CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Contribution to society and public service media's neoliberal dilemma

MANUEL PUPPIS[I] & CHRISTOPHER ALI[II]

[I] DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION AND MEDIA RESEARCH, UNIVERSITY OF FRIBOURG, SWITZERLAND

[II] BELLISARIO COLLEGE OF COMMUNICATIONS, PENN STATE UNIVERSITY, USA

ABSTRACT

While many public service media (PSM) organisations remain in strong positions in their respective markets, digitalisation and convergence have led to new market constellations and changes in media use. These changes have led to fierce debates about the legitimacy, the remit, and the funding of PSM in the digital age. With its contribution to society concept, the European Broadcasting Union (EBU) is trying to address these challenges. Based on new institutionalism in organisation studies, we argue that the contribution to society concept is bound to fail if it only reinforces the neoliberal discourse that dominates media policy today. Instead, a more ambitious interpretation of the concept would offer PSM the opportunity to shift the policy debate away from a market-based discourse and towards one based on PSM's core roles and responsibilities.

KEYWORDS: contribution to society, public service media, new institutionalism, media policy, neoliberalism

Puppis, M., & Ali, C. (2023). Introduction: Contribution to society and public service media's neoliberal dilemma. In M. Puppis, & C. Ali (Eds.), *Public service media's contribution to society: RIPE@2021* (pp. 9–28). Nordicom, University of Gothenburg.
https://doi.org/10.48335/9789188855756-1

Introduction

Launched in 2015 by the European Broadcasting Union (EBU), the contribution to society initiative was designed to measure and augment the impact of public service media (PSM) organisations in their respective media systems. The concept is intended to help PSM organisations "respond to criticism, renew their legitimacy, and bolster their political, market and social support" (EBU, 2015a: 11). Framed primarily as a communication campaign, PSM organisations "must improve their communication, becoming more […] influential within the decision-making and bargaining processes that define their remit and resources" (EBU, 2015b: 3). According to the EBU, this requires not simply reporting on the fulfilment of their remit vis-à-vis policy-makers, but also assessing their impact in a comprehensive way and addressing market players and citizens directly with an "inspiring and meaningful narrative about the value and benefits of PSM for the whole of society" (EBU, 2015a: 11). In other words, PSM organisations are instructed to take control of the narrative of PSM, and in doing so, improve relationships with three pivotal stakeholder groups: market players, citizens, and policy-makers.

This focus on PSM organisations' relationship with society and different stakeholder groups echoes earlier research that has been seminal in conceptualising PSM more clearly. In contrast to approaches that try to define PSM based on either the content of the programme remit or their non-commercial organisation, Søndergaard (1999: 22) proposed understanding PSM via their relationship with society: "The concept of 'public service' primarily refers to a set of relationships between electronic media and the society they operate in and are mandated to serve". Hence, what PSM are – and what they are supposed to offer – depends on the particular conditions of society, and since society changes over time, the remit and organisation of PSM must be renegotiated time and again. More specifically, scholars have argued that PSM should maintain relationships with the political system, private competitors, and the audience (Jarren & Donges, 2005; Moe, 2007). Indeed, the societies in which PSM operate are rapidly changing due to digitalisation, transnationalisation, and commercialisation. In Europe and beyond, these developments have led to heated debates about the need for PSM, their appropriate role, and funding in the digital era. While it is uncontroversial in communication research to claim that public service broadcasting must develop into PSM (Lowe & Bardoel, 2007), the (more) relevant stakeholders of public service tend to be less convinced: The support for the idea of public service broadcasting and media has weakened among policy-makers; given their financial problems, many private media perceive PSM and their digital services as a threat; and audiences have partly moved away from (private and public) media to online platforms like social networks and video-sharing services.

As a consequence, PSM organisations and their European trade association, the EBU, have started to develop new concepts to legitimise their role in

society. Already in 2004, the BBC began to tout its "public value", redefining a term that had been developed for the management of the public administration in the US (Collins, 2007; Lowe & Martin, 2014). This eventually led to the introduction of "public value tests" in several European countries (Donders & Moe, 2011). In the meantime, the discussion has turned towards PSM's contribution to society, with recent attempts by PSM organisations to persuade stakeholders as to their relevance, necessity, and legitimacy. Yet, as we argue in this chapter, in order to be meaningful for society and to have a transformational effect on PSM organisations, the contribution to society concept needs to be more than just an instrument of legitimacy management employed by organisations under increasing public pressure. While communicating the many valuable contributions of PSM is important, the task at hand is not solving a communication problem. The concept is useless if it is limited to the question of how to better sell the contribution of PSM to citizens instead of guaranteeing that PSM *serves* the public interest and makes a contribution worth paying for and talking about.

Communication scholars can make a valuable contribution not just to research but to PSM practice by critically discussing the analytical value and usefulness of new concepts that are circulated in industry and policy-making. Indeed, scholars tend to quickly pick up on new concepts like public value or contribution to society. Unfortunately, given the innate tendency of scholars to be defensive of PSM, critical analysis is sometimes not prioritised. To be sure, we subscribe to the statement that media are "not just any other business" (McQuail & Deuze, 2020: 235). Even in markets that do not fail from an economic point of view, media policy intervention is still needed. Commercial media and platforms mainly follow their own economic interests and treat audiences as a commodity sold to advertisers, with implications for the content produced and (algorithmically) distributed as well as for the cultural experience of citizens and the fulfilment of society's democratic needs. PSM has an important role to play in a public sphere transformed by digitalisation (Habermas, 2021).

Having said that, scholars of PSM need to be mindful of unacknowledged and uncritical normative assumptions of the importance of PSM. Many in the realm of PSM research implicitly believe that PSM is a crucial component of a healthy, diverse, and pluralistic media ecosystem, but such normative impulses should be checked and acknowledged. As critical theory teaches us, it is alright to take a political stand, but such normative commitments should be transparent (van Dijk, 1993; Wodak & Meyer, 2009). More importantly, they should be complemented by systematic, transparent, and planned research design and methodologies that generate trusted findings, be they qualitative, quantitative, or mixed (Just & Puppis, 2012; see also Van den Bulck et al., 2019).

