Miguel Túñez-López
Valentín-Alejandro Martínez-Fernández
Xosé López-García · Xosé Rúas-Araújo
Francisco Campos-Freire   *Editors*

Communication: Innovation & Quality

Springer

Studies in Systems, Decision and Control

Volume 154

The series "Studies in Systems, Decision and Control" (SSDC) covers both new developments and advances, as well as the state of the art, in the various areas of broadly perceived systems, decision making and control—quickly, up to date and with a high quality. The intent is to cover the theory, applications, and perspectives on the state of the art and future developments relevant to systems, decision making, control, complex processes and related areas, as embedded in the fields of engineering, computer science, physics, economics, social and life sciences, as well as the paradigms and methodologies behind them. The series contains monographs, textbooks, lecture notes and edited volumes in systems, decision making and control spanning the areas of Cyber-Physical Systems, Autonomous Systems, Sensor Networks, Control Systems, Energy Systems, Automotive Systems, Biological Systems, Vehicular Networking and Connected Vehicles, Aerospace Systems, Automation, Manufacturing, Smart Grids, Nonlinear Systems, Power Systems, Robotics, Social Systems, Economic Systems and other. Of particular value to both the contributors and the readership are the short publication timeframe and the world-wide distribution and exposure which enable both a wide and rapid dissemination of research output.

** Indexing: The books of this series are submitted to ISI, SCOPUS, DBLP, Ulrichs, MathSciNet, Current Mathematical Publications, Mathematical Reviews, Zentralblatt Math: MetaPress and Springerlink.

More information about this series at http://www.springer.com/series/13304

Miguel Túñez-López
Valentín-Alejandro Martínez-Fernández
Xosé López-García · Xosé Rúas-Araújo
Francisco Campos-Freire
Editors

Communication: Innovation & Quality

Springer

Editors
Miguel Túñez-López
Faculty of Communication Sciences
Universidade de Santiago de Compostela
Santiago de Compostela
Spain

Valentín-Alejandro Martínez-Fernández
Faculty of Economics
University of A Coruña
A Coruña
Spain

Xosé López-García
Faculty of Communication Sciences
Universidade de Santiago de Compostela
Santiago de Compostela
Spain

Xosé Rúas-Araújo
Faculty of Social Sciences
   and Communication
Universidad de Vigo
Pontevedra
Spain

Francisco Campos-Freire
Faculty of Communication Sciences
Universidade de Santiago de Compostela
Santiago de Compostela
Spain

Printed on acid-free paper

Editorial Project Developed By:

Contents

About the Editors

Miguel Túñez-López, Ph.D. did his Journalism from the Universitat Autónoma de Barcelona, Spain. He is the Professor of undergraduate and postgraduate courses of the Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, Spain. He is expert in communication management in organisations and news making. He coordinates the Ph.D. programme in Information and Contemporary Information from the Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, Santiago de Compostela, Spain.

Valentín-Alejandro Martínez-Fernández is Tenured Professor at the Faculty of Economics of the Universidade de A Coruña. He has been Head of the Galician newspaper of *El Ideal Gallego*, and executive in many news companies. He has a degree in Information Science from the Universidad Complutense de Madrid. He also has an MBA in Business Administration from the Universidade de A Coruña and Ph.D. in Information Science from the Universidad Complutense de Madrid, A Coruña, Spain.

Xosé López-García is Professor of Journalism at the Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, Spain and has Ph.D. in history and journalism. He coordinates the research group Novos Medios. Among his research lines, there is the study of digital and printed media, analysis of impact of technology in mediated communication, analysis of the performance of cultural industries, and the combined strategy of printed and online products in the society of knowledge. Santiago de Compostela, Spain.

Xosé Rúas-Araújo is Tenured Lecturer of Techniques of Electoral and Institutional Communication at the Faculty of Social Sciences from the Universidade de Vigo. He is the principal investigator of the neuro-communication area of the research group CP2: Persuasive Communication from the Universidade de Vigo, Pontevedra, Spain.

Francisco Campos-Freire is Professor of Journalism at the Faculty of Communication Sciences of the Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, Spain, has an MBA. degree in Industrial and Service Business Management and a Ph.D. in Communication and Contemporary History, also at the Universidade de Santiago de Compostela. His research lines focus on the study of Cultural and Communication Industries, management of informative and audiovisual business and communication policies. Santiago de Compostela, Spain.

Innovation for Quality

The media ecosystem is currently suffering disruptive changes marked by how users use and consume contents. Digital media are entering their second decade of life involved in changing dynamics related to new technologies, as well as innovation processes in content production, distribution and commercialisation.

Public service broadcasters are not stranger to these changes. In fact, in the last few years of the second decade of the twenty-first century, studies, debates and news on public service revolve around five main pillars or challenges, which could be summed up as adapting this audiovisual service to the present social, economic, technological, consumption, access and competitiveness reality of mass media.

The European model of public broadcasting, which was born in the twentieth century and will turn a hundred in 2022 (BBC, London), has significantly changed and will have to even more to adapt to the present scenario and the new media ecology, dominated by a hyper-fragmentation of production and a mega-concentration of distribution platforms for audiovisual contents.

This book, *Communication: Innovation & Quality*, collects advances in different research areas: uses and information preferences in journalism, on one side, and public audiovisual policies in the European Union, related to governance, funding, accountability, innovation, quality and public service, on the other side. The impetus to research and disseminating initiatives in both areas thus converge, promoted within the debate activities of two projects. The first one is 'News uses and preferences in the new media map in Spain: media mobiles for mobile devices'. The second one is entitled, 'Indicators related to broadcasters' governance, funding, accountability, innovation, quality and public service applicable to Spain in the digital context'.

The study on news uses in the new media map is drawn from the observation of the performance of traditional (legacy) and emergent media outlets (native), especially the development of their web strategies and the study on the evolution of digital media in the framework of convergence (CSO 2009-13713-C05) and on the innovation processes launched to adapt content and business models to the context of crisis faced by media companies (CSO 2012-38467-C03). In order to advance in the study of digital media, the focus then moves to the analysis from the media and

their offer (digital media) to users and their demands (customer media), so the research is opened to other platforms apart from the web.

The main objective of the project 'News uses and preferences in the new media map in Spain: media mobiles for mobile devices' consists in identifying and analysing contents produced by the media and distinguished because of users' acceptance in terms of diffusion, comments and evaluations, as well as the study of platforms.

Goals are clear: (a) Identifying the models behind contents and news narratives for different multi-screen devices that characterise the network society within a period dominated by access and mobility; (b) preparing a typology of innovative contents and narratives that achieve greater acceptance in the different digital platforms; and (c) analysing similarities and differences of contents and narratives typologies used for different devices and platforms.

