

Second progress report
by the Study Commission on the Internet and Digital Society*

Media literacy

*Set up according to a Bundestag decision of 4 March 2010 (Bundestag printed paper 17/950)

Contents

Page

- Introduction 4**
- 1 Current situation..... 5**
 - 1.1 Remit..... 5**
 - 1.1.1 Basic outline 5**
 - 1.1.2 Defining media literacy 5**
 - 1.2 Current situation..... 7**
 - 1.2.1 Media literacy projects and initiatives..... 7**
 - 1.2.2 Media literacy research..... 7**
- 2 Major issues and objectives 8**
 - 2.1 Current key issues 8**
 - 2.1.1 Values and principles..... 8**
 - 2.1.2 The opportunities of interactive media 9**
 - 2.1.3 The risks inherent to interactive media..... 12**
 - 2.1.3.1 The risks of interacting with other users 12**
 - 2.1.3.2 The threat of harmful content and programmes 13**
 - 2.1.3.3 Media addiction and prevention 14**
 - 2.1.3.4 Structural deficits 15**
- 3 Protection of minors 16**
 - 3.1 Status quo of statutory protection of minors from harmful media 16**
 - 3.2 Guiding principle: Relationship between protection of minors (from harmful media) and media literacy..... 17**
 - 3.3 Guiding principle: Statutory protection of minors between entitlement to protection and practicability..... 18**
 - 3.4 The role of age ratings 19**
 - 3.4.1 Offline media / Youth Protection Act..... 19**
 - 3.4.2 Online media / Interstate Treaty on the Protection of Minors in the Media..... 19**
 - 3.4.3 International problems..... 19**
 - 3.5 Thoughts on further developing the technology-based protection of minors 20**
 - 3.5.1 Self-rating 20**
 - 3.5.2 Software to protect minors and the role parents play 21**
 - 3.5.3 The approval problem 21**
- 4 Media literacy target groups 21**
 - 4.1 Preschool children 21**
 - 4.2 Schoolchildren..... 22**
 - 4.3 Students 24**
 - 4.4 Teaching staff 24**

4.5 University teaching staff.....	25
4.6 Parents.....	26
4.7 People with an immigrant background	27
4.8 People with disabilities	29
4.9 Senior citizens	30
4.10 Journalists and multipliers.....	33
4.11 The unemployed.....	34
4.12 The employed	34
5 Recommendations for action and other key questions	35
5.1 General	35
5.2 Objectives	35
5.3 Media literacy projects and initiatives.....	36
5.4 Media literacy research.....	39
5.5 Further issues	40
6 Dissenting opinions and supplements	42
Appendices	44
1. Media literacy projects, initiatives and institutions	44
2: The public hearing on media literacy	
by the Study Commission on the Internet and Digital Society.....	60
Bibliography and references	61

Introduction

Media literacy – is it just another one of those buzzwords that are here today and gone tomorrow? Some people sneer at the concept of media literacy, whereas others consider it to be the solution to all our problems, from providing education opportunities to protecting minors. Clearly, the word is heavy with associations.

Much has already been achieved. Our research has shown that there is a vast number of wonderful projects and initiatives related to media literacy. To everyone who has been working in this area, some of whom have been at it for many, many years, thank you very much for your great work!

But, given this large number of initiatives, why does it seem that there is still a lot to be done in the area of media literacy?

Part of the reason may be that media literacy is the only remaining answer to many complex questions. These mainly apply to the protection of minors. Today, there is no technology that can prevent minors from accessing age-inappropriate content on the internet. Many youngsters are clever enough to get around technological controls and filters. The study commission therefore is advocating more than simple warnings on parental control software to remind parents that just installing a program will not solve all their problems.

