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New media owners in Slovakia in recent years

WJS/corruption and media
New media owners in Slovakia
HN – Babiš
PENTA – SME - N

Príbeh Penty nie je len o Gorile

Hoci začínali dovozom člníckeho testiku, dnes sú vlastníci Penty vplyvámi a bohatými štúdiom.
Peter Vajda a Prvá slovenská investičná skupina počas celej histórie umožňovali vedeniu denníka SME rozhodovať sa slobodne. No aj spôsob, akým sa Penta ukrytá za dcérsku firmu agentúry SITA dostala k akciám Petit Pressu, nás utvrdil v tom, že pre nich nesmíme pracovať, aj keby mali vo vydavateľstve len menšinový podiel.
### Number of articles by changing owner of SME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days</th>
<th>num/100 days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>num</td>
<td>Sme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-08</td>
<td>1827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-13</td>
<td>1826</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Number of articles by changing owner of PRAVDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days</th>
<th>num/100 days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>num</td>
<td>Sme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-10</td>
<td>1826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-13</td>
<td>1096</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Number of articles by changing owner of NOVY CAS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days</th>
<th>num/100 days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>num</td>
<td>Sme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-6/2010</td>
<td>2374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7/2010-2013</td>
<td>1279</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Number of articles by Government (corruption not marginal)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Days</th>
<th>Sme</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>Pravda</th>
<th>HN</th>
<th>All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2004-3.7.2006</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>9,62</td>
<td>4,26</td>
<td>7,32</td>
<td>6,89</td>
<td>7,02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7.2006.-7.7.2010</td>
<td>1465</td>
<td>9,22</td>
<td>2,80</td>
<td>4,78</td>
<td>4,37</td>
<td>5,29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.7.2010-3.4.2012</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>10,22</td>
<td>2,99</td>
<td>8,49</td>
<td>6,45</td>
<td>7,04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4.2012-31.12.2013</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>9,75</td>
<td>1,26</td>
<td>4,72</td>
<td>3,77</td>
<td>4,87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WJS
Political and economic factors are clearly the most important denominators of cross-national differences in the journalists’ perceptions of influences. Furthermore, perceived political influences are clearly related to objective indicators of political freedom and ownership structures across the investigated countries.

Economic influences seem to have a stronger impact in private and state-owned media than in public newsrooms, but they are not related to a country’s economic freedom.
Suphachalasai (2005): media competition appears to serve as more important tool to combat corruption than press freedom.
Freille et al. (2007) also suggest that political and economic freedoms are more relevant in generating positive outcomes in the fight against corruption than are legal restrictions on media freedom.

An ex: HU
WJS

T9 Ownership of medium
1 Purely private ownership
2 Purely public ownership
3 Purely state ownership
4 Mixed ownership but mostly private
5 Mixed ownership but mostly public
6 Mixed ownership but mostly state-owned
T-9 indicator

„these are certainly not more important than others just because you think they are. This ownership classification is important when you study foreign vs. domestic ownership, but they are not important per se."
it does not matter so much whether it is Purely private ownership OR Mixed ownership but mostly private, etc

(although it **may matter when it is non-profit based such as the Guardian**, which is, however, again a special category of ownership)
WJS

not so much about "owned" by state but rather funded by Parliament (state) or established by law..

and/or municipalities (BTW, is this seen as public or state owned?)
but what matters more whether it is FOREIGN, mixed or DOMESTIC (and here whether it is either exclusively focused at media busines or media busines is just a sort of side-busines).
And

whether it is either exclusively focused at media business or media business is just a sort of side-business
Foreign ownership is especially important to Slovakia and several other countries, while it is of little relevance to Germany, the US and others.
RESEARCH
The results show the influence of media owners and business owners supports the freedom of journalists in selecting their own stories. More influence of business people is associated with more freedom of journalists in aspects emphasized in the stories and in the frequency the journalists participate in newsroom coordination.

In SA, the results suggest that the influence of media owners seems to lessen journalists' freedom to select news and to emphasize certain news aspects, and coordination. Moreover, the perceived level of influence of business people in SA did not statistically significantly relate to all three aspects of journalists' freedom.
UEA. 2013. Media outlets and their moguls: why concentrated individual or family ownership is bad for editorial independence.

Prasa niemieckich wydawców w debacie publicznej

(German Publishers, Polish Reader. Press of German Publishers in a Public Debate). Wroclaw: Wydawnictwo ATUT
PROS
AND
CONS
higher wages
better/modern equipment/technology
advanced marketing
better and more frequent journalistic training
etc.

etc.
But also

Destruction or limited a local advertising market for local media etc.
The qualification in this last recommendation is important. Minimizing owner influence is rarely the only, or even the major, concern when regulating the media. Whilst owner influence of the kind we discuss here is one type of non-pecuniary benefit, or amenity potential, of media ownership, there are other non-pecuniary benefits which are more socially beneficial. To return to the example with which this article started, one important factor in Rupert Murdoch’s successful acquisition of the Times and the Sunday Times was his desire, forcefully stated and by all accounts sincere, to maintain both papers as important and prestigious titles. The non-pecuniary benefit to Murdoch of maintaining both titles has led to considerable losses for News International (News Corporation’s British subsidiary), which one estimate put at one million pounds weekly (Sabbagh, 2012). If access to a wide range of titles is valuable in democracies, this is one non-pecuniary benefit which we might wish to encourage by concentrated individual ownership.
LESSON LEARNED....?