This RIPE volume aims to offer such a critical perspective on PSM, its contribution to society, and the attempts at using the concept for legitimacy

management. In this introductory chapter, we offer a theoretical background for analysing the contribution to society concept and a critique of its current limitations. First, we argue that new institutionalism helps to better understand the use of communication in media policy-making in general and in the governance of PSM in particular (Ali & Puppis, 2018). Second, we argue that the problem the contribution to society programme hopes to address is much more than just a communication problem; however, the EBU and PSM organisations mainly consider the concept as a strategic device of legitimacy management instead of embracing necessary organisational change. Third, we scrutinise the appropriateness of the current iteration of the concept to successfully make the case for strong PSM. We argue that the contribution to society initiative is bound to fail if it reinforces instead of challenges the neoliberal discourse dominating media policy (Freedman, 2008), and thus may lead into what we call a neoliberal trap. Instead, we argue that a more ambitious interpretation of the concept would offer PSM the opportunity to escape that trap and shift the media-policy debate. In doing so, we point out how the contribution to society concept is an "empty signifier" that could – if filled with an alternative vision of PSM – help alleviate neoliberal predominance in media policy-making. To conclude the chapter, we emphasise the need for critical PSM research and provide an overview of the chapters contained in this volume.

The role of communication in public service media governance

According to Black (2002: 164), "regulation is in large part a communicative process". On the one hand, traditional command-and-control regulation ("the stick") and incentives ("the carrot") are complemented by communication ("the sermon") as a soft tool of governance (Black, 2001; Vedung, 1998). Regulators not only make use of private regulatory conversations (Black, 2002), but also of public communication via the media to send messages to regulated firms (Coglianese & Howard, 1998; Deacon & Monk, 2001; Puppis et al., 2014; Yeung, 2005, 2009). On the other hand – and more relevant here – communication is an important element of how regulated firms respond to regulation (Ali & Puppis, 2018; Black, 2008). Companies make use of lobbying and public relations in their attempts to influence policy-making and prospective regulation.

Yet, *media* policy is different. While media always distribute chances for attention (and influence) with their decisions to cover or not to cover a certain political issue (Habermas, 2006), in media policy, they are political actors in their own right (Page, 1996; Pfetsch, 2003). And these actors can try to influence media policy not only by way of lobbying and public relations but also by utilising their own media for furthering their private interests.

This raises serious questions regarding the media coverage of media policy. According to McChesney (2008: 350):

> The corporate media are in an ideal position to control the public perception, or lack thereof, of any possible debate regarding the control and structure of the media. The media have shown two basic responses to efforts to challenge their legitimacy. First, they simply ignore the issue or provide it minimal coverage. […] Second, the […] media distort the issues to suit their own purposes.

This influence of media over the media-policy agenda and the debate of rivalling political solutions has been labelled as media-policy bias and media-policy silence, amplifying fears of a neoliberalisation of media policy (Ali & Puppis, 2018; Freedman, 2008, 2010).

And yet, media policy, political communication, and journalism research have shown little interest in the role of communication in media policy-making (Jarren, 1998). The few existing studies have almost exclusively focused on private media and their coverage of media mergers (Beck, 2001; Hackett & Uzelman, 2003; Kemner et al., 2008; Kweon, 2000; Müller & Donsbach, 2006) and broadcasting regulation (Gilens & Hertzman, 2000; Pratte & Whiting, 1986; Schejter & Obar, 2009) that affect them directly, or on the funding and online remit of their PSM competitors (Löblich, 2011; Maier & Dogruel, 2016; Udris et al., 2021; Weiß, 1988). These studies provide evidence of the existence of media-policy bias. In particular, press coverage is often critical of PSM, their online remit, and their funding.

However, PSM organisations themselves have not been at the centre of attention when investigating the influence of regulated firms on media policy-making and regulation via communication. While several studies have shown that PSM organisations are actively involved in media policy-making and often successful in defending their position (see, e.g., Sundet & Syvertsen, 2021; Van den Bulck & Donders, 2014), they do not focus on the role of communication. To be sure, we would not expect PSM to make use of their own radio and television channels to pursue their self-interests, as commercial media apparently do – simply because they are under heightened public scrutiny from their competitors and policy-makers alike. Yet, communication is part of their repertoire in advocating their position in the policy-making process and this, we believe, deserves scholarly attention.

New institutionalism in organisation studies is particularly well-suited for analysing the interdependence of media policy-making and media organisations as well as the role of communication in governance, as it helps to understand the recursive relationship between organisations and their institutional environments. Briefly, sociological institutionalism emphasises that it is important for organisations to conform to their institutional environments to gain legitimacy (Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Suchman, 1995). These

institutional environments shape organisations by way of taken-for-granted assumptions and collectively share understandings, normative expectations, and moral obligation, as well as coercion and the threat of sanctions in case of nonconformity (Scott, 2001). Conceptualising media governance as part of the institutional environments helps to understand how adhering to rules generates legitimacy for media organisations and that they are conforming to rules not only because of their punitive quality (i.e., coercion and sanctions) but also because of their normative and cultural-cognitive quality (Edelman & Suchman, 1997; Puppis, 2010). At the same time, sociological institutionalism draws our attention not only to the influence of governance on media organisations, but also to the way these organisations respond to rules and try to influence media policy-making to induce more favourable regulation. The relationship between organisations and their institutional environments is a recursive one, and organisations influence the process of institutionalisation both strategically and unintentionally (Barley & Tolbert, 1997). In this vein, Oliver (1991) has suggested distinguishing among five strategic responses of organisations to their institutional environments in order to manage their legitimacy: acquiescence, compromise, avoidance, defiance, and manipulation. Communication is seen as pivotal in such legitimacy management (Black, 2008). In short:

> [Media organisations' communication is] at the same time influenced by institutional environments and a strategic device used to manipulate perceptions of the media's activities and performance. Communication can be used to conceal non-conformity behind a façade of acquiescence, to reject requirements or to lobby for a change of regulation. (Ali & Puppis, 2018: 280)

To better understand the use of communication by media organisations in this recursive cycle (put differently, how they depend on existing ideational structure to communicate their ideas and how they reproduce and change these structures) discursive institutionalism (Alasuutari, 2015; Ganter & Löblich, 2021; Schmidt, 2008) is helpful as it sheds light on the communicative process of generating, deliberating, and legitimising ideas. Thus, it allows us to trace the relationship of discourse and policy over time, contributing to a better understanding how policy is made (Ali & Puppis, 2018).