But if technological solutions cannot help, what can? The commission agreed that children and teenagers should continue to be protected from particularly horrible images because the intense emotional stress these may trigger cannot be compensated by intellectual means alone. So what is needed? Responsibility, parental responsibility – nothing can replace it. Yet many parents have a hard time meeting this responsibility because of all the many and various technological issues. That is why we need to direct our media literacy efforts at parents much more than in the past. The same goes for new challenges to the protection of minors, such as cyber-bullying, sexual advances, fraud and identity theft.

Yet media literacy is about more than avoiding risks; it is also about taking advantage of opportunities – especially for education. Our work has revealed that computer and internet use in schools is still unsatisfactory in the year 2011. The problem is often compared to the question of the chicken and the egg.

Why train teachers if there is no technology to use, and why invest in hardware when teachers have not received sufficient training?

The study commission's proposed solution is a crucial, central point: stop equipping schools and start equipping pupils. Every schoolchild should receive a laptop or tablet PC of his or her own, affordably produced in large batches and funded in part by the federal government. When all pupils are bringing these computers to class to learn, everyone will be forced to deal with the internet and to use the educational opportunities of the web across all subject areas.

Those are just a few highlights from this far-reaching report, which was written primarily for practitioners and which offers concrete proposals. But alongside the recommendations for action, new key questions arise, such as "In what areas does the internet require us to change the way we think?" At the end is a comprehensive appendix with many great projects and initiatives that can be regarded as best practice models.

To conclude, I would like to say thank you, most particularly to the experts whose hard work has enabled the success of this project. I am also grateful to all those who made suggestions on our website, enquetebeteiligung.de. We have incorporated many of these in our recommendations for action. At the start of many of our discussions, it looked like several of our positions were irreconcilable, but after long, intense debate, we often found common ground. Thank you all for helping to create this constructive working environment.

Thomas Jarzombek, Member of the Bundestag (CDU/CSU)

Chairman of the Media Literacy project group of the Study Commission on the Internet and Digital Society

1 Current situation

1.1 Remit

1.1.1 Basic outline

In the area of media literacy, the Study Commission on the Internet and Digital Society understands its role as follows:

- The commission acknowledges that a variety of valuable initiatives successfully promoting media literacy already exist in the Federal Republic of Germany. These are run by a wide range of organisations at municipal, state or national level. Some receive government funding, some are public broadcasting initiatives, some involve cooperation with industry, and others are purely citizens' initiatives.
- The study commission is not restricted to monitoring federal legislative and administrative powers. As a German Bundestag commission, its main focus is, of course, on the situation in Germany as a whole and on making appropriate recommendations for action at this level. It was set up with the aim of focusing exclusively on internet-based communication. This narrows its scope (by excluding other types of media) in one respect, but widens it in another (by looking beyond conventional media), in contrast to traditional reviews of media literacy. In presenting its results, the study commission mainly aims to suggest specific recommendations that can be expected to have a positive effect on teaching and promoting media literacy.
- Literacy generally becomes an issue whenever it is found to be inadequate. So far, these initiatives have mainly focused on children and young people, but many studies, including the public hearing on media literacy organised by the study commission in December 2010, have shown that as this target group is growing up with interactive media, it often has greater technological expertise than adult users. Although technical expertise on its own is not enough, it provides a basis for understanding and getting to grips with new media. So as well as focusing on children and young people, the study commission will assess the extent to which different groups of adults have the necessary skills to harness the internet's full potential.

- The study commission is aware that activities protecting minors from harmful media and activities promoting media literacy are closely interlinked. Protecting minors from harmful media is not just about shielding them from danger – it is also, and perhaps primarily, about enabling each person to make the best possible use of new communication methods in their own lives.

Media literacy is a very popular yet also normatively loaded term, which is used very differently and rather vaguely by politicians, academics and media specialists alike.⁹ The following considerations aim to provide a useful definition of the term for the purposes of the study commission's work, to enable adequate descriptions of the problems at hand, and to develop a range of possible solutions to them.

