



MARS – MEDIA AGAINST RACISM IN SPORT

Media, Diversity & Racism in Sport

NATIONAL MEDIA ENCOUNTER

Journalism & Media Training & Literacy

DRAFT REPORT

13. – 15 JUNE 2012

Hotel Arthur

Vuorikatu 19

Helsinki

Finland

Tel. + 358 9 173 441

www.hotelarthur.fi



MEDIAKASVATUSSEURA
SÄLLSKAPET FÖR MEDIEOFSTRAN
FINNISH SOCIETY ON MEDIA EDUCATION



MARS - Media Against Racism in Sport

Funded
by the European Union
and the Council of Europe



EUROPEAN UNION



COUNCIL
OF EUROPE CONSEIL
DE L'EUROPE

Implemented
by the Council of Europe

Author: **Anna-Maija LAINE**, Coordinator, Mediakasvatusseura, Finland

The opinions expressed in this publication should not be regarded as placing upon the legal instruments mentioned in it any official interpretation capable of binding the governments of member states, the Council of Europe's statutory organs or any organ set up by virtue of the European Convention on Human Rights. The opinions expressed in this publication are under the solely responsibility of the author(s) and do not reflect official position of the Council of Europe.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction	4
2. The participants	4
3. Dynamic of the encounter	5
3.1 Plenary sessions and round table summary	6
The Round table session	6
4. The outputs	9
4.1 Tested tools, exercises and strategies	9
4.1.1 "The Checklist"	9
4.1.2 "The Roadshow"	10
4.1.3 "Do I fit into the Frames?"	11
4.1.4 "Including statements"	13
4.2 Training propositions.....	13
5. Conclusions	15

1. INTRODUCTION

In 2011 Finland was chosen as one of the countries to host a national Media Against Racism in Sport – encounter focusing on Journalism, Media Training and Literacy. The Finnish encounter was eventually organized in Helsinki on the 13-15th of June 2012. It was preceded by a European encounter in October 2011 and three national encounters (Italy, France and Romania) and succeeded by the Belgian national encounter in October 2012. The purpose of the encounter was to address issues regarding discrimination in sports media and to identify, present and produce exercises and pedagogical tools for journalism- or media literacy training. This was to be fulfilled through both general plenaries and analytical and creative working group sessions.

The national partner of the Finnish MARS-encounter was the Finnish Society on Media Education, an association aiming to support and develop the field of research and practices concerning media education, contribute to the public debate and provide opportunities to share media education experiences online and offline. The Finnish Society on Media Education prepared the encounter with help from a national steering group consisting of Satu Heikkinen from the Ministry of Education and Culture, Maarit Jaakkola from the University of Tampere, Riitta Kauppinen from Save the Children Finland and Kaj Kunnas from the Finnish Broadcasting Company YLE. The national encounter was organized in Hotel Arthur situated in the city center of Helsinki.

2. THE PARTICIPANTS

The participants at the encounter were experts in the fields of media literacy, journalism training, media, sports or diversity and non-discrimination issues.

The national steering group had the main responsibility for introducing possible participants for the encounter. The group identified a large number of experts, and all in all approximately 100 people were sent a preliminary invitation to the event. In the end 35 people attended the encounter. Some were not able to be present during the whole encounter, and the average number of participants per day was thus 27. Five of the attendees were international participants and the rest were Finnish representatives.

The Finnish participants represented different organizations from different parts of Finland, some of which were large state owned companies and others small non-governmental organizations. A large number of the participants were versatile professionals with experience in more than one field. Out of the 30 Finnish participants over 10 people had professional experience in journalism or media, although many of them were primarily experts on issues regarding diversity, discrimination and media education. 11 participants were eligible researchers or educators. The researchers had recently been looking into different aspects of discrimination and homogeneity in sports and media. 5 of the participants were experts in mainly diversity and non-discrimination issues and at least 6 out of 30 were knowledgeable in media education. In addition there were a number of participants that were athletes themselves, and some of them had first-hand experience in discrimination in sports.