The end result should be to prepare a report containing contents, narratives and tools adding value through the integration of languages, new narratives and the use of crossmedia and/or transmedia journalism. This report should also address the issue of the development of pieces with data journalism techniques, information displaying, as well as topics and resources, prescribers, sources and new trends that might arise in this unstoppable evolution characterising cyberjournalism in last years.

The project for assessing public broadcasting in Europe confirms that the access to distribution of audiovisual services is very competitive and diverse, penetrated by foreign brands and concentrated in 44 parent companies, 26 of which belong to the European Union, 15 to the EE.UU. and three to other countries. Only one in every 10 foreign channels broadcasted in the EU is a public service channel.

The challenges for European public service media may be presented as questions to future. Is the survival of public audiovisual services, within the context of a new digital media ecology, in risk? Is funding of public service media sustainable? Is there a need to reform the governance system to adapt it to the social requirements and to improve its function, representation, transparency, accountability and reputation? What innovation process should be faced by public service media in the next decade? And, do the value of public service media need integrated indicators to assess it?

This book, edited by professors Miguel Túñez-López (Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, Spain), Valentín-Alejandro Martínez-Fernández (Universidade da Coruña, Spain), Xosé López-García (Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, Spain), Xosé Rúas-Araújo (Universidade de Vigo, Spain) and Francisco Campos-Freire (Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, Spain), brings together experts from Europe and America working on four main areas developed in the two above-referenced research lines: broadcasting and the audiovisual sector, journalism and cyberjournalism, corporate and institutional communication, and education. Overall, works selected through an expert review process are an in-depth look from the academic rigour that, undoubtedly, contribute to provide a reliable media scene and its lines of future development.

Part I
Television and Audiovisual Sector

The Trend of Assessment Indicators for Public Service Media in Europe

Francisco Campos-Freire, Rosario de Mateo-Pérez and Marta Rodríguez-Castro

Abstract The creation of indicators to assess the provision of public audiovisual services is a strategy that has increased over the last years, both in Europe and other parts of the world, with the aim of reinforcing credibility and supporting the sustainability of their funding through the improvement of their governance, transparency, participation, innovation and accountability. The chapter, which starts from the evolution from public broadcasting to public media service, addresses the issue of public value tests and indicators as one of the current trends in the research and management agenda of these media of social communication. It is concluded that composed indicators, as quantitative and qualitative statistical tools, are demanded because of their utility for good practices in governance and new ways of accountability with the aim of reinforcing legitimacy and assessing both the effectiveness and efficiency of public service media, against the competition of many other media within the context of the new ecology of social communication.

Keywords Governance · Accountability · Corporate social responsibility
Value indicators *per* public media service

1 Introduction: Validity of PSM

The present ecosystem of social media puts into question and, at the same time, raises the need for revitalization of the validity of public service media. They emerged in Europe almost a century ago at the English studies 2LO of Marconi—Strand.

F. Campos-Freire (✉) · M. Rodríguez-Castro
Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, Santiago de Compostela, Spain
e-mail: francisco.campos@usc.es

M. Rodríguez-Castro
e-mail: m.rodriguez.castro@usc.es

R. de Mateo-Pérez
Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain
e-mail: rosario.demateo@uab.cat

The British Broadcasting Company (BBC) was finally established, on October 18, 1922, and its Director General, the Scottish engineer John Charles Walsham Reith was appointed some months after. Few years later, the Nippon Hoso Kyokai (NHK, 1926), the Australian Broadcasting Corporation (ABC, 1929) and the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC, 1936) were created, becoming global benchmarks in public broadcasting. Throughout those years, broadcasting systems and social communication experimented great changes, especially since the arrival of the Internet and the introduction of digital technologies in the 21st century.

The road ahead for the BBC is clear, at least in the medium term, since it was approved in 2016 the Royal Charter, in force from January 1, 2017 to 2027, which establishes its strategy, governance and funding for that period. But this is not the case of other public service broadcasters, whose strategic and funding projections are much more uncertain. In any case, the discussion on the validity of public service media and their adaptation to the digital area remains on the table since the beginning of the present century. It is a matter of finding the new ethos of public service media and assess their social capital (Horowitz and Car 2015).

Theoretical contributions are abundant. Many books and articles in scientific journals published in the last years deal with the transition and adaptation of Public Service Broadcasting—PSB and its evolution towards Public Service Media—PSM. However, the uncertainty regarding whether there is a path and how and what is the future path for public service media has not been completely cleared (Gulyás and Hammer 2013), although there is a broad coincidence that its social function remains necessary in today's digital society (Consejo de Europa 2009; Iosifidis 2010; Jakubowicz 2010; Weeds 2013; Fuchs 2014; Bustamante 2015; Horowitz 2015; Tambini 2015; Tremblay 2016; Donders 2017).

There are major challenges that public service media organizations should face in their process of adaptation to the provision of audiovisual services imposed by the digital ecosystem. These challenges could be summarized as follows (Campos-Freire and Valencia-Bermúdez 2016):

1. Review of regulation, remit, mission, vision and strategy, at least, for the next ten years.
2. Readjustment of their governance models to the requirements of today's society.
3. Review, stabilization and sustainability of their funding models.
4. Ensuring and guaranteeing an institutional framework of independence for public service media, free from governmental, partisan, union and other lobbying pressures.
5. Clarifying, in the long term, the unknown about the availability of use of the necessary digital spectrum, both in terrestrial networks and different platforms, in order to meet the fundamental principle of universality of access.
6. Modernization of business management strategies and systems.
7. Developing systems of regulation, control, self-regulation and co-regulation committed to social responsibility, transparency, accountability and citizen participation as real owners or shareholders of the social capital, represented by these institutions.

8. Adaptation of contents and programming to the demands of the various forms of consumption and access (online and streaming) and different screens, combining the essential principles of public service media: universality, excellence, independence, diversity, innovation and accountability.
9. Promoting talent, innovation and quality as the engine of strategic change and opening up creativity to audience participation.
10. Finding ways and indicators to assess the social contribution of public service media to better communicate their public value.

These challenges to the existence and current validity of public service media respond to the weaknesses and shortcomings appreciated after the review of research published in last years and the analysis of corporate reports by these organizations (Campos-Freire 2017). The theoretical diagnosis is quite coincident about the need and urgency to address regulatory, governance and funding reforms, but practical and specific applications in corporations are much slower and diffuse.

Tambini (2015), following a comparative research of the *Mapping Digital Media* regarding public service media from 56 countries, notes the evidence that: (a) the audience for public service media is in decline; (b) their funding is also in decline; (c) their remit is contested, and their standards are under threat; (d) digitization undermines the traditional regulatory framework for PSM; (e) the intervention of governments and political parties enlarges their deterioration, generating a demand of independent public service media. Marzal and Zallo (2016) also add the mutations provoked in the traditional public audiovisual service by socio-technological mutations: digital convergence, audience fragmentation, diversity of access, creation of virtual communities and emergence of cheaper and more effective new online media.

