Editor-in-Chief, Res Publica Nowa, Poland

The panelists began the discussion by first describing how each of their companies originated and evolved through the political climates in the V4 countries. Matúš Kostolný explained that *Denník N* started out with 50 staff members, and in four years of profit the number has grown to 60. They have also increased their reader base and are able to participate in public debate. *Denník N* is still a small paper, but it is much more independent than the larger papers in the country: “I felt in the media scene in Slovakia, every paper was owned by political parties ... we needed something independent.” Kostolný credits the paper’s success to the different forms of journalism provided to readers. Journalists are working on either very short stories—two sentences of information for free—or very long articles that offer in-depth investigation.

Piotr Pacewicz described how *OKO.press* was started after it was financed by Agora Holding, the publisher of the largest liberal daily paper in Poland. One of the main strategies of the production of *OKO.press* is publishing articles on social media. Because they do not have advertising, it is up to readers to support the organization. He admitted they might have to think of different ideas in the future, depending on the state of journalism in Poland. Right now, *OKO.press* prides itself on its success in the “sort-of free media market” in the country. Its journalism receives an overwhelming amount of attention through social media.

Hungary’s *444* started as a spinoff of an online journalism outlet. Gábor Kardos explained how he used to be CEO of a company until it “fell into oligarchic hands” and he decided to start his

own publication. The organization's news coverage is traditional, but also includes a mixture of anything "fascinating to the public." When asked by Wojciech Przybyleki how the model of *444* relates to other media, Kardos replied that normal media is present in Hungary to some extent, but they still do not have any major independent media outlets besides one television station. Commenting on the poor state of journalism, he stated that "every time one of my competitors dies, a piece of my future is gone too."

Michal Klíma described how there are many media sources on the market, making it overcrowded with too much content. At the same time, print publications are declining at around seven percent a year. He said there are still a lot of independent projects in Czechia after the change of ownership in the media market. Czech media used to be owned by foreign publishers, but after they left the second-richest man in the country—Andrej Babiš—bought its most famous publishing house in 2013. He later became prime minister, but this change did not affect much of Czechia's media market.

The panel concluded with a short discussion on the future of journalism. The panelists all agreed that in the next decade journalism will completely evolve and the future for newspapers hangs in the air. There is also the never-ending search to finance publications, and the question of how to balance advertising and subscribers. Overall, the four media publications discussed in the panel are succeeding in the V4 countries media market.

Smart Phones and Social Media: A Mixed Bag

Friday, November 16, 2018, 14:30 – 15:45, Goethe-Institut, Lecture Room

Panelists:

Juliette Storr, Associate Professor, Communications Department, Pennsylvania State University-Beaver, USA

Thomas Wold, Postdoctoral Fellow, Department of Information Science and Media Studies, University of Bergen, Norway

Marius Gudonis, Lecturer in Sociology, Institute of Sociology, Collegium Civitas University, Poland

Moderator: *Christian Christensen*, Professor of Journalism, University of Stockholm, USA/Sweden

Juliette Storr discussed her research, which assesses the state of journalism in six English-speaking countries in the Caribbean. Since the 1990s, public and private media have existed in competitive markets; however, the political landscape of small micro-states with centralized governments means control of information is a problem. Combined with rapid changes in technology, like the dispersion of smart phones, there have been changes in journalism. Storr drew comparisons with the conversation in the US on how to maintain the relevance of journalism, alongside concerns about verification, objectivity, and professionalization. The central question is whether these changes have had a “positive or negative impact on the circulation of information,” and how journalists are protecting and upholding principles of democracy. Storr stated that a trend which emerged from her research was the “increasingly fragmented information environment.” Citizens are now mass disseminators of information, meaning breaking news is often circulated on social media ahead of legacy outlets. This can have negative consequences—for example, factual inconsistencies can emerge when disaster strikes as the United States’ coverage is circulated alongside local coverage. Concluding, she highlighted the difficulties of upholding the principles of democracy in these conditions.

Thomas Wold focused on how Norwegian journalists use social media as a source for news. He did this through a content analysis of news articles from Norwegian online newspapers based on social media posts published by ordinary people. Wold explained that when journalists find a social media post, they reproduce the main content of the post in the article, and include an

interview with the person who produced it. They rarely elaborate on it: only 60 percent of articles used any additional sources, and in this way it is a cheap and fast form of journalism.