1.1.2 Defining media literacy

An initial working definition of media literacy could be the ability to use media "correctly" and "appropriately", and it can therefore be seen as a key skill in present-day society.¹⁰ The inclusion of the word "correctly" shows that this definition has a normative element, which adds certain preconditions to any study of media literacy.

In academic debate, the term "media literacy" not only refers to manual and technical skills; it comprises a wide range of cognitive, affective and conative (i.e. related to thinking, feeling and acting) skills.¹¹ For example, media literate individuals should be able to read texts, understand how technical processes interrelate, and know about the economic and legal structures of the media. They should also be able to set up an account on a social media platform and critically analyse the effects this may have on their personality.¹²

The filtering skills required (to make appropriate search requests and select useful search results) in order to acquire information or knowledge and take part in society, and the need to keep up with constantly changing forms of new media, highlight a

⁹ Cf. Jarren, Otfried / Wassmer, Christian, "Medienkompetenz – Begriffsanalyse und Modell", *medien + erziehung*, Issue 03/2009, pp. 46–51

¹⁰ Cf. Gapski, Harald (ed.), *Medienkompetenz. Eine Bestandsaufnahme und Vorüberlegungen zu einem systemtheoretischen Rahmenkonzept*. Wiesbaden: 2001

¹¹ Cf. Groeben, Norbert, "Anforderungen an die theoretische Konzeptualisierung von Medienkompetenz", Groeben, Norbert / Hurrelmann, Bettina (eds.), *Medienkompetenz. Voraussetzungen, Dimensionen, Funktionen*. Weinheim: 2002, pp. 11–22

¹² Cf. Jarren, Otfried / Wassmer, Christian: loc. cit., p. 47

problem of this definition of media literacy. This expertise is not something that can be acquired once and for all; it requires constant training and development. It is hardly surprising that terms that emphasise an understanding of media, like *Medienbildung* (media education) in Germany or media literacy at international level, have become commonplace.

The term “media education” refers to the process by which various players working at different levels make a specific contribution to developing media literacy. According to the report on media education published by the expert commission of the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research in March 2009 “the term ‘media literacy’ is used in the public sphere in an overblown and often simplified way. With regard to academic disciplines, the fields of media teaching and (media) information technology in particular have formulated highly divergent concepts of media literacy.” That is why “the expert commission advocates a comprehensive view of media education” and has chosen this broader term.¹³

New types of communication repeatedly raise the question of what exactly “appropriate” media skills are. The phenomenon of the social web is a good current example of this. Here, users not only call up much larger amounts of information than on other services, but also have the option of posting information themselves for varying purposes. This has created new types of online activity, which are known in academia as “identity management”, “relationship management” and information “management”.¹⁴

In academia, there have been several attempts to define the term “media literacy”. According to the Bielefeld model of Baacke,¹⁵ media literacy has four dimensions:

- Media criticism
- Media usage
- Media knowledge

¹³ Quote from a report by a BMBF expert commission entitled *Medienbildung: Kompetenzen in einer digital geprägten Kultur. Medienbildung für die Persönlichkeitsentwicklung, für die gesellschaftliche Teilhabe und für die Entwicklung von Ausbildungs- und Erwerbsfähigkeit*, March 2009, p. 2 ff.

¹⁴ Cf. Schmidt, Jan-Hinrik / Paus-Hasebrink, Ingrid / Hasebrink, Uwe (eds.), *Heranwachsen mit dem Social Web. Zur Rolle von Web 2.0- Angeboten im Alltag von Jugendlichen und jungen Erwachsenen*. Berlin: 2009

¹⁵ Cf. Baacke, Dieter: “Medienkompetenz als Netzwerk. Reichweite und Fokussierung eines Begriffs, der Konjunktur hat”, *Medien praktisch*, Volume 2/1996, pp. 4–10

- Media design

The model by Groeben¹⁶ differentiates more finely as follows:

- Media knowledge / media awareness
- Reception patterns specific to different media
- The ability to enjoy media
- The ability to criticise media
- Selecting/combining media usages
- (Productive) participation patterns and follow-up communication