Burri explores, in various works (2015a, b), the ability of traditional public broadcasters to adapt their remit and principles to the new multi-platform communication ecosystem, to new ways of production and distribution, and access to contents, as well as to changes in consumption patterns, prioritizing some type of editorial intelligence that links users to programming, in order to effectively meet the objectives diversity of public interest. Van Dijck and Poell (2015), and Martin (2016) consider mobility, connection and audience participation useful tools through digital social networks, even though Carpentier (2011) and Hasebrink (2011) doubt that public corporations want to use them properly for participation, because of the loss of ideological control that these might entail.

Other authors also raise the need for adaptation of public broadcasters to technological convergence (Humphreys 2010; Larrondo et al. 2016); the deinstitutionalization and adaptation to globalization (Horowitz 2015); the search for new forms of legitimacy (Pava and Krausz 1997; Powell 2016); the transformation, safeguarding the key values of public services (Trappel 2016); the preservation of the digital terrestrial spectrum and presence in multichannel platforms to maintain universality (AETHA 2014; Lamy 2016; Ala-Fossi and Lax 2016; Campos-Freire 2016); the search for new and better ways of communicating public value (Bruun 2016); and the assurance of funding sustainability (Campos-Freire 2012; Picard and Siciliani 2013; Burnley 2015; Bonini and Pais 2016; Richeri 2016).

Recognising the need and current validity of public service media organizations, because they address issues that other do not sufficiently deal with, and also generate relevant externalities for society not provided by intervention-free markets (Weeds 2013), state and regional corporations that manage PSM are facing, according to Donders (2017), five complex paradoxes.

The first of those paradoxes is the relationship between PSM and politics and politicians (should they be independent or spokespeople of government policy? To legitimate, control, or hold political power accountable?). The second one is related to competitors ("pax media" or polarization? Collaboration with private competitors or competence at risk of attacks by market distortions?). The third paradox has to do with institutions, looking for empathy through shared values and focusing internally. The fourth is about the dilemma of audience marketing and the balancing between quantitative and qualitative data. And the last one is on the risk of internal hypocrisy without doing anything in favour to put them into practice.

2   Public Good and Social Value

The consideration of public broadcasting as a pure public good, original matrix conception with which this service was born and developed during much of the 20th century, is currently under consideration (Horowitz and Car 2015; Picard and Siciliani 2013; Weeds 2013) and it is necessary to refocus it within the digital society by appealing to its value and social capital (Bordieu 1986, 1993; Coleman 1990; Putnam 1993; Lin 2001; Campos-Freire 2016). In the economic theory, we would say that the condition of Samuelson (1954) and the essence of the democratic civic right of access to independent information creates room for grounding (Stiglitz and Rosengard 2016) and re-establishing the public audiovisual services as a public good of social interest, necessary to cover the externalities that the market does not sufficiently address.

Public service media need a change in the approach to value creation, reorienting it towards its contribution to social capital. This form of capital is the expression of collaboration among the different groups of a community, whose sources of sociability are knowledge, recognition, mutual trust, effective rules and social networks. Public audiovisual services should demonstrate that, despite not being strictly efficient in terms of commercial profitability according to the logics of the market, it can be for cohesion and democratic, social, cultural and economic development of a country or community, establishing guarantees for their independence, accessibility, freedom of expression, contrast and range of views; the promotion of society, in general, and the promotion of the creative industry in the areas in which it operates, while contributing to the preservation of pluralism and diversity.

The founding principles of the PSM remit (universality, cohesion, independence, diversity, innovation, quality, transparency, participation and accountability) should be adapted and combined according to the social demands and the new ecology of the media not only provided by communication technologies but also by funding

and competition conditions, which allow convergent regulations and markets. The responsibility and weight of that reshape rests on their governance and funding and, eventually, on the legitimacy of their public value.

Public service media legitimacy has to be based on their fundamental contribution to the social capital and on the recognition of their public value by society (Arriaza et al. 2015), preserving the equity of its primary social good (Rawles 1986). It is the challenge ahead for governance of public service media organizations: to respond to increasingly diverse and complex social demands while integrating cooperation and interaction of citizens (Mayntz 2000; Schmitter 2001). Legitimacy and governance are closely interconnected, as the present conception of the first one goes far beyond the legal existence and regulation of the second one. According to the modern theory, the legitimacy of governance and public value should be based on their social recognition to support the existence and funding of public service media.

That social recognition requires an open governance and an accountability where public service values may be perceived. This leads to the value axiology and theory, a field in which professors Picard (2012) and Lowe (2016) have worked, and to which many researchers have been incorporated, aiming at identifying models and indicators to assess the qualities and characteristics of communication services and institutions (Campos-Freire 2016).

3 Governance and Accountability

Governance is defined as a multilevel organizational system of distribution of powers and coordination of players, social groups and institutions for a better, more participative, democratic and transparent corporate management, in fragmented, complex, systemic and uncertain environments (Moore 1995; Mayntz 2000; Prats 2003; Le Gales 2007; Rhodes 2007; Olsen 2008; Klepper 2014) and is suitable for representing internal and external control of public service media (Coppens and Saeys 2006) through mechanisms for participation, relation and interaction with citizens (Puppis 2010; Puppis et al. 2014; Fengler et al. 2014).

The legislation of public broadcasting services regulates bureaucratic and uniformly their governance, without great changes over time nor differences between countries, even though their particularities and funding models are diverse. The structure of their governance is organized around internal bodies (boards of management, supervision and control, executive management, advisory councils and entities in connection with audiences and in dialogue with professionals), and externals (through sectorial and convergent regulatory bodies and commissions on parliamentary control and on funding and economic issues).

The profile and representation of governance is of a political-partisan and parliamentary nature—more or less measured depending on the country, but which is still contaminated by the *lottizzazione*, the "Italian anomaly" of political power-sharing that Betino Craxi and Berlusconi made evident in the 80's of the last century (Chimenti 2007; Padovani 2010; Zaccaria 2016). That way, the institutional

representation of such governance becomes the channel of transmission between political and media powers, breaking independence of origin and action required by audiovisual media services to ensure their independence.

The European system of governance for public service media may be classified (Campos-Freire 2017) in three categories according to the characteristics of their functional assignment to the departments of the respective governments, election system of governing bodies, funding, control and accountability; in such a way that the affiliation may be really and organically independent of the current government, dependent of the corresponding Culture Department and the less independent model, linked to the Presidency and the Spokesperson of the government.

