



MARS – MEDIA AGAINST RACISM IN SPORT

Media, Diversity & Racism in Sport

NATIONAL MEDIA ENCOUNTER

Media Cross-Production for Inclusive Coverage

PARTICIPANT SURVEY REPORT

14 - 17 SEPTEMBER 2011

CMFE

COMMUNITY MEDIA FORUM EUROPE

Raum der IG Architektur

Gumpendorferstraße 63b

1060 Vienna

Austria



Verband Freier Radios Österreich
Association of Free Radios Austria



MARS - Media Against Racism in Sport

Funded
by the European Union
and the Council of Europe



EUROPEAN UNION



COUNCIL OF EUROPE
CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

Implemented
by the Council of Europe

This is a report of the National Media Encounter held in Vienna from the 14th to 17th of September 2011. It combines the contents of a report from the National Organisers of the event (VFRÖ) delivered within a couple of weeks of the event, with the results of a questionnaire survey distributed to all participants during the final session.

1. Structure, Duration, Organisers

The event was organised by the Verband Freier Radios Österreich (VFRÖ), the Association of Community Radios Austria. It was the first National Encounter, in a series of fifteen.

It ran from 2:00 pm Tuesday 14th September, to 1:00 pm Friday 17th September, a duration in total of three days.

2. Participation and Participants

As it was the first meeting, time to organise it was very short, about five weeks, mostly during the month of August. The initial participant target for each Encounter of 30 participants was thus unrealistic, but the decision was taken to proceed as a pilot for the later Encounters.

There were a total of 14 active, invited, participants, alongside several support people and MARS Project team members including (for the last two days) the evaluator. Participants comprised 10 males and 4 females. All but one works in Austria, the exception being based in Poland.

For a couple of reasons, the largest group represented was 'alternative media', if this is seen to include ethnic & community media, community media, and human- rights NGOs. VFRÖ is itself a major player in the realm of alternative and community media in Austria and thus contacts into this field are strong. There also seemed to be (in the opinion of the organiser) a psychological barrier among journalists from mainstream media against participating in a four-day-meeting in their home town. A four-day conference abroad would probably have attracted more interest.

Table 1: Type of Organisation	Number
Public service media	1
Commercial/private media	4
Ethnic & Diversity media	3
Community media	5
I work freelance	3
Journalism/communication school/dept.	1
Journalism/media training body	1
Human rights/anti-racism NGO	3
Other	1
Total (Some choose more than one)	22

Table 2: Media worked most with	Number
Print	4
Radio	5
TV	1
Web/multimedia	4

Apart from this basic focus on alternative media, all media genres were represented: radio, television, print and online, though television least of all.

3. Structure and activities

The three days of the meeting, spread over four days, were structured in the following way:

Day 1 was devoted to introducing the programme, its objectives and what would be expected of participants in terms of producing concrete media outputs in pairs or small teams.

The MARS programme partners, VIDC (Vienna Institute for Dialogue and Cooperation), and CMFE (Community Media Forum Europe), offered insights into their role within the programme, and the participants introduced themselves and their motivation for becoming involved. Moderated by the editor-in-chief of the alternative soccer magazine *Ballesterer*, Reinhard Krennhuber (who had taken on the role of facilitator for the output production process), participants identified partners with whom they would collaborate over the following two days. Furthermore first ideas on the themes they would work on were identified and discussed in a first round.

Further inputs were provided by Diamantis Mastrogiannakis from the University of Lille 2, and by Clara Akinsyoye editor-in-chief of M-Media.

Days 2 and 3 were devoted to the production of the media pieces by the teams identified.

This took place at the general venue, IG Architektur, as well as at WienXtra Medienzentrum where the participants working with electronic media found resources for their technical needs such as cameras, recorders, cutting rooms, as well as technical support. Mr. Krennhuber worked with all groups, giving advice on such things as interview partners as well as the structure of the articles or radio/TV features. Further resources such as a library and advice on topics were provided at the VIDC office through Elisabeth Kotvojs and Markus Pinter.