Building on this, Jarren and Wassmer¹⁷ suggest defining media literacy firstly in terms of the medium itself, secondly in terms of the individual using it and thirdly in terms of other individuals or groups. This leads to a three-level model in media literacy, divided into:

- Instrumental media literacy (related to the activity)
- Reflexive media literacy (related to the individual)
- Communicative media literacy (related to the social aspects)

Instrumental media literacy is regarded on the one hand as the ability to understand how to use media to satisfy individual needs and on the other as the ability to become a full member of the media society and to actively participate – whether individually or as part of a group – in shaping it. The authors understand reflexive media literacy as the ability to critically analyse one’s own use of the media and its consequences. Communicative media literacy is the ability to actively communicate these previous two areas of competence to a third party. Media literacy should therefore be defined as a process that must be constantly updated. At the same time, it must always be conveyed anew and in different social contexts.¹⁸

To find out where action is required, we will use some distinctions based on considerations published by a working group at Digital UK in cooperation with the British media and telecommunications

¹⁶ Cf. Groeben, Norbert: loc. cit., pp. 11–22

¹⁷ Cf. Jarren, Otfried / Wassmer, Christian: loc. cit., pp. 46–51

¹⁸ Overview of other suggestions on dimensions of literacy in Gapski, Harald (ed.), *Medienkompetenzen messen? Verfahren und Reflexionen zur Erfassung von Schlüsselkompetenzen*. Munich/Düsseldorf: 2006, p. 17

regulatory authority Ofcom in 2009.¹⁹ This distinguishes between the following levels:

- Possibility: This means having all the technological prerequisites for inclusion in the information society.
- Ability: This relates to acquiring and developing skills needed in different circumstances.
- Activity: This refers to skills that allow active use of media.

Based on these levels, it is possible to investigate the requirements of certain groups, pinpoint deficits and ultimately identify ways of promoting media literacy.

1.2 Current situation

1.2.1 Media literacy projects and initiatives

There are already a plethora of trans-regional and regional projects and initiatives for promoting media literacy in children, teenagers and adults in Germany. They are mostly funded by the government, but also partly by the EU. The Appendix provides a list of examples of educational media projects and activities offered by state media institutions and their focal activities in the relevant state, as well as corresponding initiatives at national level and by the public broadcasting authorities.²⁰

At this point, we would also like to refer to the longstanding work of the Society for Media Education and Communications Culture (GMK),²¹ the D21 initiative²² and the *Bericht über Möglichkeiten zur Stärkung der Medienkompetenz bei Kindern und Jugendlichen, Eltern sowie Fachkräften in Schulen und in der Kinder- und Jugendarbeit* (“Report on ways to increase media literacy in children, teenagers, parents and professionals working in schools, childcare and youth groups”) of March 2010 by the interdepartmental working group on media literacy,

¹⁹ Cf. Ofcom/Digital UK, Report of the Digital Britain Media Literacy Working Group, March 2009

²⁰ Cf. Appendix 1 “Media literacy projects, initiatives and institutions”. The list contains information provided on request by the responsible state and public broadcasting institutions as well as the working group of the state media authorities of the Federal Republic of Germany (ed.), special publication “Medienkompetenz. Förderung, Projekte und Initiativen der Landesmedienanstalten”, *ALM Jahrbuch 2009/2010. Landesmedienanstalten und privater Rundfunk in Deutschland*. Augsburg: 2010

²¹ Cf. <http://www.gmk-net.de>

²² Cf. <http://www.initiatived21.de>

which includes representatives of the Conference of Interior Ministers and other Specialised Ministers’ Conferences, and other experts.²³

1.2.2 Media literacy research

Concerning research on children and adolescents, and taking the findings on their media usage as the basis for all other considerations about necessary skills, we are in the fortunate position in Germany that continually updated basic data is available thanks to the regular studies of the *Medienpädagogischer Forschungsverbund Südwest* (Media teaching research association for south-west Germany). These take the form of what is known as the KIM study for children aged between six and 13 years and the JIM study for 12-to-19-year-olds. The surveys ask participants targeted questions about their computer and internet usage and their use of end devices.