“The media loves sports and sport loves the media. The world’s most watched TV programmes are major sports events, and significant investments are made by the media in the area of sports. In addition to delivering sports as entertainment, the media disseminates information, attitudes and values to large groups of people. In an Olympic Year like this one, one would hope that the basic principles of the Olympic movement – peace, non-discrimination, respect for human rights, friendship, solidarity and fair play – would come across to the reader, listener and viewer in a clear manner. “

Minister Paavo Arhinmäki

The three day encounter was built around plenaries and working group sessions, in which the themes of discrimination and diversity in sport and media were discussed and possible new training resources were created. The encounter was opened by a written greeting from the Finnish Minister of Culture and Sports, Paavo Arhinmäki.

Questions asked during the newspaper media literacy training exercise:

- *Who do we see in the pictures?*
 - *How do they look?*
 - *What are they doing?*
- *Who are the writers, the experts and the subjects in the stories?*
- *How does the world and/or the world of sports look like based on only the pictures in the newspapers?*
 - *How does an athlete look like based on the pictures in the newspaper?*

During **the first day** of the encounter the participants got to hear more about the MARS-programme. MARS Programme Manager Reynald Bliion (Council of Europe) presented the backgrounds, motivations, goals and methods of the EU and Council of Europe joint programme. The outputs of the previous national encounters focusing on Journalism, Media Training and Literacy were presented by Patrick Verniers (MediaAnimation, Belgium), Anne-Claire Orban de Xivry and Mircea Toma (ActiveWatch, Romania).

Sports journalist Kaj Kunnas (Finnish Broadcasting Company, YLE) facilitated a round table discussion, which introduced the participants to some aspects of the topics at hand. Multicultural advisor at the Football Association of Finland and former professional basketball player, mr. Maurizio Pratesi, freelance sports journalist ms. Sari Sirkkiä-Jarva and researcher ms. Marja Kokkonen took part in the discussion about discrimination and diversity in Finnish sports and sports media.

During the first working group session the participants were asked to take part of a typical media literacy training exercise. The participants were handed different issues of the largest daily Finnish newspapers (Helsingin Sanomat and Aamulehti), and were asked to look at the pictures and texts in them. They were then asked to answer some questions and discuss the state of diversity and discrimination in the media based on what they witnessed in the papers. After this the groups discussed the overall situation of discrimination and diversity in sports and sport media. The day was ended with a plenary session where the groups presented their conclusions.

The second day of the encounter consisted mainly of analytical and creative working group sessions. The groups started working on ideas for training tools and exercises by first discussing already existing tools that were familiar to them. In between the working group sessions the groups got to present their ideas to the others and to the chair of the Finnish Society on Media Education, Dr. Ritva-Sini Merilampi, who gave comments and critique on the presented ideas to help the groups continue their work.

On **the third day** the working groups finalized their tools or exercises and presented them to the others and/or tested the exercises with them. There were 2 exercises that were tested and 2 other tools that were presented in detail.

The encounter was ended with a concluding session, where general thoughts on the Finnish encounter were shared and different ways to keep updated, to contribute and follow MARS activities were presented.

3.1 PLENARY SESSIONS AND ROUND TABLE SUMMARY

There were some reoccurring themes and statements in the discussions during the encounter and some of the most discussed statements are presented below. The main points of the round table session are presented after these general statements.

One of the things that were established early on is that all sports media cannot be discussed about as if they were all the same. There are too big differences in state owned and private owned media, as well as national and local media. The differences and special interest should be considered when trying to encourage to diversity. At the same time it should be noted that the power lies in different people depending on the media: in a local newspaper the decision makers might not be in a similar position as in big national newspapers. In state owned TV-channels there might not be the same restrictions or possibilities as in a private owned channel. Sports media is a vast field and different methods to improve the diversity and non-discrimination are needed for different media.