In the most independent model, audiovisual bodies of governments, steering and administration are chosen by an independent body outside the executive or parliamentary power (Audiovisual Media Councils). Others make this election through the Parliament, by an absolute or enhanced majority (2/3 or 3/5 majority); and by direct appointment of the President of the Government. The funding models are: (a) independent from government, multiannual and linked to a long charter (Royal Charter of the BBC, 2017–2027); (b) independent and adopted by the Parliament for not less than five years (Germany, for the ARD and ZDF); and (c) annual charters agreed by governments through subsidies (Spain, RTVE and regional broadcasters).

According to the same gradual map of three models, the control is exercised by: independent bodies, Parliament and government departments. And also accountability: (a) to a specialised independent body and society, with public participation and assessment indicators; (b) to a commission on parliamentary control; and (c) directly to the government. If control and accountability lack the necessary independence to counterbalance governmental and political-partisan interference, professional conflicts because of the manipulation of public service media deteriorate the reputation of these services, as reflected in the analysis of several European countries—including Spain—Monitoring Media Pluralism (Brogi et al. 2017).

What is evident in the analysis of public service media governance is the lack of open systems of participation, transparency and control opened to society beyond political and bureaucratic systems. Some corporations publish strategic declarations and documents of intentions, but the transition from theory to practice is still medium low. In order to regain or reinforce their reputation, many broadcasters have developed from 2007 public value tests and self-regulatory systems, as accountability on Corporate Social Responsibility, which are required by competitions rules imposed from Brussels. However, the weakest development link is in the integration of participation and interaction with society, despite the possibilities offered by tools of new social technologies.

Contrary to the bureaucratic and traditional conception that still prevails in the governance of public service media, new theoretical and practical approaches directly link this term both to policies and to satisfaction of social needs (Brower 2015), adapting behaviours to the characteristic of the media ecosystem (Peters 2016), enhancing innovation (Torfil and Ansell 2017) and placing public interest (Ginosar and Krispil 2016) and user participation in the centre of attention (Hutchinson 2015; Azurmendi 2015). Professors Muñoz Saldaña and Azurmendi (2016) call for inclusion of

participation, openness, coverage, transparency, inclusiveness, citizen participation and active citizenship in the goals of public service media governance.

Contemporary research on this concept clarifies some aspects or characteristics that confuses governance with governability, decision-making, executive behaviour and strategy, which correspond more to the area of management (McGrath and Whitty 2015). Similarly, other authors (Barnett 2016) characterize the participatory dimension of governance by the dysfunction of the operability and effectiveness that may cause on the management of organizations. But governance requires not only participation, dialogue, consensus and interaction with stakeholders, but also accountability and corporate responsibility.

If governance is the multi-level system of distribution of powers and coordination of players that interact with an organization, accountability is the set of mechanisms that allow explaining and justifying objectives and achieved results to stakeholders with the aim of improving their performance (Schedler 2008). Public service media accountability is institutionally delimited in its own regulation although it is a horizontal accountability. Vertical accountability, on the other hand, is dome from citizenry and its sanctions are moral and reputable through public opinion (O' Donnell 2004; Rios Ramírez et al. 2014; Jacobs and Schillemans 2016).

The State organization itself endows with inter-institutional mechanisms, through the separation of powers (executive, parliamentary and judiciary) for self-control and horizontal accountability. The institutionalized control through the higher state bodies of division of powers (Parliament and Court of Justice) is known as accountability of balance and carries administrative and criminal penalties to the detected dysfunctions of deviations. But there is also other accountability assigned through certain institutions (Audit Commissions, Ombudsmen), whose opinions and sanctions are elevated to previous higher bodies. In this second category of horizontal accountability, assigned or delegated, organizations seek to preserve their independence through statutory institutions not dependent on either the government or the monitored body.

Public broadcasters carry out horizontal accountability through their own Board of Directors to government departments to which they are attached, the corresponding Control Committees of the Parliament, independent audiovisual and communication regulators and Audit Councils. Some of them in Europe (BBC, ORF, YLE, ZDF, VRT, SVT) develop vertical accountability systems, trying to find a more direct interaction with stakeholders and society to better communicate the public value of their social contribution (EBU 2015; ORF 2017). This last approach of communication on accountability of the social contribution of public value could be considered as social accountability, a third gradual type, apart from horizontal and vertical accountability.

Accountability focused on groups or stakeholders and openness to audience participation—increased through the possibilities of interaction offered by networks and new communication tools (Gacía González and Alende Castro 2015) are growing theoretical trends (Wurff and Schönbach 2014) and approaches to good practice increasingly recognised by corporations—with more or less tradition according to the countries' media models (Almirón et al. 2016)—as a tool to support and justify their funding systems (Benson et al. 2017). Two accountability systems developed by

some broadcasters, both vertical and horizontal, are Corporate Social Responsibility reports and Public Value Tests.

4 CSR and Public Value Tests

Corporate Social Responsibility (RSC) is a self-regulatory system linked to horizontal accountability, transparency, communication of social values (Vázquez 2014), strengthening of credibility and recovery of trust by different stakeholders that are related to and organizations, with optimistic, hopeful, cynical and pessimistic expectations and perceptions (Olkkonen 2017).

Despite the fact that CSR is born in the private sector, public service media have seen in it a strategy capable of satisfying society's demand for information and of communicating the social value of the public service. It is, therefore, a voluntary commitment of corporations with three basic components: credibility, utility and counteracting negative impacts by expressing ethical attitudes (Lee et al. 2016).

The implementation panorama of Corporate Social Responsibility in European public service media is mainly composed by public corporations that regularly report on CSR, with the aim of analysing the result and performance of their transversal strategies in this matter (Fernández-Lombao and Campos-Freire 2013). These public corporations are the German ZDF, the Finnish YLE, the Irish RTÉ, the Italian RAI, the Portuguese RTP, the British BBC and the Spanish RTVE. Five other corporations (ORF, RTBF, VRT, DR and FT) and some Spanish regional broadcasters (Galicia, Catalonia and the Basque Country) have performed some specific action of CSR until 2016.

Within this trend of accountability system, we can also include the so-called public value test, previous evaluation or *ex ante tests*, in this case a form of horizontal accountability, as they regulate and condition the funding of new services. It is a regulation tool applied to decision-making processes on the approval of new services within the activities of a public broadcasting service. To do so, the test balances two different aspects: on the one hand, an evaluation of the public value of the proposed new service is carried out; on the other hand, the impact on the market of the proposal is assessed. The joint assessment will result in the approval or rejection of the proposed new service.

The need to implement this kind *of ex ante* mechanisms is born within a context in which advances in new media made by public service media are stopped by protest coming from the private sector. Having public resources and being, in a certain way, free from pressure to obtain economic benefits, public service media had more room to experiment with the offer of new audiovisual services, within the wide possibilities that the changing media ecosystem was beginning to show. From the perspective of competition, this created a hurdle for private initiatives.