Such an institutionalist approach emphasises, first, that the governance of PSM is part of the institutional environments of PSM organisations; second, that PSM governance has a cultural-cognitive, normative, and punitive quality; third, that adhering to governance generates legitimacy for PSM organisations; fourth, that PSM organisations strategically try to influence PSM governance; and fifth, that communication is an important element of PSM organisations' response to governance. Accordingly, an institutional approach helps to understand that the political communication of PSM organisations

in media policy-making – including concepts like contribution to society – is at the same time 1) a strategic device of legitimacy management used to influence perceptions of the organisation's performance and, consequently, media policy-making, and 2) influenced by PSM organisations' institutional environments (Katzenbach, 2018; Löblich, 2017; Siegert & Hangartner, 2017). The following two sections focus on both aspects: the contribution to society concept as a communication strategy that is not necessarily in line with the public interest, and institutional influences on the concept that might turn it into a neoliberal trap for PSM.

More than a communication problem

As noted in the introduction to this chapter, the EBU's contribution to society initiative aims to address the existential threats to PSM in the twenty-first century: Challenges to the existence and relevancy of PSM are levied from multiple vantage points, including a much more fluid and dynamic media ecosystem; the national limitations of PSM; the fact that new streaming services and online platforms often "do not operate within the same legal framework" as PSM (EBU, 2015a: 8); and the observation that PSM organisations have done a poor job communicating with market and citizen stakeholders. As a result, the EBU fears that the legitimacy of PSM in the new media ecosystem is at stake, or in some cases, already dissolved. This analysis is largely shared in communication scholarship (Leurdijk, 2007; Moe, 2007; Rodríguez-Castro et al., 2021).

According to the EBU, there are two remedies to this issue: 1) adapting to the new context and 2) demonstrating the value and benefits of PSM "to their multiple stakeholders, including not only politicians but also other market players and most importantly citizens" (EBU, 2015a: 10). In short, the contribution to society concept maintains that PSM organisations can no longer rest on their "intrinsic or moral values", nor can they depend on regulatory protection for survival (EBU, 2015a: 9). Rather, it is crucial, the EBU argued, that PSM organisations communicate their contribution to society to market and public stakeholders:

> PSM need to craft a comprehensive set of fact-based counter-arguments. These should be well-structured and holistic, covering all the issues in a particular way, yet also building a solid and convincing ideological framework. This should result in a renewed, inspiring and meaningful narrative about the value and benefits for PSM for the whole society. (EBU, 2015a: 11)

The goal, therefore, is first and foremost to regain control of PSM's narrative. In doing so, the EBU purports, PSM organisations will be able to shape their own "storylines" and rebuild legitimacy in the eyes of the market and of the public.

To accomplish this goal, the EBU recommends that PSM organisations engage in a series of impact assessments covering four interrelated quadrants: economy, technology, culture and education, and democracy. Moreover, the EBU noted how communication must be at the front and centre of these impact assessments: "The results need to be communicated in-house and outside […]. Without a proper communication plan, targeting as many stakeholders as possible with suitable messages, the outcome of the project will not generate the expected impact" (EBU, 2015a: 31). Crucially, the storylines should be adapted to different stakeholders' characteristics and needs to ensure the effectiveness of advocacy activities (EBU, 2015a). While PSM organisations in the past mainly directed their communication towards regulators and policymakers, the EBU recommended shifting narrative attention towards market and public stakeholders so that they may "be turned into strong supporters [and] even PSM ambassadors, helping to raise general awareness about PSM's contribution to society as well as build their case" (EBU, 2015a: 38).

Underscoring the importance of messaging, the final chapter of the contribution to society concept paper is devoted entirely to how PSM organisations can craft an impactful communication plan ("Communication Reshape"). The purpose of the concept is restated in no uncertain terms: "Communicating the value delivered by public service media is an essential part of the PSM contribution to society mindset" (EBU, 2015a: 36). Without an effective communication strategy, PSM organisations are told, the future of PSM in Europe is bleak indeed. And this is not seen as a recent development, as the EBU clearly explained:

> Many PSM organizations are not especially active or good when it comes to communicating their successes, the good things they do for the citizens and what they do for the market. Consequently, their value frequently goes unnoticed. This not only results in a missed opportunity to raise the profile of PSM, which could result in greater acceptance and support, but it also opens the door to a worrying situation: it is not unusual for commercial operators in many European countries to claim that they are the ones providing services and value that have traditionally been inherent in the PSM remit. (EBU, 2015a: 36)

The purpose of fashioning a series of clear storylines is to control the agenda of the PSM debate. Failing to do so, the EBU (2015a) stated, risks damaging the PSM organisation's public image. The path forward is therefore clear: Conduct impact assessments, craft both the process and results of these assessments into digestible and tailored narratives for market and public stakeholders, and in doing so, regain control of a lost narrative of PSM's contribution to society.

To be sure, the contribution to society initiative acknowledges that organisational change must occur within European PSM organisations. This is

made clear in its call for impact assessments along the economy, technology, culture and education, and democracy matrix. Purportedly, these assessments are necessary for rendering PSM organisations more responsive to the dynamic and fluid media environment of the twenty-first century and regaining a lost legitimacy. What is also made clear, however, is that any such organisational change takes a secondary position to communicating these assessments to market and public stakeholders in order to convince them of the value of PSM.

While communication is indeed a vital part of organisations' legitimacy management (Black, 2008; Price, 2012), the contribution to society concept reduces the challenges PSM organisations face to an ill-defined public relations strategy:

> Public service media organizations need to adapt their public relations and communication strategy. This is the only way for stakeholders to have the feeling that they are important to PSM, and this is essential to ensure their support. (EBU, 2015a: 38)

As the EBU (2015a: 39) has continued, if PSM organisations adopt the communication strategies listed in the concept paper, "they will [be] able to generate the facts, arguments and storylines that are needed to build a new narrative about how they bring value to society". The issue here is not that there is *not* a communication problem, but that the concept seems to reduce the *entire* PSM legitimacy challenge to one of communication and public relations.

This lack of attention to the organisational dimension is a recurrent theme in the discourse about PSM. When public value was *en vogue* in media policymaking as well as industry and scholarly circles, it was often reduced to new regulatory requirements for PSM organisations, culminating in the adoption of so-called public value or Amsterdam tests across Europe (Donders & Moe, 2011). Yet, for that concept to have any value for the *citizens* PSM purportedly serves, it should not underestimate the importance of organisational structures, procedures, and cultures (Puppis et al., 2013). Considering how the ethos of PSM has been maintained and transformed in the digital era thus becomes a crucial task (Brevini, 2010, 2013). There is a clear need for fostering an awareness of the distinctiveness of PSM within PSM organisations (Lowe & Jauert, 2005) that should involve institutionalised internal discussion about output quality and value. Moreover, as PSM organisations have an obligation to be responsive and accountable towards civil society, public value should be the result of consultations with citizens and stakeholders (Hasebrink, 2007). These insights also apply to the contribution to society concept.