It was often stated, that in particular sports journalists are increasingly uneducated in journalism. They are eager and technically skilled, but are unable to understand the power they possess and critically evaluate their own work. This was seen as a threat against diversity in sports media, as the fans that become sports journalist might not be able to consider new approaches to their job. They are basically unqualified to handle broad social issues. Therefore it would be important to increase the possibilities for sports journalism training and education.

The question of stardom was also brought up – is it a problem that sports journalists become stars themselves? Should we be concerned, or should we use this as a tool itself?

The participants agreed on the fact that sports journalism is very result oriented, even though there would be many other, for example social aspects to explore and report on. It was stated that the (sports) people are more interesting than the (sports) results, and that focusing also on people instead of only scores there might be a larger variety of people represented in sport media as well as more people interested in sports media. The fear of losing viewers or readers to gain new audiences is also a problem that should be issued.

As there in fact is research being done regarding diversity, discrimination and racism in media and sports, the participants wondered if there might be a link missing. Why do the findings of researchers not reach journalists? Is it due to a missing link in the system, or is it just a lack of interest on the part of the journalists? The fact that journalists work on a tight schedule and might be unable to familiarize themselves with extensive research cannot be ignored. Still it seems that there is little or no effort being done on the part of media houses to familiarize journalists with discrimination in media.

The participants raised the question on whether sponsors and advertisers are interested in more diverse sports media coverage or not. Is it necessarily so, that advertisers and sponsors are uninterested in small sports, women's sports or disabled sports? This is a key issue for private owned media, and should be considered. As the rights for broadcasting sports is increasingly expensive, the media tries to use all angles of the sports rights they possess. Smaller sports do not seem interesting to private owned media as the viewers are thought to be uninterested in these sports.

THE ROUND TABLE SESSION

The round table session was held on the first day of the encounter. During the 1,5h session facilitated by YLE sports journalist Kaj Kunnas, three experts discussed the state of the art in sports, media and discrimination. The participants were multicultural advisor at the Football Association of Finland, M..

Maurizio Pratesi, freelance sports journalist ms. Sari Sirkkiä-Jarva and researcher ms. Marja Kokkonen.

During the discussion racist and sexist remarks were often, referred to as "ordinary stuff". It was recognized that discriminating comments are largely considered to be part of the nature of sports and that you as an athlete or referee are just supposed to shake it off. It might simply be considered "bad humor". Mr. Pratesi stated that to be able to shout sexist, racist or other demeaning comments you should not go to the street because there you would eventually be stopped, but simply buy a ticket to any sports event. There it seems to be okay to behave badly.

But as sports is considered to be a mirror of society, the same rules should apply in sports events and sport media as in other parts of life. It was indicated that sports could potentially be the easiest way to unify people and to tackle discrimination, but it was also recognized that both the good and the bad in people come out during emotional sports happenings. When the Finnish Men's Ice Hockey team won the world championship in 2011 the victory was celebrated by hundreds of thousands different Finns, but as some were celebrating peacefully side by side others took the liberty to claim ownership of the victory. They tried to exclude ethnic- and lingual minorities by racist remarks and claiming, that this was the victory of exclusively "the real Finns".

Although this "ordinary stuff" is frowned upon, it is rarely discussed in the media. Sari Sirkkiä-Jarva said that it is easy for the media to accept discrimination in sport if the players and referees seem to accept it. That way racism, sexism and other forms of discrimination becomes just what it was called - ordinary stuff.

It was also recognized that sports journalists tend to function in a similar manner as athletes in locker rooms. The similar lingo and macho attitude is present. Kaj Kunnas stated that you might gain some positive recognition if you decide to step up and address possible troubling behavior, but that you cannot – and should not – always be policing your colleagues'.

On the other hand it was clear to the round table participants, that sports journalists are not getting any help to learn about minorities or how to address and avoid discrimination. The only way to do so is to be active and learn by doing. This mirrors the fact that female journalists do stories on female athletes far more easily than their male colleagues, as they might be generally more aware of and interested in female sports. The diversity amongst journalists is one important aspect of increasing diversity in the sports media, but at the same time all journalists should be helped and familiarized with diversity and non-discrimination issues.