Protests from the commercial about this competitive advantage soon surpassed the national level and reached the European Commission, alleging market failures resulting from double provision of services and denouncing the possible double

funding of public media. That, along with complaints about the lack of transparency in development processes of communication policies, triggered a series of research works on the financing and governance of public service media (Bardoel and Vochteloo 2011; Donders 2011; Donders and Raats 2012).

These investigations were favourable to the demands of the private sector. The European Commission, then, initiated a series of negotiations with Member States, mainly on the need to define the mission of public service and to provide better supervision over their funding and investment of resources in new media. These negotiations between the Community and the national level influenced the drafting of the "Communication from the Commission on the application of State aid rules to public service broadcasting", published in 2009. Paragraph 84 recommends the incorporation of an evaluation prior to the management of public service media, with the aim of not violating the guidelines of the Amsterdam Protocol.

Following the guidelines set out in the Communication from 2009, many European countries have chosen to adapt this *ex ante* procedure to their respective national contexts. However, in 2007, the United Kingdom had already implemented the Public Value Test, the first public assessment in Europe that, also, served as a basic outline for the design of the proposal from the European Commission.

The basic elements of the British Public Value Test are, therefore, shared by most of the public media that have adapted this type of procedures. First, the Public Value Test consists of a public value assessment (with a three-months' duration), which should include a 28-day public consultation, open to participation of representatives of citizens and different stakeholders who wish to express their opinion.

In parallel, the second part of the test is also carried out: the analysis of the potential market impact that would come with the implementation of the proposed new service. To make the assessment, voices from different stakeholders—including the commercial sector—must also be taken into account. After completing both evaluations, it will be checked whether the public value of the proposal justifies its market impact and, in that case, the new service will be approved.

The British test, together with the recommendations of the European Commission, provided the basic guidelines for the development of other *ex ante* tests in Europe. At the moment, 9 Member States (Germany, the Flemish Belgium, Ireland, Austria, Netherlands, Denmark, Sweden, Finland and Croatia) together with two non-Community countries (Norway and Iceland) have opted for the adaptation of a public value test, although with certain differences concerning both the procedure and the actual use of the test.

The number of evaluations carried out in each country, in fact, is one of the most striking differences: whereas in Germany 45 tests have already been completed, other Member States such as Sweden and Denmark have not yet released the procedure. The duration and budget of each of the test adaptations also fluctuates. In the United Kingdom and Germany, the evaluation can last up to 6 months and involve an expenditure up to 1 million euro; however, in countries such as Norway, it can be completed in less than 4 months and expending more modest amounts.

The dynamics of the test depend on the context. In the Netherlands, for instance, the procedure does not include a market impact assessment. Germany, on the other

hand, structures its *Drei-Stufen-Test* starting from three questions: the relation of the proposal with the needs of society, the contribution of the proposal to the editorial competence and the necessary financial expense to carry it out. Another aspect lies in the political interference during the process, since whereas in countries such as United Kingdom and Austria, decision-making falls on an independent body or regulators, this task competes with political agents in tests such as the Norwegian and the Irish.

Public value tests can be also understood as double-edged weapons and their effectiveness depends on how their development is approached: as a tool that contribute to increase transparency and participation in decision-making processes, legitimating the activity of public media, or as a hostile tool designed for its control and restriction, strongly in favour of commercial interests.

5   Composed Indicators

Indicators are useful to help manage, administrate and control governance, particularly through accountability. There are many types of simple and composed indicators, more than 400 according to the OECD (2008). When the topic to be addressed is complex and multidimensional, such as governance, it should be tackled using composed indicators. Multidimensional or composed indicators are statistical tools of information prepared to assess performance in different areas, through the simplification of data, using aggregation arithmetic formulae of their relevant variables (OECD 2008; Becker et al. 2015).

The 10 steps that OECD (2008) proposed in its basic guide for the elaboration of indicators include: study of the theoretical framework, selection of data, multivariate analysis, import of missing data, normalization, weighting, aggregation of indicators, sensitivity tests, links with other measures and visualization. In the field of communication, in general, and the public audiovisual service, in particular, different approaches and models have been made in order to achieve indicators that express different categories (UNESCO 2008; Bucci et al. 2012; Lowe and Martin 2013; EBU 2014; Brogi et al. 2017).

The first research works on the usefulness of indicators go back to the concern for media's social responsibility and the need to transfer to data the accountability of those ethical commitments. These are the *Moyens d'Assurer la Responsabilité Social* (M*A*R*S*) or Media Accountability Systems (English version), proposed by Claude Jean Bertrand (1999). These systems are followed by proposals from different authors and organizations, such as Media Ethics, Media Act, Media Accountability, Media Sustainability, the media standards by de Global Reporting Initiative, EBU PSM Values, Media Pluralism Monitor, Ranking Digital Rights, State of the News Media de Pew Research Center, DAMIAN method for assessing convergence (Nooren et al. 2014), ISO systems and EFQM.

The European Broadcasting Union prepared in 2012 and published two years later (EBU 2014) a model for the assessment of public service media, a peer review mechanism characteristic of the quality review of scientific production, from six core

values: universality, independence, excellence, diversity, accountability and innovation. The EBU tool was implemented by some Northern European corporations (Finland and Sweden) and served as a basis for a further model (EBU 2015), which is an assessment of the social contribution of public service media from the indicators of performance, scope, perception and impact.

The BBC (2004) and the ORF (2017) developed systems of indicators. In the British case, these are democratic, cultural, creative, educational, social-community and global values. In the case of Austria, the corporation assesses the global value of the corporation consisting of individual, social, national, international and corporate values. Broadcasters from Germany, Belgium, Norway and France also use specific systems of indicators for the qualitative assessment of their services and the communication of their social contribution.

For its part, the Media Pluralism Monitor assesses media systems through five areas (basic protection, market pluralism, political independence and social inclusion) and 20 indicators. The Digital Rights Ranking, a non-profit initiative created in 2013 by Rebecca Mackinnon and New America's Open Technology Institute, analyses the compliance with the digital social responsibility of 22 mega-corporations through 35 indicators.

Research conducted by professor Manuel Chaparro (2016), from the University of Malaga, is pioneering in Spain in the development of an indicators of the social profitability of communication (IRSCOM). Also, professor López-López et al. (2017) proposes 29 indicators, grouped into three blocks (institutional and economic information, and information production), for the analysis of transparency in public broadcasters.

For the analysis of information quality of digital media, Luis M. Romero Rodríguez et al. (2016) propose a structured model in three macro-areas and 75 dimensions of indicators, drawn from the consensus of 40 experts. The authors who lead this work participate in other research in progress on indicators of governance, funding, accountability, innovation, quality and public service of European public service media applicable to Spain, in the digital context.