Interestingly, he highlighted that national newspapers use social media as a source for news articles more often than local newspapers as they have a wider field to choose from and have more resources to dedicate to monitoring social media. The topics covered in such articles range from trivial issues to the more serious topics of healthcare, unemployment, and customer complaints. Wold drew a comparison between social media posts and letters to the editor; when someone is happy or displeased about something they turn to Facebook. Overall, Wold concluded that there is “much greater potential for journalists here to find more material.”

Marius Gudonis considered whether the far right has “colonized” social media, specifically in relation to genocide denial in Poland. Gudonis stated that whilst there are many good papers which describe how the far right has utilized social media, “they invariably focus just on that hate speech,” without weighing in on the counter message. Therefore, he compared videos of denial with videos that acknowledge the massacre. Gudonis specified that he was “taking a broad meaning of denial” of which explicit negation is only one form. From 2007-2018, he found 216 videos which were relevant. Of these, 64 percent denied Polish-Catholic involvement in the crime, with only 15 percent acknowledging it. Gudonis then indicated that these figures could be misleading due to disparity of view counts and when the results were adjusted to reflect this fact, 85 percent deny Polish involvement. Furthermore, he found that many people will actively search out the videos that acknowledge the crime to post negative comments.

A central question to emerge from these discussions was whether social media reflects pre-existing sentiment in society, or whether it amplifies it. Storr argued that the answer is mixed; amplification does take place because people have more freedom to express their opinions in various venues and can do so at a higher speed through social media. Equally, she argued, what may seem like higher discontent could be an accurate reflection as people adjust to changes around them. Wold argued that there is an amplification of some topics but not others, whilst Gudonis highlighted that in his research there was clear amplification.

The Myths and Truths of Multimedia Journalism

Friday, November 16, 2018, 16:00 – 17:15, Goethe-Institut, Conference Room

Panelists:

Craig LaMay, Associate Professor in Residence, Northwestern University In Qatar, Associate Professor, Medill School of Journalism and IMC, USA

Michael Fleischhacker, Talk Show Host, Publisher and Editor, Addendum.org, Austria

Moderator:

Arzu Kurtulus, Journalist, Turkey/Azerbaijan

Multimedia platforms are the public squares of the twenty-first century; they provide audiences with an opportunity to engage and connect. Although journalists are using these new platforms more efficiently, they are still not experienced with rising digital journalism. Craig LaMay and Michael Fleischhacker examined the challenges and trends of the new multimedia journalism in this panel discussion.

Fleischhacker explained that the issue of trust still remains a big concern for *Die Presse* (a long-running daily newspaper based in Vienna), but that audiences in Austria and Western Europe in general do not trust media any less. Rather, they trust media of their choice, but distance themselves from other sources of information. “People who don’t trust legacy media trust their own media,” Fleischhacker explained. According to him, the audience that disagrees with the mainstream media follows alternative platforms which create their own, different, narrative. For LaMay, the challenge lies in the fact that while there is a lot of quality journalism, audiences have become fragmented, and media desperately try to promote more quality content to a shrinking amount of people. “There has never been as much good journalism as there is now, and it’s impossible to consume it all. Journalists now work in groups to cover various topics and spaces,” he explained before adding that, “for young people who don’t have a point of reference that older generations have, it’s harder for them to evaluate quality journalism.”

Social media use was another challenge discussed. LaMay shared his experience of talking with many publishers and editors of renowned media; for them, social media was a challenge and an opportunity. “When I talk to publishers about their experience with social media, they tell me they want to be less reliable on social media, but they don’t know how to do it,” he said. Still,

social media has been the main discussion platform and a tool for engaging and attracting audiences. For Fleischhacker, social media has been a source of business disruption in terms of traditional models the media used. Thanks to social media, journalists started selling “communities” or “membership” which has been a new way to keep newsrooms working. Rather than selling content, an audience or dialogue became the main tools for media sustainability. Fleischhacker also spoke about the media alienation of different groups, as marginalized communities did not follow traditional news sources. According to him, instead of trying to attract these audiences somehow, media should accept and legitimize them as the feeling of illegitimacy was the reason pushing certain communities away from mainstream media.

Both experts discussed the issue of trust in multimedia journalism and the difficult task of fighting for attention with scarce resources. With so much information in the digital space, the media has had a hard time keeping their audiences interested, and the presenters agreed that there were no easy solutions to this challenge.