It was not denied that sports journalists are in a difficult position. The fact that the journalists depend on good relations with the athletes and coaches to be able to do their job, makes opposing or scolding them very hard to do. Still we seem to hope that the journalists would oppose if they hear discriminating remarks, like we hope that discriminated athletes would step up and talk about it publicly, or that for example homosexual athletes would talk about their sexuality in public. This raises the question: are we too eagerly hoping to solve the problem by martyrdom?

Some of the round table participants felt that personal stories could help change the current landscape of homogenous representation in sports media, but others felt that single stories are simply too easily forgotten. For example; although the success of wheelchair racer Leo-Pekka Tähti has introduced the Paralympic sport to the Finnish people, it has not changed the overall situation. Still it was concluded that small steps will eventually get us to our goal.

Marja Kokkonen stated that sports journalism seems to be very old fashioned. This is exemplified by the fact that the gender representation in sports media is very narrow. Sports are still in 2012 displayed as a male dominated macho society. It seems to be stuck with some age old conventions, and these are

carried on from generation to generation. This and the fact that working sports journalists are increasingly uneducated in journalism present some real problems. They do not have the insight to approach sports from different angles and are less able to critically analyze their own work, let alone to see the subtle tones of discrimination in their work. This underlines the importance of education.

As the change towards a more diverse media representation may not happen overnight it was concluded that education is key in making this change happen. This means educating journalists, but also people from the world of sports and of course regular pupils and students. Maurizio Pratesi has been visiting schools as part of his work, and meeting people face to face seems to be a very effective way to tackle prejudices. Athletes that kids get to meet are big heroes, no matter their gender, color of skin or possible disability. Education is proactive, and that makes it more effective than any single campaign.

4. THE OUTPUTS

As the main focus of the encounter was to produce new journalist training and media literacy training tools, the concrete outputs of the three day meeting are the tools and exercises presented here. The three working groups worked on a number of ideas, but they focused especially on four of them, processing them further and finally presenting and testing the tools with their peers in a plenary session on the last day of the encounter.

4.1 TESTED TOOLS, EXERCISES AND STRATEGIES

The four presented tools and exercises were shaped differently and focused on diverse aspects of the issues that had been discussed during the encounter. Some of the groups chose to focus on a broad perspective by offering tools to the editorial staff to encourage them to be more inclusive and varied in their work, as others decided to create exercises to raise the awareness of more detailed issues, like racism and heteronormativity. Most of the tools can be usable in different contexts, also as generic media educational exercises.

4.1.1 "THE CHECKLIST"

One of the groups established a checklist for editorial staff to help them keep up diverse and non-discriminating media content production. They stated that a checklist could be a useful tool to reflect on what was being done and how issues were being covered. The proposal was that the editorial staff of a media house should regularly use this both individually and as a group, but not by any means every time they produced something.

The checklist was divided into five main issues or points of interest; topics, the editorial process, self-reflection, relations to the audience and feedback. The editorial staff was to reflect on these questions to identify the quality of their work, especially from the point of view of diversity and non-discrimination.

The questions in the checklist:

Issue 1 - Topics

- Which topics do we chose to cover?
- What have we decided to leave out?
- Which & whose aspect and point of view have we decided to take?

Issue 2 - The editorial process

- What kind of editorial culture does the news room / do the editorial staff have?
- What kind of language do we use on the stories and whose ideas and opinions are brought out?
- Do we pay attention on the choices made on language and words used?
- Are the decisions up to each journalist his/herself and how much does the editor in chief has to say in the choices made?

Issue 3 - Journalist's self-reflection.

- Big and small choices; what to say, what to leave out in the article?
- How do I see my role as an actor of society?

- How do my own ideas and opinions guide (or mislead) me in the production process?
- Do I recognize my own perspectives that affect my work?