On the final Day 4 each participant team presented the outcomes of their two-day's work, and these were discussed by everyone.

The MARS evaluator went through with the evaluation of the meeting; and Reynald Blion, CoE informed on the further plans and meetings within the MARS Programme.

4. Satisfaction with Organisation, Content and Expectations

Participants were asked:

"Overall, how satisfied were you that the organisation of the Encounter was appropriate and effective for what it set out to achieve?"

Responses are presented in Table 3.

Applying a simple weighting where “very satisfied” scores five points and “Very Dissatisfied” scores one point yields **an average score of 4.64** from a possible 5, indicating a high level of satisfaction.

A similar question was asked regarding the content and activities of the meeting:

“Overall, how satisfied were you with the content and activities of the Encounter?” with the following results.

Table 3: Satisfaction with Organisation of the Encounter	Number	Simple Weighting
Very Satisfied	9	45
Somewhat satisfied	5	20
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	0	0
Somewhat dissatisfied	0	0
Very dissatisfied	0	0
Total responses/Weighted Average	14	4.64

Table 4: Satisfaction with content and activities	Number	Simple Weighting
Very Satisfied	8	40
Somewhat satisfied	6	24
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	0	0
Somewhat dissatisfied	0	0
Very dissatisfied	0	0
Total responses/Weighted Average	14	4.57

Using the same weighting method, the meeting scored an **average of 4.57**, only very marginally lower than that for the organisation of the event and, again, indicating that the content and activities met with a high level of satisfaction among participants.

A third, general, question was as follows:

“Indicate overall the extent to which your expectations of this Encounter have been fulfilled”.

Participants rated this on a scale of one to five, where one means “Not at all” and five means “fully”.

The average here **came to 4.21**, the score slightly reduced by one participant who gave it a score of 2. This participant clearly had higher expectations, though was satisfied with the organisation and content of the event.

5. Qualitative Considerations

A number of questions were put to participants about what they gained qualitatively, in terms of balance and inclusiveness in the media, from the event concerning: broader ways of working; stimulating awareness of the issues; and working in partnership with others. Each was put in the form of statement with which participants could express different levels of agreement or disagreement.

The first such statement was:

“The Encounter encouraged broader ways of working, that give greater consideration to balance and inclusiveness in producing media content.”

All participants at least somewhat agreed with the statement, with a good majority in strong agreement.

The second statement put to participants concerned the extent to which awareness raising had occurred among participants.

"The Encounter stimulated ideas about ways of raising awareness of intercultural, diversity and non-discrimination issues."
Results here were precisely the same as those above.

Table 5: Encouraged broader ways of working	Number	Simple Weighting
Agree strongly	10	50
Agree somewhat	4	16
Neither agree nor disagree	0	0
Disagree somewhat	0	0
Strongly disagree	0	0
Total responses/Weighted Average	14	4.71

Table 6: Stimulated ideas about raising awareness on diversity issues.	Number	Simple Weighting
Agree strongly	10	50
Agree somewhat	4	16
Neither agree nor disagree	0	0
Disagree somewhat	0	0
Strongly disagree	0	0
Total responses/Weighted Average	14	4.71

The third question concerning the benefits of working in partnership yielded somewhat different results.

The statement put to participants was:

"The Encounter demonstrated advantages of working in partnership, including across different media sectors and types."

Results were again broadly positive, though with a few expressing no strong view either way.

A series of potential support actions were also presented to participants with a request that they indicate which *"might help you to include diversity as an angle to your daily media work/coverage"*. Participants were encouraged to select up to three (an option "does not apply to me was also given, and was chosen by one).

Table 7: Encouraged broader ways of working	Number	Simple Weighting
Agree strongly	5	25
Agree somewhat	6	24
Neither agree nor disagree	3	12
Disagree somewhat	0	0
Strongly disagree	0	0
Total responses/Weighted Average	14	4.36

Results suggest that a range of supports would be welcomed by a significant number of participants.