Engagement through Digital Technologies

Friday, November 16, 2018, 16:00 – 17:15, Goethe-Institut, Lecture Room

Panelists:

Ilona Biernacka-Ligieza, Professor of Humanities, University of Marie Curie Skłodowska, Poland

Dmitry Chernobrov, Lecturer, Department of Journalism Studies, University of Sheffield, United Kingdom

Banu Akdenizli, Associate Professor, Northwestern University, Qatar

Moderator:

Lenka Waschková Císařová, Vice-Dean for External Affairs, Faculty of Social Studies, Masaryk University, Czechia

The panelists examined how digital communication affects communities across the world. Three distinguished researchers discuss their findings on the engagement of communities through digital technology from data gathered from different cultures, platforms, and experiences.

Ilona Biernacka-Ligieza opened the panel discussion with her comparative analysis on new communication technologies and how they strengthen citizens' trust in media and enhance public dialogue. The focus of her research involved three countries: Poland, Italy, and the United States. The results of her research indicate there are vast differences in engagement of digital technologies in different contexts. Smaller communities throughout Poland and Italy were found to engage more with digital technologies as a source of news than those of the United States. Biernacka-Ligieza stated: "When you look at the sources of communications in local communities, in the US the dominant form is still TV and local newspaper—which is exactly the opposite in Poland." She then explained that with the ease of communicating and publishing online one might assume this would be the dominant form of communication in even rural communities, but it is the opposite. "Local communication is still based on more traditional media, which has been proven mostly by Americans," Biernacka-Ligieza explained. Three key points from her findings include: digital media is an important source of information for local communities, but is not so important for participation within the community; the e-participation process is based not only on technical capacity, but also on people's consumption of traditional media; and that digital media increases citizens' knowledge of municipal affairs.

Dmitry Chernobrov then discussed the emergence of digital volunteer networks and humanitarian crisis reporting. Historically, communities have relied on the media and actors like the Red Cross and the World Health Organization to promote awareness and implement relief efforts during humanitarian crises. These media outlets and aid organizations rely on government funds, public transparency, and company media/branding to function. But, in recent years, the emergence of digital volunteerism in humanitarian crises has resulted in more contemporary ways of handling catastrophes. These communities differ from traditional aid organizations in that they do not require funding; they assemble organically through the use of social media; and they are more responsive than traditional relief efforts. Chernobrov demonstrated these points through the response and relief efforts of an Alabama community during a catastrophic tornado that killed dozens in 2011. Community members took to social media to organize relief efforts and to bring the authorities' attention to areas in the greatest need. In response to tragic events like this one, a new method of relief and volunteerism has emerged. Chernobrov stated that "digital volunteer communities democratize disaster response." The emergence of this communal relief effort will drastically affect the way catastrophes are managed and prevented in the future.

Banu Akdenizli examined digital journalism and Twitter use in Turkey. Key findings indicate there is a decline in unbiased and independent journalism throughout the country. Akdenizli pointed out that "between 2014 and 2017, Twitter reported that Turkey requested more than 52 percent of removal requests worldwide—which is also the highest volume of removal requests worldwide." She explained that overall trust in media is declining in the country and many journalists self-censor due to fear of reprisals from the regime. This trend has greatly affected female journalists in particular. Previously, female journalists represented a small percentage of overall Twitter use by journalists in Turkey, but now rarely tweet. "The females are silent—females are not talking anymore," Akdenizli explained. With most of the world experiencing growth and emerging technologies through digital journalism and independent communication, Turkey's activity within these fields is declining at an alarming rate.

Women in the Newsroom: Breaking Male Decision-Making Power

In cooperation with Heinrich-Böll-Stiftung Prague

Friday, November 16, 2018, 17:30 – 18:45, Goethe Institut, Conference Room

Panelists:

Ines Kappert, Director of Gunda Werner Institute in Germany, Germany

Lenka Vochocová, Research Fellow at the Media Studies Department of Charles University, Czechia

Andrea Petö, Professor of Gender Studies at Central European University, Hungary

Moderator:

Christian Christensen, Professor of Journalism at University of Stockholm, USA/Sweden

Christian Christensen began with a discussion about how the abuse female journalists in Sweden face on a daily basis affects their working life. He pointed to a large quantity of death threats and "threats of sexual violence against female journalists who are reporting on political issues." Lenka Vochocová continued, posing two questions: "Why are there so few women in decision-making positions working in media and why so few creators?"; and "how is the disproportion between men and women working in media related to media content, and is there any problematic relationship we may expect if there are more women working in media?". Ines Kappert returned to the topic of hardships female journalists face by citing her own experience working at an opinion desk: "It was very clear that if I or my female colleagues made a mistake, it would be remembered for ages," while "for males it is much easier to make mistakes, take the critique and then to be bold again." She called for challenging "the connection between authority, who is defining what is interesting and what matters, and masculinity."