Issue 4 - The relations to the audience

- To whom am I writing?
- Who are we serving, how do we guarantee the quality and diversity of articles produced?
- Are we equally considerate of different groups in the society?

Issue 5 - Feedback

- Do you get real feedback or is it more of a form of small talk in your editorial?
- The tools of feedback: how to deal with it, how to improve and how to give encouraging feedback?
- Could we be more active ourselves when it comes to feedback?
- What tangible tools could we use for receiving and giving more feedback - from the audience and from the colleagues?

There was a proposition to make the checklist into a more interactive tool, as one of the groups had thought of turning the tool into a collaborative process instead of just following given guidelines. This tool is presented shortly later on.

4.1.2 "THE ROADSHOW"

One of the groups decided to create a diversity promoting roadshow, where a team including a respected sports journalist, a well-known athlete, a media educator and a representative of a sports federation would meet journalists, editorial staff and educators to promote diversity and good practices in non-discrimination.

The key idea for the Roadshow was that to be able to establish some change, people have to be able to meet other people. The working group stated that brochures, e-mails and letters are easily forgotten but people tend to remember other people.

The roadshow would consist of four parts: the introduction, the feedback, the 4-step program and the follow-up.

1. Introduction

- the team initiates discussion on the matter of discrimination and sports journalism
 - common problems regarding diversity in sports journalism are issued
 - good practices are presented
- introduction of benefits for the participants

2. Feedback and response

- Tailored feedback for each newsroom/sports department before and after the visit
 - "soft and understanding" feedback
 - dialogue, not lecturing!
 - not only talk about problems but also solutions

3. 4 step program

The 4-step program is a tool for the participants to identify challenges, set goals and find methods to change the state of the art.

- 2020 vision – how should things be in the year 2020?

- Identified challenges – what are my/our main challenges?
- Methods to change the current situation – how to tackle obstacles?
- Action plan – this is how I/we will make the change happen.

4. Follow-up

- follow up ex. 2 months later – how are things now?
 - meeting with managerial staff
 - all participants get written feedback

The roadshow would tour in different media houses and educational institutions to provide tools for non-discrimination and critical self-reflection and raise awareness on the issue of discrimination. It would also promote an award, which would be presented yearly to a sports journalist who has done an especially outstanding job on diversity and non-discrimination. This would be an additional incentive to support diversity in sports media.

4.1.3 "DO I FIT INTO THE FRAMES?"

This exercise was inspired by "Frames" (*Break the Norm! Methods for studying norms in general and the heteronorm in particular* by RFSL Ungdom, Sweden).

The group prepared an exercise to explore diversity of gender, how other human characters affect our interpretation of gender expressions and to discuss the norms of our society. The exercise "Do I fit into the frames?" addresses gender stereotypes, ethnic, cultural and functional diversity.

Part 1 - Brainstorm

The exercise uses pictures of different people and flipcharts to identify perceptions of masculine and feminine. Two large frames are drawn side by side on the flipcharts and they are labeled "masculine" and "feminine". The participants are asked to come up with words or short sentences to describe what is considered feminine or masculine *in our society* (not personal standards), and the words are written down in the respective frames.

Part 2 - Reflections

After this the participants are asked to consider the contents of the frames for example in pairs.

Things to consider:

- What comes to mind when reading the words?
- Where do the expectations on masculine and feminine behavior come from?
- Are there differences in what is expected in sports, compared to the society in general?
- Why are many of the attributes in the masculine frame considered to be of greater value than those in the feminine frame?

Part 3 – Reviewing

The participants are asked to review some of the reflections:

- Is it possible to entirely live up to the standards?
- Are the masculine standards valued higher? If this is considered the case, you may illustrate this placing the "male flipchart" higher.
- If it has not come up, highlight that manly men and feminine women are assumed to be heterosexual.

Part 4 – Who fits into the frames?