As important as communicating the value of PSM and its contribution to society is – and as important as the regulation of PSM is – responding to changing societies also requires organisational changes. While it should

not come as a surprise that survival is an important goal of organisations (Scott, 2003), surviving for survival's sake is not enough for PSM to serve the communication needs of ever more diverse societies. Thus, it is important to stress that the self-interest in survival pursued with the contribution to society concept does not necessarily align with the public interest. As important as the model of PSM is for society, existing PSM organisations do not always live up to it. For instance, Freedman (2019) offered a critique of the BBC's elite capture (although that might be a particular British issue). Strengthening the self-preserving status quo of legacy PSM organisations simply might not be sufficient. It is, therefore, even more important to put front and centre the public interest when adapting PSM organisations to the digital era.

More worrisome than the prioritisation of communication over organisational change is that the concept fails to address the larger ontological threat to PSM looming in media-policy discourse. The contribution to society concept is mainly shaped by neoliberal ideology, forcing PSM organisations to legitimise themselves within the narrow framework of the market and preventing them from shifting the discourse with an alternative narrative. In the following section, we explore this in greater detail.

The neoliberal trap

Conceptualising the contribution to society initiative as a strategy of legitimacy management alone would underestimate institutional influences on PSM organisations (for a detailed assessment of the concept of legitimacy in PSM, see Fehlmann, Chapter 2 in this volume). Two strands of institutionalism help us fully grasp this problematic. First, discursive institutionalism, with its focus on how ideational structures shape the communication of ideas by organisations, is helpful for understanding the influence of a dominant ideology like neoliberalism. Neoliberalism is an all-encompassing discursive, political, social, and economic construct and is predicted on an unassailable belief in the free market, individual choice, and a market-support role for states, reducing society to transactional relationships (Brown, 2015; Freedman, 2010; Harvey, 2010). In media policy-making, it can lead to discursive capture, meaning that policy options "are constrained by market-dictated imperatives" (Pickard, 2015: 91): Ideas of the desirability of markets have so successfully captured or ensnared policy conversations, that such conversations only reflect neoliberal values, or what Pickard (2015) has called "market ontology." As a result, public interest organisations, like PSM, museums, galleries, or universities, must increasingly justify their existence in terms of their market value.

Next, sociological institutionalism helps us to understand that organisations follow this neoliberal logic not only because non-conformity might result in sanctions or because of expectations they are confronted with, but also because they adopt or internalise neoliberal values themselves. This is what

we call the neoliberal trap: a situation in which PSM organisations believe they must employ the language of neoliberalism and of market fundamentalism to justify and legitimise their place in (European) media landscapes. By refocusing attention on PSM's impact on the economy, the concept runs the risk of defending PSM's valuable contribution in a world in which it has no place at all. While creating jobs and stimulating the economy can be a *side* effect, this is neither the core value of PSM nor will it convince its opponents. Moreover, adopting a neoliberal perspective involves the danger of limiting PSM to the role of correcting a narrowly defined market failure which occurs due to public good characteristics, externalities, information asymmetries, subadditivity, or network effects (Puppis, 2023). Yet, even economically competitive media markets do not necessarily do justice to the fact of media being both economic and cultural goods, which implies that PSM have a much bigger role to play in countering the commodification and commercialisation of culture (e.g., Hardy, 2014). However, instead of building upon the idea of merit goods, which emphasises the societal role of media (Ali, 2016), or following the institutional thread of other extra-market institutions such as museums (O'Neill, 2008), the contribution to society concept subsumes PSM into neoliberal discourse. The concept is therefore bound to fail if it reinforces rather than challenges the neoliberal discourse that dominates media policy (Freedman, 2008).

For the contribution to society concept to successfully support PSM organisations in legitimising their public interest role in the media landscape, it should embrace an alternative to the neoliberal discourse of profit-oriented commercial media and online platforms. As Cammaerts and Mansell (2020: 145) argued about online platforms,

> by challenging the taken-for-granted common sense of the digital platforms, it is more likely that discursive practice can become generative of alternative visions for the design and use of digital technologies that work in support of (rather than against) democratically agreed public values.

The same can be said about media: Once this ontological threat to the future of PSM is recognised, the contribution to society concept can become a powerful instrument for shifting the media-policy discourse. If we consider the contribution to society concept to be an empty signifier, whereby "everything depends on who gets to fill it with meaning" (Harvey, 2013: xv), the void can be filled with an alternative vision. For this, we believe, "the commons" or "digital commons" would offer a powerful idea (Murdock, 2004; Ramsey, 2013; Schweizer, 2016, 2019). As Murdock (2004: 1) argued:

> We have to stop thinking of public broadcasting as a stand-alone organisation and see it as the principal node in an emerging network of public and civil initiatives that taken together, provide the basis for new shared cultural space, a digital commons, that can help forge new communal

> connections and stand against the continual pressure for enclosure coming from commercial interests on the one hand and the new moral essentialism on the other.

The commons can be conceptualised as "a resource shared by a group where the resource is vulnerable to enclosure, overuse and social dilemmas" (Hess, 2008: 37). In her work introducing the notion of the commons to PSM, Schweizer (2016) saw two ways in which the two are connected: First, PSM is an organisation "that contributes to and offers access to an intangible culture or knowledge commons", and second, it is a "specific infrastructure that creates a shared space for public deliberation" (Schweizer, 2016: 177). Similar calls for such a transition have also been made by those arguing for PSM to become an open platform for public communication (or a "public open space") that cooperates with public knowledge and cultural organisations, civil society knowledge organisations, and citizens (Dobusch, 2018; Dörr et al., 2016; Grassmuck, 2018; Mitschka & Unterberger, 2018).