6 Defining Indicators for Public Service Media

Indicators are useful for assessing intrinsic (Moore 2009), exchange and use values of public service media, which help governance to be accountable and communicate its social value. It is a matter of trying to demonstrate, in short, that results correspond to the readapted objectives of the mission, the cost is efficient and the use accepted. In such a way that indicators are measuring tools to transform, according to Chaparro et al. (2016). Exchange and use values may be assessed with quantitative indicators, but the intrinsic ones are much broader and diverse, requiring qualitative and composed tools of greater complexity.

Based on theories that analyse the respective systems of governance, accountability and funding of public service broadcasters, we conceive the establishment of

composed indicators grouped into four categories and ten indicators for each of them: regulation, application or implementation, integration or combination with regard to stakeholders and models and, eventually, impact through perceived effects. This is the criterion with which we work in the project of indicators of governance, funding, accountability, innovation, quality and public service of European public service broadcasters applicable to Spain, in the digital context. Not without forgetting the next steps needed to be completed, to weigh and contrast the indicators.

References

Azurmendi, A.: Un espacio público por conquistar. La participación institucionalizada de las audiencias en las televisiones de proximidad españolas y europeas como indicador de transparencia para la gobernanza de los medios de comunicación. Derecom **19**, 1–32 (2015)

AETHA: Future use of the 470–694 MHz band. Report for Abertis, Ariva, BBC. BNE, EBU and TDT. In: http://www.bipt.be/public/files/en/21172/02-aetha_consulting_-_report_on_the_economic_benefits.pdf (2014)

Ala-Fossi, M., Lax, S.: The short future of public broadcasting: replacing digital terrestrial television with internet protocol? Int. Commun. Gaz. **78**(4), 365–382 (2016)

Almirón, N., Narberhaus, M., Mauri, M.: Mapping media accountability in stateless nations: The case of Catalonia. Catalan J.Commun. Cult. Stud. **8**, 2 (2016)

Arriaza, K., Novak, E., Kuhn, R.: Public Service Media in Europe. A Comparative Approach, Routledge-ECREA (2015)

Bardoel, J., Vochteloo, M.: Dutch public service broadcasting between bureaucratic burden and political choice. Implementing the Amsterdam Test in the Netherlands. In: Donders, K., Moe, H. (eds.) Exporting the Public Value Test: The Regulation of Public Broadcaster's New Media Services Across Europe. Nordicom (2011)

Barnett, M.: Accountability and global governance: the view from paternalism. Regul. Gov. **10**, 134–148 (2016)

BBC: Building Public Value. Renewing the BBC for a digital world. In: https://downloads.bbc.co.uk/aboutthebbc/policies/pdf/bpv.pdf (2004)

Becker, W., Paolo, P., Saisana, M., Saltelli, A.: Measuring the importance of variables in composite indicators. European Commission. In: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/283014579 (2015)

Benson, R., Powers, M., Neff, T.: Public media autonomy and accountability: best and worst policy practices in 12 leading democracies. Int. J. Commun. **11**, 1–22 (2017)

Bertrand, C.J.: L'Arsenal de la démocratie: médias, déontologie et M*A*R*S. Économica, Paris (1999)

Bonini, T., Pais, I.: Hacking public service media funding: a scenario for rethinking the licence fee as a form of civic crowdfunding. Paper presented at the RIPE@2016 Conference (2016)

Bordieu, P.: Sociology in Question. Sage, London (1993)

Bourdieu, P.: The Forms of Capital. In: Richards, J.G. (ed.) Handbook o Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education, pp. 241–258. Greenwood Press, New York (1986)

Brogi, E., Bania, K., Nenadic, I., Ostling, A., Parcu, P. L.: Monitoring media pluralism in Europe: application of the media pluralism monitor 2016 in the European Union, Montenegro and Turkey. Policy Report Centre for Media Pluralism and Media Freedom. European University Institute. The Spanish report was prepared by Pere Masip, Carlos Ruiz, Jaime Suau & Ángel García Castillejo (2017)

Brower, J.: Aportes epistemológicos para la comprensión de los conceptos de gobernabilidad y gobernanza. Revista Venezolana de Gerencia **20**(72), 630–646 (2015)

Bruun, H.: The prism of change: 'continuity' in public service television in the digital era. Nordicom Rev. **37**(2), 33–49 (2016)

Bucci, E., Chiaretti, M., Fiorini, A.M.: Indicadores de Qualidade nas Emissoras Públicas, uma avaliaçao contemporánea. Unesco, Brazil. In: http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0021/002166/216616por.pdf (2012)

Burnley, R.: Public fundic principles for service media. In: http://www3.ebu.ch/home (2015)

Burri, M.: Contemplating a "Public Service Navigator". In search of new- (and better-) functioning public service media. Int. J. Commun. **9**, 1341–1359 (2015a)

Burri, M.: Public Service Broadcasting 3.0: Legal design for the digital present. Routledge, London (2015b)

Bustamante, E.: Europa: Un servicio público multimedia para una nueva era. Diagnóstico y propuestas. Síntesis de trabajos 2009–2015. Grupo Turín (2015)

Campos-Freire, F.: Modelos de financiación de las televisiones públicas autonómicas. In: Miguel de Bustos, J.C., Casado del Rio, M.A., Televisiones autonómicas. Evolución y crisis del modelo público de proximidad, pp. 143–170. Gedisa, Barcelona (2012)

Campos-Freire, F.: El valor social de la TV abierta. In: Gutiérrez Montes, E. (coord.), Televisión Abierta. Situación actual y tendencias de la TDT, pp. 147–166. Colegio Oficial de Ingenieros de Telecomunicación, Madrid (2016)

Campos-Freire, F.: Situación actual y tendencias de la radiotelevisión pública en Europa. Coordination of research by the Federación de Organismos de Radiotelevisión Autonómica (FORTA), Spain, Madrid (2017)

Campos-Freire, F., Valencia-Bermúdez, A.: Los retos de la gobernanza, financiación y valor de las radiotelevisiones públicas. In: Felici, J.M., Rabadán, Pl, Castillo, J.I. (eds.) Los medios de comunicación públicos de proximidad en Europa. RTVV y la crisis de las televisiones públicas. Tirant Humanidades, Valencia (2016)

Carpentier, N.: Media and Participation: A Site of Ideological-democratic Struggle. Intellect, Bristol (2011)

Chaparro, M., Olmedo, S., Gabilondo, V.: El indicador de la rentabilidad social en comunicación (IRSCOM): medir para transformar. Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Cuadernos de Información y Comunicación (CIC) (2016)

Chimenti, A.: L'ordinamento radiotelevisivo italiano. Giappichelli Editorial, Turín (2007)

Coleman, J.S.: Social capital in the creation of human capital. Am. J. Sociol. **94**, 95–120 (1990)