Table 8: Encouraged broader ways of working	Number
Training workshops (Content and Techniques)	7
Financial support	6
Case Study examples of good practice	5
Good, reliable contact sources from diverse backgrounds dealing with your issue	5
Production techniques manuals or examples	4
Tools for reflecting on diversity in the workplace	4
Arguments that make the case to senior management on diversity	3
Elearning tools (content and techniques)	1

6. Outputs

A key goal of the Encounters is to produce a set of concrete outputs, both as a practical pedagogical exercise and for the value of the outputs themselves. Everything produced will be available on the MARS Website. However, participants were also encouraged strongly to publish and promote them elsewhere.

The participants teamed up in four pairs and one trio – a few did not participate directly in the outputs. The results were six articles/features produced on five different topics.

Participants were asked to rate the stage of development that their output had achieved by the end of the meeting (some opted for *N/A: Does not apply to me*).

Table 9: Stage of Development	Not yet begun	Have just begun	Well underway	Completed	N/A
Concept and Design			1	9	2
Planning the production			3	9	
Content production			2	10	
Testing/proofing/verifying			3	8	
Finalisation/production	post 1	1	3	7	

Thus by the end of the event most participants felt that their media output was completed, or at least well on the way based on the work undertaken during the event itself.

The following summarise each of six outputs from the five themes from the event, drawn from the report of the National Coordinator.

- In "Better than the best – but not good enough" **Yilmaz Gülüm and Marion Draxler** interviewed two successful sports people after they had ended their main career in soccer, to verify the assumption that there is a "glass ceiling" for people with a migrant background concerning a second career in training or management.

The article was published on 19 September 2011 in *dastandard.at* at <http://dastandard.at/1315006683943/Fussball-und-Integration-Am-Beispiel-Zoki-Barisic>

For Yilmaz and Marion, the cooperation was fruitful and they felt they inspired and complemented one another. Marion was quite surprised that – with the help of Reinhard Krennhuber – they managed to interview so many famous sportspeople in such a short time. One interviewee found it the most interesting topic he had been questioned on in a long time, and it seems this topic is rarely raised in the media.

- "Enlargement of the Ice Hockey League in Austria" is a radio feature by **Daniela Errenst and Michael Gams**. They researched how the major Austrian ice hockey league has become more international in the last years, influencing also the way people understand and accept other cultures, languages and traditions.

The radio feature was published in the Cultural Broadcasting Archive of VFRÖ at <http://cba.fro.at/49887>. It was broadcast on Friday, 23 September in 'FROzine' at 6 pm on radio FRO; and on Sunday, 2 October, Radio Agora at 6 pm.

Both Daniela and Michael come from radio and found their cooperation very successful. For Daniela, coming from a radio station that deals with minority issues on a daily basis, the change of focus from "there is a problem" to a genuine topic where the "problem" becomes secondary was an interesting experience. She said she would not have chosen such an approach without the MARS seminar. They, too, heard that the topic they chose had never been dealt with in the media concerning ice hockey. With more than an hour of material they are considering to create a larger feature. A problem they faced was the short time they had, leading to the use of inaccurate terminology at times. In the future they would like to be able to work more on this especially as it is a sensitive topic.

- **Kerstin Kellermann** has been working for some time on the topic of why Women's Ski Jumping has not been an Olympic discipline for many years. Together with **Sefer Ülger** they interviewed William Rush, uncle of successful ski jumper Jessica Jerome, and Daniela Iraschko about discrimination of women in sports, only to find out that this discipline had been admitted in the beginning of the year. This fact had escaped Kerstin's attention even though she is an attentive follower of sports news – which as a fact speaks for itself concerning reporting on women in sports.

The article by Kerstin and Sefer has been published in *M-Media*: <http://www.m-media.or.at/sport/ende-der-diskriminierung-frauen-zur-ski-olympia-zugelassen/2011/10/04/>

Kerstin will publish an article on the "Raiffeisen Vikings" – Ladies American Football Team – in *Augustin*; she had the idea for this through the MARS Media Encounter.