Crucially, both ways that Schweizer (2016, 2019) connected the commons with the mission of PSM (knowledge commons and infrastructure) also find purchase with other public organisations struggling to reinvent themselves in a digital age. With this in mind, and drawing on Cammaerts and Mansell's (2020) push for "alternative visions" in digital media, we suggest that rather than negotiate a place for PSM within the market and vie for support from commercial competitors, PSM organisations should build coalitions with other public institutions like museums, academia, or cultural organisations to support the digital commons. This form of commons coalition-building was recently argued by Jolly and Goodman (2021), who consider PSM as part of a network of digital "anchor institutions" to support a new age of public media called the "public media stack:"

> Through technological characteristics such as open-data protocols and accountable-governance principles, the public media stack should be designed to devolve decision-making powers to end-users, while amplifying local information, opportunities for cultural exchange, and constructive engagement in the democratic process. By decentralizing control over the flow of information through the network, the public media stack should empower users, rather than platform authorities, with the tools to "boost the signal of good information" and "dampen the noise created by bad actors and disinformation." While public media commentary has long focused on content decision, technical and governance design choices that encourage informed civic discourse are just as important to combat information disorder. (Jolly & Goodman, 2021: 4)

With a contribution to society concept inspired by the public interest rather than market ideology, PSM organisations have a chance to rethink their role and challenge the neoliberal predominance in media policy-making that

narrows PSM's potential. Greater openness with respect to participation, transparency, and licensing of their self-produced content would make PSM distinct from commercial media and offer a foundation for its legitimacy in the digital space (Dobusch, 2018). In other words, "the commons concept can be a powerful narrative for legitimating PSM by representing the enterprise as a societal alternative to corporate commercial media" (Schweizer, 2016: 178).

Conclusion: The shape of things to come (in this volume, anyway)

To conclude this introductory chapter, we wish to emphasise that for PSM to re-legitimise itself in the twenty-first century, it will require more than a communication strategy. While it is important to engage in communication in the process of media policy-making, there is the very real danger that the contribution to society initiative is only trying to solve a communication problem without inducing real change within PSM organisations. Successfully communicating the need for PSM in society may satisfy the self-preservation instincts of PSM organisations, but it does not sufficiently acknowledge the needs of democratic societies undergoing a fundamental transformation of the public sphere. The contribution to society concept will only be successful in strengthening the legitimacy of PSM organisations if it is reinvigorated with an alternative vision of PSM as commons or a public open space.

At the same time, there is value for scholars in engaging with concepts like public value or contribution to society. Indeed, research can add to a better understanding not only of the ways in which PSM organisations try to legitimise themselves and make use of such concepts to influence media policy-making, but also of how such concepts restrict PSM organisations' scope of action and the visions about their future development. Consequently, such research can make important contributions to both academia and PSM practice. This, however, requires keeping a sympathetic but critical distance from PSM organisations. In this book, we hope to achieve this lofty goal and to continue the legacy of previous RIPE volumes of embracing, analysing, and scrutinising contemporary challenges to PSM.

The chapters found in Part I of this volume, "Theorising and testing contribution", continue the introduction's conceptual intervention by assessing and proposing various conceptual markers of PSM, notably legitimacy and universality. In Chapter 2, Fiona Fehlmann begins by introducing and challenging the different ways that legitimacy is conceptualised vis-à-vis PSM. Through an illustrative example of the earlier debates over the public value of PSM, she argues that we should reconceptualise legitimacy in terms of *perception* (rather than process). Such an approach may help us to better understand PSM's contribution to society. Cathrin Bengesser continues the conceptual discussion of PSM's legitimacy in Chapter 3 by employing Jürgen

Habermas's concept of lifeworld. She goes further, however, by adding an empirical element with a case study of the BBC's potential adoption of subscription services. In Chapter 4, Uwe Hasebrink echoes the mixed conceptual and empirical approach of Bengesser, this time focusing on PSM's contribution to social integration through a survey of German adults.

The chapters in Part II of this volume, "Beyond broadcasting", discuss the development of PSM with (algorithmically personalised) streaming services and on-demand offers, mobile distribution, and social bots on (third-party) platforms. In Chapter 5, Julie Münter Lassen and Jannick Sørensen examine the rise of PSM's video-on-demand (VoD) services in Denmark and the connected shift from volume to value. Tim Raats continues the discussion of VoD in Chapter 6 with his analysis of Streamz, the so-called Flemish Netflix. Yu-Peng Lin and Hui-Ju Tsai do crucial work in Chapter 7, moving the debate over PSM's streaming offers outside of Western countries and focusing on the launch of PTS+ in Taiwan. In Chapter 8, Aura Lindeberg and Marko Ala-Fossi shift the conversation again from video to the understudied audio-streaming services of PSM in their assessment of the transformation of Nordic public radio services from analogue to digital. Moving beyond the topic of on-demand services in Chapter 9, Imir Rashid and Seamus Simpson discuss recent efforts by PSM organisations to deliver content via smartphones. Lastly, in Chapter 10, Stefano Pedrazzi and Franziska Oehmer-Pedrazzi address the potential role played by automated social network accounts of PSM organisations, or "public service bots". For this chapter, they received the EBU Best Paper Award for Established Scholars at the RIPE@2021 conference.

While Part II focuses on the renewal of PSM's offers to ensure its ongoing contribution to society, the chapters that make up Part III examine "Organisational change and innovation." In Chapter 11, Marta Rodríguez-Castro and Francisco Campos-Freire analyse the role of public consultations in the development of public value tests for PSM, while in Chapter 12, Matthias Künzler, Fiona Fehlmann, and Ulla Autenrieth present empirical insights into innovation within the Swiss PSM organisation SRG SSR. Henning Eichler engages with contribution to society as a normative function in Chapter 13, examining how Germany's ARD manages the shift to digital. Lastly, Dominik Speck continues the inquiry into German PSM in Chapter 14 by examining the practice and regulation of transparency therein. This chapter was chosen for the EBU Best Paper Award for Emerging Scholars at the RIPE@2021 conference.

This volume concludes with an afterword by Hilde Van den Bulck, who synthesises and reflects upon the theoretical arguments and empirical data brought to light in the preceding chapters.

The theme of contribution to society opens up avenues of research, study, and contemplation, as exemplified by the chapters in this book. As a heuristic device, it also offers an opportunity for PSM scholars to reflect on their

normative assumptions and commitments, hopefully bringing them to the fore, rather than presumed. In other words, PSM's contribution to society should not be normatively taken for granted, but rather critically interrogated through theorisation and empirical research. A critical engagement with PSM and the concepts used to legitimise it, as is the aspiration of this volume, will hopefully help to advance research, contribute to PSM practice and media policy-making, and invite more scholars to contemplate the place of PSM in a digital world. For PSM organisations themselves, rethinking their contribution to society by exploring ways to collaborate with public and civil society organisations and integrating citizen participation may be the last best hope for media landscapes and public spheres besieged by commodification and commercialisation.