Andrea Petö added that a serious problem is posed by the lack of "a conceptual toolkit or understanding of what is happening" in regards to these topics. She also provided three concepts for better understanding of where we are now. They are: "her-story" turn which argues that there are no women on the other side; gender as symbolic glue that holds together different political actors and agendas which were not connected previously; and new forms of government, using the analogy of polypore mushrooms. Then, Petö elaborated on the third concept, describing three different modes of an operating states. They create parallel female

NGOs that are proudly reported to the UN; drawing a connection between women, their families, and units of care; and a securitized language of fear “polypore states” use to label “others.”

Another question Christensen brought up was why gender-diverse newsrooms are important. Vochocová replied, referring to representation in specific important topics such as issues related to sexual abuse or gender-based violence which become uncovered. She also emphasized how the Czech media are gender-blind since they "were not mentioning or supporting gender issues, and were denying the importance of it."

Petö raised the issue of how neoliberal systems label women's bodies as sources of income by selling them, and stating how women take care of reproduction and its control, and, most important, how various media cover it. Kappert added that right-wing movements in Germany "are not only objectifying female bodies, but also objectifying bodies of non-white males" to gain popularity in light of the refugee crisis by “protecting” white women's bodies from newcomers.

Finally, the panelists discussed why feminism and gender studies are being marginalized. Vochocová explained that educational training is important, as "most people simply do not understand the agenda of feminism and gender studies, and this ignorance enables those who can accuse and label gender studies or feminism as the ideology, whereas patriarchy is perceived as neutral." Christensen said that the problem lies in the “distance” created by journalists who separated the issue from ordinary people by speaking with academics only. Petö, in response, explained that there are intentional attempts on behalf of the “polypore states” to delegitimize gender studies by referring to fake articles.

The Future of Audio

Friday, November 16, 2018, 17:30 – 18:45, Goethe-Institut, Lecture Room

Participants:

Graham Griffith, Media Strategist and Public Radio Producer, USA

Dávid Tvrdoň, Podcast Producer and Product Manager for Online News, SME.sk, Slovakia

Participants discussed the growth of podcasting and “on-demand audio” and its relationship to journalism. Graham Griffith introduced Dávid Tvrdoň as a “positive deviant” in his field, and expressed that “podcasting is in a period of boom.” Tvrdoň agreed with the statement, but pointed out that “podcasting is not new,” even in Central and Eastern Europe.

Tvrdoň described his personal experiences in establishing a podcast at the media organization he worked for, and how he acquired permission to start a news podcast after his deputy editor bought an iPhone and discovered *The New York Times*’ podcast. Initially, his colleagues would come together and discuss the topics of the day, in a way that worked “just like the structure of an article.” According to Tvrdoň, the approval of his proposition was based on the low-cost, experimental, and safe character of the investment, although positive feedback from the publishing house and trust in the content’s power were also important. Griffith then made reference to the first days of podcasting, when people mostly did it “on the side,” before leaving the public radio system completely to focus on podcasts. The complicated character of the relationship between supply and demand—whether good content attracted audiences or existing audiences made podcasts a possibility—was also discussed.

When asked how success is measured in podcasting, Tvrdoň noted that downloads or listener counts were certainly used, but the creation of mimics in other news outlets was also significant. He mentioned that his site’s podcasts attracted about fifty thousand listeners.

Tvrdoň was also asked about the devices people were listening on, and he responded that through improvements in analytics, he knew that the plurality of his used the Internet, with listeners using Apple podcasts and other platforms coming in second and third. The “migration” of users towards phones made Griffith again ponder the “chicken and egg question” of whether content brings audience or audiences demand content, especially since phones makes access

to podcasts easier. Tvrdoň added that when it comes to journalism podcasts can be seen as newsletters, because “when [listeners] subscribe, you have a direct feed.”

The participants then fielded questions from the audience, and Tvrdoň was asked about the type of content he created. He responded that his site was currently running eight different feeds on subjects from daily news to history and cars. He pointed out that “it’s good for us journalists to know who is interested in what,” while specialization was also good for sponsorships and advertising. Griffith also examined the “different inflection points in the history of podcasting,” while mentioning that the medium is still in the process of “growing up” as much time has passed since classic podcasts like “Serial” and “the Daily” first aired.