After reviewing and reflecting on the perceptions of masculinity and femininity, the participants are given pictures of different people. There should be just one person on each picture. The pictures could be pictures from newspapers and magazines and as representing a diverse range of people. The participants are asked to place the pictures somewhere inside or outside the frames, depending on whether they consider them to conform to the frames or not. Review the outcome together by asking about a few examples – who is in the middle of a frame, who is on the edge, who remains outside and why?

- Discuss the consequences that may arise from deviating from the frames. The consequences may come in the form of jokes, comments, strange looks, harassments or violence.
- Why are masculine women often perceived more positively than feminine men?

Possible options for a sports context:

- When brainstorming about "masculine" and "feminine" label the flipcharts "Sportsman" and "Sportswoman" and brainstorm about perceptions of sportsmen and sportswomen.
- Use pictures from the sports section of a newspaper
- Look at the pictures in the sports section of a paper; is the diversity of gender pictured as broad there, as in the rest of the paper? Does it reflect the diversity found in the real society as a general, or within sports in particular?

4.1.4 "INCLUDING STATEMENTS"

As the discussions during the encounter showed, that some situations made it more difficult to avoid discriminating statements in media content than others, one of the groups decided to create a challenge-type exercise. The group produced a list of statements that the trainees were to include in a media product they were supposed to produce in 30 minutes time. Some of the statements had a discriminating undertone and the challenge was to use them in a non-discriminating manner. This was to imitate the fact that sometimes journalists get orders to include some information in their media products, as they are not always independently choosing what to include in their stories.

The trainees got to prepare a live commentary to the chosen sports video (from YouTube), a live interview with the athletes (portrayed by some of the trainees) and to write a short article on the event. The trainers decided that the live commentary should be for a state owned company, the live interview for a private TV-channel and the articles for a tabloid newspaper, but the specifications could be changed in any preferred way.

During the live commentary and the live interview one of the trainers played the part of the director of the TV- program. He gave some orders to the commentators and the interviewer regarding how long to speak and on some of the topics to address. This posed a further challenge to the trainees, as they were to keep on going and adlibbing to include things that the director was asking for. This included focusing on the topic of racial tension.

As some of the trainees were unfamiliar with sports journalism, they faced some challenges that journalist trainees would not necessarily face. The trainees that did the live commentary felt that the exercise made them focus more on the actual commenting practices than on the possible discriminating content, as they were not familiar with live commenting and how it is done. This on the other hand showed that making live commentaries could be a good media educational tool to teach non-journalists about the difficulty of the situation. During the encounter it was often pondered if live commenting is journalism at all, and at the same time the extremity of the situation was seen to make live commenting the most difficult situation in which to avoid discriminating remarks as you do not have the time to reflect on what you are saying.

The exercise could be used as both a media educational exercise for non-journalists but also as an exercise for journalism students. The testing situation during the encounter was special because all of the trainees knew that the exercise was about discrimination. If the trainees would not know this, the exercise might be more surprising and eye opening, and the reviewing and feedback on the produced content would probably be more interesting.

4.2 TRAINING PROPOSITIONS

There were also some ideas that were presented but not developed further or tested. Those ideas are shortly presented here.

"THE STORY GAME"

In the story game the player takes the role of the protagonist and plays a branching linear narrative game, where he/she is presented with different options that take him/her to the next level of the game. The game challenges the player to think about which options to choose, because the choices will influence the outcome. The game could teach the player about diversity in media and how simple choices could make for example sport media more diverse.

“REWRITING FAIRYTALES”

Fairytales are in many cases quite stereotypical and represent the world in a very heteronormative way. Rewriting fairytales to make them less discriminating and making the representations more diverse was considered to possibly be a good learning experience.

“THE CHECKLIST AS A PROCESS”

One of the groups presented and developed a tool called the Checklist, but there was also discussion on making the checklist into a process instead of a set tool. This would mean that the checklist would be produced by the people who would be using it in their work. This way they would have to think more about why some points in the checklist are important, not just make them follow the rules.