References

Alasuutari, P. (2015). The discursive side of new institutionalism. *Cultural Sociology*, *9*(2), 162–184. https://doi.org/10.1177/1749975514561805

Ali, C. (2016). The merits of merit goods: Local journalism and public policy in a time of austerity. *Journal of Information Policy*, *6*, 105–128. https://doi.org/10.5325/jinfopoli.6.2016.0105

Ali, C., & Puppis, M. (2018). When the watchdog neither barks nor bites: Communication as a power resource in media policy and regulation. *Communication Theory*, *28*(3), 270–291. https://doi.org/10.1093/ct/qtx003

Barley, S. R., & Tolbert, P. S. (1997). Institutionalization and structuration: Studying the links between action and institution. *Organization Studies*, *18*(1), 93–117. https://doi.org/10.1177/017084069701800106

BBC. (2004). *Building public value: Renewing the BBC for a digital world*. http://downloads.bbc.co.uk/aboutthebbc/policies/pdf/bpv.pdf

Beck, K. (2001). Medienberichterstattung über Medienkonzentration [Media coverage of media concentration]. *Publizistik*, *46*(4), 403–424. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11616-001-0121-3

Black, J. (2001). Decentring regulation: Understanding the role of regulation and self-regulation in a "post-regulatory" world. In M. Freeman (Ed.), *Current legal problems 54*(1), 103–146. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/clp/54.1.103

Black, J. (2002). Regulatory conversations. *Journal of Law and Society*, *29*(1), 163–196. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6478.00215

Black, J. (2008). Constructing and contesting legitimacy and accountability in polycentric regulatory regimes. *Regulation & Governance*, *2*(2), 137–164. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-5991.2008.00034.x

Brevini, B. (2010). Towards PSB 2.0? Applying the PSB ethos to online media in Europe: A comparative study of PSBs' internet policies in Spain, Italy and Britain. *European Journal of Communication*, *25*(4), 348–365. https://doi.org/10.1177/0267323110381004

Brevini, B. (2013). *Public service broadcasting online: A comparative European policy study of PSB 2.0*. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137295101

Brown, W. (2015). *Undoing the demos*. Zone Books.

Cammaerts, B., & Mansell, R. (2020). Digital platform policy and regulation: Toward a Radical Democratic Turn. *International Journal of Communication*, *14*, 135–154.

Coglianese, C., & Howard, M. (1998). Getting the message out: Regulatory policy and the press. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, *3*(3), 39–55. https://doi.org/10.1177/1081180X98003003004

Collins, R. (2007). The BBC and "public value". *Medien & Kommunikationswissenschaft*, *55*(2), 164–184.

Deacon, D., & Monk, W. (2001). Quangos and the communications dependent society. *European Journal of Communication*, *16*(1), 25–49. https://doi.org/10.1177/0267323101016001002

Dobusch, L. (2018). Demokratisch-mediale Öffentlichkeiten im Zeitalter digitaler Plattformen [Democratic media public spheres in the age of digital platforms]. In K. Mitschka, & K. Unterberger (Eds.), *Public open space: Zur Zukunft öffentlich-rechtlicher Medien* [*On the future of public media*] (pp. 308–312). Facultas.

Donders, K., & Moe, H. (Eds.). (2011). *Exporting the public value test: The regulation of public broadcasters' new media services across Europe*. Nordicom, University of Gothenburg. http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:norden:org:diva-10044

Dörr, D., Holznagel, B., & Picot, A. (2016). *Legitimation und Auftrag des öffentlich-rechtlichen Fernsehens in Zeiten der Cloud* [*Legitimacy and the mission of public television in times of the cloud*]. https://www.zdf.de/assets/161007-gutachten-doerr-holznagel-picot-100~original

EBU (European Broadcasting Union). (2015a). *Public service media: Contribution to society*.

EBU (European Broadcasting Union). (2015b). *Knowledge exchange 2015* [Event report]. https://issuu.com/ebu-uer/docs/kx15-event-report

Edelman, L. B., & Suchman, M. C. (1997). The legal environments of organizations. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *23*, 479–515. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.23.1.479

Freedman, D. (2008). *The politics of media policy*. Polity Press.

Freedman, D. (2010). Media policy silences: The hidden face of communications decision making. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, *15*(3), 344–361. https://doi.org/10.1177/1940161210368292

Freedman, D. (2019). "Public service" and the journalism crisis: Is the BBC the answer? *Television & New Media*, *20*(3), 203–218. https://doi.org/10.1177/1527476418760985

Ganter, S. A., & Löblich, M. (2021). Discursive media institutionalism: Assessing Vivien A. Schmidt's framework and its value for media and communication studies. *International Journal of Communication*, *15*, 2281–2300.

Gilens, M., & Hertzman, C. (2000). Corporate ownership and news bias: Newspaper coverage of the 1996 Telecommunications Act. *The Journal of Politics*, *62*(2), 369–386. https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-3816.00017

Grassmuck, V. (2018). Für eine europäische Plattform in Public Partnership [For a European platform in public partnership]. In K. Mitschka, & K. Unterberger (Eds.), *Public open space: Zur Zukunft öffentlich-rechtlicher Medien* [*On the future of public media*] (pp. 313–320). Facultas.

Habermas, J. (2006). Political communication in media society: Does democracy still enjoy an epistemic dimension? *Communication Theory*, *16*(4), 411–426. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.2006.00280.x

Habermas, J. (2021). Überlegungen und Hypothesen zu einem erneuten Strukturwandel der politischen Öffentlichkeit [Reflections and hypotheses on a renewed structural change of the political public sphere]. In M. Seeliger, & S. Sevignani (Eds.), *Ein neuer Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit?*[*A new structural change in the public sphere?*] (pp. 470–500). Nomos.

Hackett, R. A., & Uzelman, S. (2003). Tracing corporate influences on press content. *Journalism Studies*, *4*(3), 331–346. https://doi.org/10.1080/14616700306486

Hardy, J. (2014). *Critical political economy of the media: An introduction*. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203136225

Harvey, D. (2010). *A brief history of neoliberalism*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780199283262.001.0001

Harvey, D. (2013). *Rebel cities: From the right to the city to the urban revolution*. Verso.