When asked about the lack of research on the content and funding of far-right podcasts, and whether their popularity was caused by the fact that they are free to listen to, Griffith stressed that most podcasts are free, although “what we see is that people are paying for podcasts.” He further added that the danger of being completely dependent on ad revenue exists in podcasting, but that the medium was also very favorable towards the creation of communities, as “on-demand audio is in some ways changing what is considered ‘talk.’”

Griffith asked the audience for input as to whether podcasts can be seen as a way to circumvent state control of the media. Various audience members provided insights on the Czech and Hungarian cases, while Griffith highlighted the storytelling power of the medium and the development of technology in regards to making podcasts a journalistic tool.

In the concluding questions, Griffith and Tvrdoň were asked about their opinion on the future of radio. “I don’t believe you give up on radio,” Griffith responded, “but I don’t think there’s any indication it will grow.” He urged those in the field of radio to “think about your work as audio,” a point Tvrdoň agreed with, despite pointing out the success of regional audio in Slovakia.

On whether podcasting can be seen as another case of “instant gratification” in the modern entertainment world, Griffith insisted that “when I want to listen to something, I want to be able to control what I listen.” He added that “there is no room for mediocrity,” as audience response is better viewed in terms of “instant judgment, as opposed to instant gratification.”

Public Service Media in Central Europe: What Role Should the State Assume?

In cooperation with the International Visegrad Fund and the Czech-German Future Fund and
Saturday, November 17, 2018, 10:00-12:00

Faculty of Social Sciences, Charles University, Hollar Building, Room 215

Participants:

Gábor Kardos, CEO, 444, Hungary

Piotr Pacewicz, Editor-in-Chief, Oko.press, Poland

Patrick H. Leusch, Head of European Affairs, Deutsche Welle, Belgium/Germany

Zuzana Kovačič Hanzelová, Journalist, Formerly RTVS, Slovakia

Moderator:

Adam Černý, Chair, Syndicate of Journalists of the Czech Republic, Commentator,
Hospodářské noviny, Czechia

Panelists discussed the current public media situation in four European countries: Slovakia, Poland, Hungary, and Germany. Within the context of these countries, the panelists discussed the role of public media in democracy. They ended by touching on the European Union's role when democracy is threatened.

Slovakia, Hungary, and Poland have a declining amount of free media and trust in their public media. Slovakia and Hungary both have government interference in their public media with the Hungarian News Agency having a monopoly in Hungary. There is no other news coverage and Gábor Kardos explained that "straightforward propaganda and straightforward lies" are being broadcasted. Kardos detailed how this happened: "The lack of pressure from society is key ... In the case of Hungary, there is no pressure People don't have problems with the government interference, or they are unaware." Trust in Poland's public media has dropped from 50 percent in 2012 to 34 percent in 2018, asserted Piotr Pacewicz. The Polish television feels "invited to produce even more radical propaganda" because voters trust their own political parties' media. In contrast, Germany has a high media trust rate with 42 percent of Germans trusting media and 25 percent more or less trusting media, according to Patrick Leusch.

The panelists then examined the role of public media in democracy. It was established by Leusch that “there is no single case where you have a nondemocratic situation where you have free press.” From there, it was debated if the current model of public media works. Leusch maintained that it did “in countries that respect the law and democracy,” but Zuzana Kovačič Hanzelová did not agree because her own experience in Slovakia had differed. Hanzelová worked with a parliament appointed public media board that failed, in her opinion, to do its job of protecting journalists. Leusch worked with an unaffiliated public media board that had been successful. They both saw the potential for boards to be a part of the public media system, though. Another possible role for public media, according to Kardos is to “make up for market failures.” The public media should serve where the private or commercial cannot.

When democracy is threatened, public media is threatened as well. Leusch claimed, “when we, as an international media, feel the need to step into another country and provide a free voice, something is very wrong in that country.” He went on to explain that Germany has provided access to Turkish media and will possibly provide Hungarian media in the future. The panelists agreed with moderator Adam Černý that the EU did not “account for the possibility of this kind of conflict”— internal threats to democracy. The EU is making attempts to address it but, as Hanzelová put it, “They are stepping in at a level where there is no way back.”

Each of these countries has issues when it comes to public media either because it is government controlled or because of a lack of trust. Despite these issues, all the panelists agreed that public media has its place in democracy, but when democracy is being threatened by internal forces there are a very few ways to counteract it, especially by the EU.