Kerstin was at first unsure that her more "decorative" style would go down well with what she imagined would be the more down-to-earth approach of the sports reporter. However both she and Sefer found the cooperation to have gone well, though there was no consensus on a few areas. Kerstin, having worked in the field for over 20 years, came across few surprises, whereas Sefer, being new to the topic, had not known that there were no women ski jumpers in the Olympics.

- "A foul is when the referee whistles", referee Andreas Fellingner is heard saying in the TV feature by **Anna Maria Bulecka, Oliver Jagosch and Soheyl Liwani**. The authors interviewed two referees, one Turkish, one Austrian, on the issue of whether referees are prone to abuse on the soccer field, whatever they do. The question was, is there a difference for a migrant and a non-migrant referee?

The 10 minute feature has been published and can be downloaded at

<https://www.dorftv.at/videos/open-space/2495>

It will be published on the facebook site of wientv.org.

Oliver and Anna Maria have a radio background and Soheyl is a press officer and not a TV reporter, so all three were relatively unfamiliar with the medium. They would have liked to have had more time, especially as the female referee they wanted to speak with would have only been able to give the interview on Friday afternoon – too late for the formal constraints the project brought with it in terms of production. Producing a film does need more time and technical skills than producing a radio show or a text. All three found it an interesting experience to work together and they complemented one another well with their different talents and backgrounds. A surprising finding was that the Turkish referee did not register racism on the field and in sports, rather only in every day interactions.

- **Dominik Meisinger** (radio) and **Johannes Hofer** (print) were the only cross-media team of the group. Their work on the topic of "Migrant Football Clubs in Vienna" and the difficulties these clubs face resulted in a radio feature and a print version.

The radio feature has been published and can be downloaded on CBA at <http://cba.fro.at/49932>. It was broadcast on Radio FRO in FROzine on 20 September 2011 at 6 pm. <http://www.fro.at/article.php?id=3895>

It will also be broadcast as part of the show by Daniela Errenst at Radio Agora on 2 October 2011 at 6 pm.

The article by Johannes Hofer will be published (a bit amended) in *Ballesterer* in the November issue.

Dominik and Johannes discussed the concept and approached their interview partners together. They then produced their features independently since each medium follows its own logic and requires a different approach. The result is that the radio piece includes different aspects from the written piece, each complementing the other. Neither had worked in this cross-media way before. A written piece, they found, cannot be used even as moderation for a radio feature. They gathered a lot of material and opened up a huge field on the topic. It was not easy to maintain a focus on just one aspect of migrant soccer clubs, since a Turkish club faces problems quite different to those of a club of *sans papiers* or of refugees fighting for a residence permit.

7. Conclusion

Overall, the Austrian National Encounter has been very successful. The following summarises the main conclusions.

1. Overall the number of participants was low (14 compared to an original target of 30 for National Encounters), but this is not surprising given the very short lead in time, and that it was taking in place in September, traditionally a very busy time for meetings and events.
2. A good mix of occupations, of media organisation type, and of media were in attendance, given that the focus of the Encounter is on media producers (as distinct from media literacy or journalism trainers). Public service media and television were least represented.
3. The level of satisfaction among participants was high, in terms of how well the meeting was organised, in terms of the content and activities, and in terms of satisfying the expectations of participants (this last with only one exception).
4. Participants agreed quite strongly that the event encouraged broader ways of working, that give

greater consideration to balance and inclusiveness in producing media content; and that it stimulated ideas about ways of raising awareness of intercultural, diversity and non-discrimination issues. In terms of demonstrating the advantages of working partnership, most agreed it did, but a few were non-committal on the matter.

5. In terms of supports that participants felt might help them include diversity as an angle to their daily media work/coverage, a range were felt to be beneficial, including training workshops, financial support, case studies, and having access to contacts from diverse backgrounds.
6. Six outputs were finalised or almost finalised across five themes (one was a 'cross-media' theme, in which outputs was produced for both print and radio). This was a significant achievement, and showed a high degree of commitment from the participants. All have been completed since.
7. They have been published in a variety of ways, including in print, on radio, on media websites. More dissemination might follow.