Coppens, T., Saeys, F.: Enforcing performance: new approaches to govern public service broadcasting. Media Cult. & Soc. **28**(2), 261–284 (2016)

Consejo de Europa: Reykjavik declaration on media and new communication services. A new notion of media? In: http://teledetodos.es/index.php/documentacion/1-textos-legales-normas-decisiones-ue/79-declaracion-reykjavik-sobre-nuevos-medios-audiovisuales-29052009/file (2009)

Donders, K., Raats, T.: Measuring public value with the public value test: best of worst practice? In Janssen, J., Comprovoets, J. (eds.), Geographic Data and the Law. Defining New Changes. Leuven University Press, Leuven (2012)

Donders, K.: Looking at Practice to Find a Theory of Public Service Media. The Center for Media, Data and Society. Central European University, Budapest (2017)

Donders, K.: The public value test. A reasoned response or panic reaction? In: Donders, K., Moe, H. (eds.), Exporting the Public Value Test: The Regulation of Public Broadcaster's New Media Services Across Europe. Nordicom (2011)

EBU: Funding of public service media. Media Intelligence Service. European Broadcasting Union. In: http://www3.ebu.ch/home (2016)

EBU: PSM values review: the tool. In: https://www.ebu.ch/member-services/psm-contributionsociety (2014)

EBU: Public service media contribution to society. Media Intelligence Service In: www.ebu.ch/mis (2015)

Fengler, S., Eberwein, T., Mazzoleni, G., Porlezza, C., Russ-Mohl, S.: Journalists and media accountability. In: Lang, P. (eds.) An International Study of News People in the Digital Age, vol. 12 (2014)

Fernández Lombao, T., Campos Freire, F.: La Responsabilidad Social Corporativa en las radiotelevisiones públicas en Europa. In Cuadernos Info, Chile **33**, 145–157 (2013)

Fuchs, C.: Social media and the public sphere. Triple C Commun. Capitalism Critique **12**(1), 57–101 (2014)

García González, A., Alende Castro, S.: El concepto de *accountability* en Facebook. Accidente ferroviario de Santiago de Compostela. Estudios sobre el Mensaje Periodístico **21**(1) (2015)

Ginosar, A., Krispil, O.: Broadcasting regulation and the public interest: independent versus governmental agencies. J. Mass Commun. Q. **93**(4), 946–966 (2016)

Gulyás, A., Hammer, F.: Public Service Media in the Digital Are: International Perspectives. Cambridge Scholars Publishing (2013)

Hasebrink, U.: Giving the audience a voice: the role of research in making media regulation more responsive to the needs of the audience. J. Inf. Policy **1**(1), 321–336 (2011)

Horowitz, M.A., Car, V.: The future of public service media. Medijske Studije/Media Stud. **6**, 2–9, Zagreb (2015)

Horowitz, M.A.: Public service media and challenge of crossing borders: assessing new models. Medijske Studije/Media Stud. **6**, 80–91, Zagreb (2015a)

Humphreys, P.: Convergencia digital y política: el futuro de la radiodifusión pública en el Reino Unido y Alemania. Infoamérica **3–4**, 57–72 (2010)

Hutchinson, J.: From Fringe to formalisation: an experiment in fostering interactive public service media. Media Int. Aust. **155**(1), 5–15 (2015)

Iosifidis, P.: Servicio público de televisión en Europa. Retos y estrategias. Infoamérica, 3–4, 7–21. In: www.infoamerica.org/icr/n03_04/iosifidis.pdf (2010)

Jacobs, S., Schillemans, T.: Media and public accountability: typology and exploration. Policy Polit. **44**(1), 23–40 (18) (2016)

Jakubowicz, K.: PSB 3.0: reinventing European PS. In: Iosifidis, P. (ed.) Reinventing Public Service Communication: European Broadcasters and Beyond, pp. 9–22. Palgrave, Basingstoke (2010)

Klepper, W. M.: Gobernanza y gestión del cambio del siglo XXI. En Reinventar la empresa en la era digital. In: https://www.bbvaopenmind.com/ (2014)

Lamy, P.: Results of the work of the high level group on the future use of the UHF band (470–790 MHz). Report to the European Commission. In: https://ec.europa.eu/digital-single-market/en/news/report-results-work-high-level-group-future-use-uhf-band (2016)

Larrondo, A., Domingo, D., Erdal, I.J., Masip, P., Van den Bulck, H.: Opportunities and limitations of newsroom convergence. A comparative study on European public service broadcasting organisations. Journalism Stud. **17**(3), 277–300 (2016)

Le Gales, P.: Gobernanza y cohesión social. In: P. Hall (dir.), Congreso Regiones Capitales, Comunidad de Madrid, 327–347 (2007)

Lee, C.G., Sung, J., Kim, J.K.: Corporate social responsibility of the media: instrument development and validation. Inf. Dev. **32**(3), 554–565 (2016)

Lin, N.: Social Capital: a theory of social structure and action. University Press, Cambridge (2001)

López-López, P.C., Puentes-Rivera, I., Rúas-Araújo, J.: Transparencia en televisiones públicas: desarrollo de indicadores y análisis de los casos de España y Chile. Revista Latina de Comunicación Social **72**, 253–272. In: http://www.revistalatinacs.org/072paper/1164/14es.html (2017)

Lowe, G., Martin, F.: The value and values of public service media. In: Martin, F., Lowe, G. (eds), The Value Public Service Media. Nordicom (2013)

Lowe, G.F.: What Value and Which Values? In Public Social Value. In: http://www.orf.at/ (2016)

Martin, F.R.: Mobile public service media in Australia: Ubiquity and its consequences. Int. Commun. Gaz **78**(4), 330–348 (2016)

Marzal F.J., Zallo E.Z.: Las televisiones públicas de proximidad ante los retos de la sociedad digital. Commun. Soc. **29**(4), 1–7, Pamplona (2016)

Mayntz, R.: Nuevos desafíos de la teoría de 'governance'. In Instituciones y Desarrollo **7**, 35–52. In: http://www.iigov/revista/revista7/docs/mayntz.htm (2000)

McGrath, S.K., Whitty, S.J.: Redefining governance: from confusion to certainty and clarity. Int. J. Managing Projects Bus. **8**(4), 755–787 (2015)

Moore, M.: Creating Public Value—Strategic Management in Government. Harvard University Press, Cambridge (1995)

Moore, G.E.: El valor intrínseco. Facultad de Filosofía de la Universidad Complutense de Madrid (2009)

Muñoz Saldaña, M., Azurmendi, A.: El papel de las televisiones públicas autonómicas en el desarrollo de la gobernanza multinivel en Europa. Commun. Soc. **29**(4), 45–58 (2016)