“AWARENESS RAISING VIDEO”

In Finland there is a media educational program, Sanomalehti opetuksessa, that brings newspapers and journalists into school classes. The program familiarizes pupils with the work of journalists and the world of journalism. The journalists that visit schools are briefed before their visits, and during the MARS encounter there emerged an idea to include an awareness raising video on discrimination and diversity issues into the brief. This would allow the journalists to be familiarized with the issues and would encourage them to take action, as they are forced to think about the matter during their preparation for the school visit.

5. CONCLUSIONS

As a conclusion one can say that there is a need for more education on diversity and non-discrimination in general, as making media and sports media more diverse is not only up to journalists. There are a lot of other people that contribute to media content and all should get some education on diversity issues. Therefore it is crucial to work on educating not only journalists but also everyone else, starting with schoolchildren, educators and sports professionals. This means providing effective diversity education to schools but also to provide students with third level education in sports journalism.

The discussion on discrimination and diversity should be kept up, as a lot of people still consider discrimination someone else's problem. There is continuous need for awareness raising and it is our collective responsibility to provide this. Collaboration is important to make the awareness raising possible and effective, and cooperation between different institutions and associations should take place.

The Finnish MARS-encounter showed that there is real interest in diversity issues in Finland. Sadly there are still a lot of people, especially in high positions that do not identify the lack of diversity in sports media and discrimination in sport as a problem. They are hard to reach and how to get to them remains an unsolved problem.

Therefore it is important to keep in mind the fact that our goals will eventually be reached by taking small steps and looking both at short term and long term progression. Keeping up the good work that is being done should be accompanied by new, focused initiatives. Educating children and youth is important when thinking about the long term progression. We have to start preparing the next generation of athletes, journalists and superiors so that sports media will be more diverse and up to date in the future.

Media, Diversity & Sport - Key Figures!

In Europe, only a quarter of news subjects are women, even though they account for over half of the European population (GMMP, 2010)! While immigrants represent around 10% of the EU population (*Eurostat, 2011*) migrants and ethnic minorities represent less than 5% of the main actors in the news in Europe (*Ter Wal, 2004*). Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender (LGBT) people represent roughly 6% of the population of the United Kingdom but account for less than 1% of the population seen on TV. 20% of the British population is disabled but less than 1% is represented in British TV (*CDN 2009-10 Progress Report*).

Through the sources they use, the subjects they select and the treatment they choose, the media influence the agenda (what to think about) and public perception (how to think) of contemporary debates. This is why the Council of Europe considers truly inclusive information - where everyone can participate as witnesses, players, producers etc. - to be crucial for social cohesion and democratic participation. But today, too many people are still excluded from public debates!

The MARS - Media Against Racism in Sport - EU / CoE joint programme chooses to focus, though not exclusively, on sport because it is considered as an important area for building social cohesion as it is also a major sector of investment in the media industry. However, sport media coverage does not reflect social and cultural diversity and does not ensure equity for all. Only 5% of press articles cover cultural and social aspects of sport; 40% of all sport articles refer to only one source and 20 % refer to no sources at all; female athletes have four times more chances to be covered by a female journalist rather than a male one but less than 5% of sport news and stories are made by female journalists (*Play the Game, 2005*)!

Building upon standards set by various Council of Europe bodies on media pluralism, expression of diversity and non discrimination and the outcome of the 2008-10 CoE's antidiscrimination Campaign, the MARS - Media Against Racism in Sport - EU / CoE joint programme aims at considering non discrimination and expression of diversity as an ongoing angle of media coverage.

Through this approach applied to sport coverage, MARS wants to encourage innovative modes of media content production that could be reproduced in all media sectors and used by any form of media coverage. By stimulating media cross-practices in the field of training, ethics and production, MARS aims at implementing an inclusive and intercultural approach to media content production. To achieve these outcomes, the MARS programme offers media professionals (journalism students and trainers, journalists, media managers, etc.) to participate in **National and European Media Encounters** and **Media Work Exchanges** conceived as first steps towards a European media network against racism and for intercultural dialogue.

More – www.coe.int/mars !