Hasebrink, U. (2007). "Public value": Leitbegriff oder Nebelkerze in der Diskussion um den öffentlich-rechtlichen Rundfunk? [Guiding concept or smokescreen in the discussion about public service broadcasting?]. *Rundfunk und Geschichte*, *33*(1-2), 38–42.

Hess, C. (2008, July 14–18). *Mapping the new commons* [Conference presentation]. 12th Biennial Conference of the International Association for the Study of the Commons, University of Gloucestershire, Cheltenham, England. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1356835

Jarren, O. (1998). Medienpolitische Kommunikation [Media-political communication]. In O. Jarren, U. Sarcinelli, & U. Saxer (Eds.), *Politische Kommunikation in der demokratischen Gesellschaft* (pp. 616–629). Westdeutscher Verlag.

Jarren, O., & Donges, P. (2005). Der öffentliche Rundfunk in der Gesellschaft: Begründung, Wandel und Konflikte um eine Leitidee am Beispiel Schweiz [Public broadcasting in society: Justification, change and conflicts around a guiding idea using the example of Switzerland]. In C.-M. Ridder, W. R. Langenbucher, U. Saxer, & C. Steininger (Eds.), *Bausteine einer Theorie des öffentlich-rechtlichen Rundfunks: Festschrift für Marie Luise Kiefer* [*Building blocks of a theory of public service broadcasting: Festschrift for Marie Luise Kiefer*] (pp. 177–195). VS Verlag.

Jolly, S., & Goodman, E. P. (2021). *A "full stack" approach to public media in the United States*. German Marshall Fund. https://www.gmfus.org/publications/full-stack-approach-public-media-united-states

Just, N., & Puppis, M. (2012). Communication policy research: Looking back, moving forward. In N. Just, & M. Puppis (Eds.), *Trends in communication policy research: New theories, methods and subjects* (pp. 9–29). Intellect.

Katzenbach, C. (2018). *Die Regeln digitaler Kommunikation: Governance zwischen Norm, Diskurs und Technik* [*The rules of digital communication: Governance between norm, discourse and technology*]. Springer VS.

Kemner, B., Scherer, H., & Weinacht, S. (2008). Unter der Tarnkappe: Der Einsatz "volatiler Themen" und "opportuner Zeugen" in der Berichterstattung zum Übernahmeversuch der

ProSiebenSat.1 Media AG durch den Springer-Verlag [Under the cloak of invisibility: The use of "volatile topics" and "opportune witnesses" in reporting on the takeover attempt of ProSiebenSat.1 Media AG by Springer-Verlag]. *Publizistik*, *53*(1), 65–84. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11616-008-0006-9

Kweon, S. (2000). A framing analysis: How did three U.S. news magazines frame about mergers or acquisitions. *Journal of Media Management*, *2*(3), 165–177. https://doi.org/10.1080/14241270009389935

Leurdijk, A. (2007). Public service media dilemmas and regulation in a converging media landscape. In G. F. Lowe, & J. Bardoel (Eds.), *From public service broadcasting to public service media: RIPE@2007* (pp. 71–86). Nordicom, University of Gothenburg. http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:norden:org:diva-10003

Lowe, G. F., & Bardoel, J. (Eds.). (2007). *From public service broadcasting to public service media: RIPE@2007*. Nordicom, University of Gothenburg. http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:norden:org:diva-10003

Lowe, G. F., & Jauert, P. (2005). Public service broadcasting for social and cultural citizenship: Renewing the enlightenment mission. In G. F. Lowe, & P. Jauert (Eds.), *Cultural dilemmas in public service broadcasting: RIPE@2005* (pp. 13–33). Göteborg: Nordicom.

Lowe, G. F., & Martin, F. (Eds.). (2014). *The Value of Public Service Media. RIPE@2013*. Nordicom, University of Gothenburg. http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:norden:org:diva-10004

Löblich, M. (2011). Frames in der medienpolitischen Öffentlichkeit [Frames in the media-political public sphere]. *Publizistik*, *56*(4), 423–439. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11616-011-0129-2

Löblich, M. (2017). Legitimität in der Medienpolitik: Eine strukturationstheoretische und neo-institutionalistische Perspektive [Legitimacy in media policy: A structuration theoretical and neo-institutionalist perspective]. *Publizistik*, *62*(4), 425–443. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11616-017-0379-8

Maier, D., & Dogruel, L. (2016). Akteursbeziehungen in der Zeitungsberichterstattung über die Online-Aktivitäten des öffentlich-rechtlichen Rundfunks [Actor relations in newspaper coverage of the online activities of public service broadcasting]. *Publizistik*, *61*(2), 145–166. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11616-016-0258-8

McChesney, R. (2008). *The political economy of media*. Monthly Review Press.

McQuail, D., & Deuze, M. (2020). *McQuail's media & mass communication theory* (7th ed.). Sage.

Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, *83*(2), 340–363. https://doi.org/10.1086/226550

Mitschka, K., & Unterberger, K. (2018). Vorwort: Medienqualität im Auftrag der Gesellschaft [Preface: Media quality on behalf of society]. In K. Mitschka, & K. Unterberger (Eds.), *Public open space: Zur Zukunft öffentlich-rechtlicher Medien* [*On the future of public media*] (pp. 3–7). Facultas.

Moe, H. (2007). Commercial services, enclosure and legitimacy: Comparing contexts and strategies for PSM funding and development. In G. F. Lowe, & J. Bardoel (Eds.), *From public service broadcasting to public service media: RIPE@2007* (pp. 51–69). Nordicom, University of Gothenburg. http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:norden:org:diva-10003

Müller, D., & Donsbach, W. (2006). Unabhängigkeit von wirtschaftlichen Interessen als Qualitätsindikator im Journalismus [Independence from economic interests as a quality indicator in journalism]. In S. Weischenberg, W. Loosen, & M. Beuthner (Eds.), *Medien-Qualitäten* (pp. 129–147). UVK.