Nooren, P., Koers, W., Bangma, M., Berkers, Boertjes, E.: Regulation in the Converged Media-Internet-Telecom Value Web. Introducing the Damian Method for Systematic Analysis of the Interdependences Between Services, Organisations and Regulation. TNO Publications. In: www.publications.tno.nl/publication/…/NhocfJ/TNO-2014-R11482.pdf (2014)

O' Donnell, G.: Accountability horizontal: la institucionalización legal de la desconfianza política. Revista Española de Ciencia Política, 11–31 (2004)

OECD: Handbook on constructing composite indicators. Methodology and user guide. OECD & European Commission. In: http://composite-indicators.frc.ec.europa.eu (2008)

Olkkonen, L.: A conceptual foundation for expectations of corporate responsibility. Corp. Commun. Int. J. **22**(1), 19–35 (2017)

Olsen, J.P.: The ups and downs of bureaucratic organization. Annu. Rev. Polit. Sci. **11**, 13–37 (2008)

Padovani, C.: El pluralismo de la información televisiva en Italia. Infoamércia **3–4**, 173–188 (2010)

Pava, M.L., Krausz, J.: Criteria for evaluating the legitimacy of corporate social responsibility. J. Bus. Ethics **16**(3), 337–347 (1997)

Peters, G.B.: Governance and the media: exploring the linkages. Policy Polit **44**(1), 9–22 (14) (2016)

Picard, R.G., Siciliani, P.: Is There Still a Place for Public Service Broadcasting? Effects of the Changing Economics of Broadcasting. Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism, Oxford (2013)

Picard, R.G.: La creación de valor y el futuro de las empresas informativas. Por qué y cómo el periodismo debe cambiar para seguir siendo relevante en el siglo XXI. Media XXI, Lisbon (2012)

Powell, A.: Hacking in the public interest: Authority, legitimacy, means, and ends. New Media Soc. **18**(4), 600–616 (2016)

Prats, J.: De la burocracia al management, del management a la gobernanza. INAP, Madrid (2003)

Puppis, M.: Media governance: a new concept for the analysis of media policy and regulation. Commun. Cult. Critique **3**(2), 134–149 (2010)

Puppis, M., Maggetti, M., Gilardi, F., Biela, J., Papadopoulos, Y.: The political communication of independent regulatory agencies. Swiss Polit. Sci. Rev. **20**(3), 388–400 (2014)

Putnam, R.: The prosperous community: social capital and public life. Am. Prospect **4**(13) (1993)

Rawles, J.: La justicia como equidad y otros ensayos. Tecnos, Madrid (1986)

ORF Public Value Report 2016/17. Media Intelligence Service. In: www.ebu.ch/mis (2017)

Rhodes, M.: Understanding governance: ten years on. Organ. Stud. **28**(8), 1243–1264 (2007)

Richeri, G.: Una prospettiva dei cambiamenti in atto. Presentación del número monográfico sobre "Futuro de la television". Revista de la Asociación Española de Investigación de la Comunicación **3**(6), 2–10. In: http://www.revistaeic.eu/index.php/raeic/article/view/60 (2016)

Rios Ramírez, A.R., Arbeláez, A.C., Suárez Valencia, Vélez, L.F.: Accountability: aproximación conceptual desde la filosofía política y la ciencia política. Colomb. Int. **82** (2014)

Romero Rodríguez, L.M., De Casas Moreno, P., Torres, A.: Dimensiones e indicadores de la calidad informativa en los medios digitales. Comunicar **49** (2016)

Samuelson, P.A.: The pure theory of public expenditure. Rev. Econ. Stat. **XXXVI**, 387–388 (1954)

Schedler, A.: ¿Qué es la rendición de cuentas? In: Instituto Federal de Acceso a la Información Pública, México (2008)

Schmitter C.: What is there to legitimize in the European Union…and how might this be accomplished?. Reihe Politikwissenschaft/ Polit. Sci. Ser. **75** (2001)

Stiglitz, J.E., Rosengard, J.K.: La economía del sector público, 4th edn. Bosch, Barcelona (2016)

Tambini, D.: Five theses on public media and digitization: from a 56-country study. Int. J. Commun. **9** (2015)

Torfing, J., Ansell, Ch.: Strengthening political leadership and policy innovation through the expansion of collaborative forms of governance. Public Management Review, 19(1) (2017)

Trappel, J.: Taking the public service remit forward across the digital boundary. Int. J. Digital Telev. **7**(3), 273–295 (2016)

Tremblay, G.: Public service media in the age of digital networks. Can. J. Commun. **41**(1) (2016)

UNESCO: Indicadores de desarrollo mediático: marco para evaluar el desarrollo de los medios de comunicación social. Paris. In: http://unesdoc.UNESCO.org/images/0016/001631/163102s.pdf (2008)

Van Dijck, J., Poell, T.: Making public television social? Public service broadcasting and the challenges of social media. Telev. New Media **16**, 148–164 (2015)

Vanhaeght, A.-S., Donders, K.: Do interaction, co-creation and participation find their way from PSM literature to PSM policy and strategy? A comparative case study analysis of Flanders, the Netherlands, France and the UK. Medijske Studije/Media Stud. **6**. In: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/311717921_Do_interaction_co-creation_and_participation_find_their_way_from_PSM_literature_to_PSM_policy_and_strategy_A_comparative_case_study_analysis_of_Flanders_the_Netherlands_France_and_the_UK (2015)

Vázquez, B.L.: Evolución e impacto de la comunicación de valores responsables. Caso de estudio en España. Historia y Comunicación Social **19**, 511–523 (2014)

Weeds, H.: Digitisation, Programme Quality and Public Service Broadcasting. In: Picard, R.G., Siciliani, P. (eds.) Is There Still a Place for Public Service Broadcasting? Effects of the Changing Economics of Broadcasting. Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism, Oxford (2013)

Wurff, R., Schönbach, K.: Audience expectations of media accountability in the Netherlands. Journalism Stud. **15**(2) (2014)

Zaccaria, R.: Diritto dell'informazione e della comunicazione (9ª edición). CEDAM, Italy (2016)

Francisco Campos-Freire Professor of Journalism at the Faculty of Communication Sciences of the Universidade de Santiago de Compostela (Spain), has a MBA degree in Industrial and Service Business Management and a Ph.D. in Communication and Contemporary History, also at the Universidade de Santiago de Compostela. His research lines focus on the study of Cultural and Communication Industries, management of informative and audio-visual business, and communication policies. Santiago de Compostela, Spain.

Rosario de Mateo-Pérez Professor of Journalism at the Faculty of Communication Sciences of the Universitat Autónoma de Barcelona (Spain), has a degree in Economics, holds a Ph.D. in Communication Sciences, and is part of the EuroMedia Research Group. Mateo-Pérez main research