Murdock, G. (2004). *Building the digital commons: Public broadcasting in the age of the Internet*. Spry Memorial Lecture, Vancouver. https://fondsgrahamspryfund.ca/en/spry-memorial-lecture-2004/

Oliver, C. (1991). Strategic responses to institutional processes. *The Academy of Management Review*, *16*(1), 145–179. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1991.4279002

O'Neill, M. (2008). Museums, professionalism and democracy. *Cultural Trends*, *17*(4), 289–307. https://doi.org/10.1080/09548960802615422

Page, B. L. (1996). The mass media as political actors. *PS: Political Science and Politics*, *29*(1), 20–24. https://doi.org/10.2307/420185

Pfetsch, B. (2003). Symbolische Geräusche über die Anderen [Symbolic noises about the others]. *Medien & Kommunikationswissenschaft*, *51*(2), 232–249. https://doi.org/10.5771/1615-634x-2003-2-232

Pickard, V. (2015). The return of the nervous liberals: Market fundamentalism, policy failure, and recurring journalism crises. *The Communication Review*, *18*(2), 82–97. https://doi.org/10.1080/10714421.2015.1031995

Pratte, A., & Whiting, G. (1986). What newspaper editorials have said about deregulation of broadcasting. *Journalism Quarterly*, *63*(3), 497–502. https://doi.org/10.1177/107769908606300307

Price, M. E. (2012). Narratives of legitimacy. *Trípodos*, (30), 9–28.

Puppis, M. (2010). Media governance: A new concept for the analysis of media policy and regulation. *Communication, Culture & Critique*, *3*(2), 134–149. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1753-9137.2010.01063.x

Puppis, M. (2023). Medienpolitik [Media policy]. UVK.

Puppis, M., Künzler, M., & Steinmaurer, T. (2013). Public service broadcasting in the digital age: Regulation and organizational strategies in Ireland, Austria and Switzerland. In M. Löblich, & S. Pfaff-Rüdiger (Eds.), *Communication and media policy in the era of digitization and the internet* (pp. 95–105). Nomos.

Puppis, M., Maggetti, M., Gilardi, F., Biela, J., & Papadopoulos, Y. (2014). The political communication of independent regulatory agencies. *Swiss Political Science Review*, *20*(3), 388–412. https://doi.org/10.1111/spsr.12118

Ramsey, P. (2013). The search for a civic commons online: An assessment of existing BBC online policy. *Media, Culture & Society*, *35*(7), 864–879. https://doi.org/10.1177/0163443713495079

Rodríguez-Castro, M., Campos-Freire, F., & Túñez-López, M. (2021). The values of public service media in the internet society. In M. Rodríguez-Castro, F. Campos-Freire, & M. Túñez-López (Eds.), *The values of public service media in the internet society* (pp. 3–20). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-56466-7

Schejter, A. M., & Obar, J. A. (2009). Tell it not in Harrisburg, publish it not in the streets of Tampa. *Journalism Studies*, *10*(5), 577–593. https://doi.org/10.1080/14616700902920240

Schmidt, V. A. (2008). Discursive institutionalism: The explanatory power of ideas and discourse. *Annual Review of Political Science*, *11*, 303–326. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.11.060606.135342

Schweizer, C. (2016). Public service media and the commons: Crossing conceptual and institutional boundaries. In G. F. Lowe, & N. Yamamoto (Eds.), *Crossing borders and boundaries in public service media: RIPE@2015* (pp. 171–183). Nordicom, University of Gothenburg. http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:norden:org:diva-4419

Schweizer, C. (2019). *Öffentliche Rundfunkorganisationen als Media Commons? Vorschlag eines neuen Leitbegriffs und vergleichende Analyse in 16 Ländern* [*Public broadcasting organisations as media commons? Proposal of a new guiding concept and comparative analysis in 16 countries*]. Nomos.

Scott, W. R. (2001). *Institutions and organizations* (2nd ed.). Sage.

Scott, W. R. (2003). *Organizations: Rational, natural, and open systems* (5th ed.). Prentice Hall.

Siegert, G., & Hangartner, S. A. (2017). Media branding: A strategy to align values to media management? In K. D. Altmeppen, C. Hollifield, & J. van Loon (Eds.), *Value-oriented media management: Media business and innovation* (pp. 211–221). Springer.

Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional approaches. *The Academy of Management Review*, *20*(3), 571–610. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1995.9508080331

Sundet, V. S., & Syvertsen, T. (2021). From problem to solution? Why it is difficult to restrict the remit of public broadcasters. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, *27*(4), 499–512. https://doi.org/10.1080/10286632.2020.1807522

Søndergaard, H. (1999). Some reflections on public service broadcasting. *Nordicom Review*, *20*(1), 21–28. http://urn.kb.se/resolve?urn=urn:nbn:se:norden:org:diva-9708

Udris, L., Eisenegger, M., Vogler, D., Häuptli, A., & Schwaiger, L. (2021). Reporting when the current media system is at stake: Explaining news coverage about the initiative on the abolition of public service broadcasting in Switzerland. In E. C. Tandoc, J. Jenkins, R. J. Thomas,

& O. Westlund (Eds.), *Critical incidents in journalism: Pivotal moments reshaping journalism around the world* (pp. 71–84). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003019688
Van den Bulck, H., & Donders, K. (2014). Of discourses, stakeholders and advocacy coalitions in media policy: Tracing negotiations towards the new management contract of Flemish public broadcaster VRT. *European Journal of Communication*, *29*(1), 83–99. https://doi.org/10.1177/0267323113509362
Van den Bulck, H., Puppis, M., Donders, K., & Van Audenhove, L. (Eds.). (2019). *The Palgrave handbook of methods for media policy research*. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-16065-4.
van Dijk, T. (1993). Principles of critical discourse analysis. *Discourse & Society*, *4*(2), 249–283. https://doi.org/10.1177/0957926593004002006
Vedung, E. (1998). Policy instruments: Typologies and theories. In M.-L. Bemelmans-Videc, R. C. Rist, & E. Vedung (Eds.), *Carrots, sticks & sermons: policy instruments & their evaluation* (pp. 21–58). Transaction.
Weiß, H.-J. (1988). Meinungsgestaltung im Interesse der Zeitungen? Eine Analyse der Zeitungspublizistik zur Erhöhung der Rundfunkgebühr (Oktober 1987 bis Januar 1988) [Shaping opinion in the interest of newspapers? An analysis of newspaper publicity on the increase in the broadcasting fee (October 1987 to January 1988)]. *Media Perspektiven*, (8), 469–489.
Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2009). Critical discourse analysis: History, agenda, theory and methodology. In R. Wodak, & M. Meyer (Eds.) *Methods for critical discourse analysis* (pp. 1–33). Sage.
Yeung, K. (2005). Government by publicity management: Sunlight or spin? *Public Law*, *2*, 360–383.
Yeung, K. (2009). Presentational management and the pursuit of regulatory legitimacy. *Public Administration*, *87*(2), 274–294. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9299.2008.01747.x