Gaining a greater understanding of how internet use compares internationally is the focus of the EU funded project EU Kids Online, which also closely investigates children and teenagers’ negative experiences online and thereby identifies possible areas for improving literacy.

Until now only relatively few studies have tried to provide empirical results on media usage and literacy.²⁴ Although media literacy research has identified factors that influence competent media usage,²⁵ it has been observed that many factors can impact either way and may be interpreted either as inhibiting or promoting media literacy. These factors include age, socio-economic status, education and

²³ Cf. Media Literacy working group, *Bericht über Möglichkeiten zur Stärkung der Medienkompetenz bei Kindern und Jugendlichen, Eltern sowie Fachkräften in Schulen und in der Kinder- und Jugend-arbeit*, inter-departmental Media Literacy working group with representatives of the Conference of Interior Ministers, Conference of Justice Ministers, Conference of Youth and Family Affairs Ministers, Conference of Work and Social Affairs Ministers, Conference of Ministers for Culture and other experts, March 2010

²⁴ Cf. Treumann, Klaus Peter / Baacke, Dieter / Haacke, Kirsten / Hugger, Kai-Uwe / Vollbrecht, Ralf, *Medienkompetenz im digitalen Zeitalter. Wie die neuen Medien das Leben und Lernen Erwachsener verändern*, in cooperation with Oliver Kurz. Opladen: 2002 and Treumann, Klaus Peter / Meister, Dorothee M. / Sander, Uwe et al., *Medienhandeln Jugendlicher. Medien-nutzung und Medienkompetenz. Bielefelder Kompetenzmodell*. Wiesbaden: 2007

²⁵ Cf. Livingstone, Sonia / Van Couvering, Elizabeth / Thumim, Nancy, *Adult Media Literacy. A review of the research literature*, on behalf of Ofcom. 2005, London. Available online at: http://www.ofcom.org.uk/advice/media_literacy/medlitpub/medlitpubrss/aml.pdf

gender. Generally speaking, the older people are and the less education they have, the less likely they are to take advantage of the possibilities offered by the various media, which in turn has an impact on other skill areas.²⁶

Due to the practical significance of media literacy in society, state media authorities and federal ministries (along with the organisations usually responsible for promoting research, such as the German Research Foundation [DFG]) play a significant role in funding research in this area. There is some evidence – though this should be treated with caution – that this has led to a trend for research to focus on specific problems or phenomena. As a result, there are research gaps in long-term studies.

Furthermore, it has been noted that empirical studies often produce heterogeneous results, sometimes leading participants in political and legal discussions to jump to the conclusion that science is not able to offer any insights here. Many studies also culminate directly in recommendations for action in media teaching. This is often a core component of studies carried out by state media institutions.

2 Major issues and objectives

2.1 Current key issues

Mid-term trends in the media sector impact the media literacy debate in a variety of ways. They can bring new skills to the fore, influence implementation concepts and even spark a complete rethink of overarching media literacy principles.

Today's most important trends include:

- **Mobility:** Due in particular to the popularity of smartphones, internet usage is less and less restricted to a particular place. We can now use a variety of communication methods at any time, liberating them from the social contexts in which they were traditionally used.
- **Activity:** Often referred to under the generalised term “Web 2.0”, social media such as networking platforms and portals for downloading content, as well as various types of computer games, have transformed the way we use the media. Instead of simply being receptive, passive users, we have become active and productive media consumers.

- **Community-oriented behaviour and networking:** Many of the most popular internet services today are groups and communities, and these are particularly – although not only – appealing to children and young people. Between the private sphere in the strictest sense and the public sphere created by the mass media, there now exists a kind of public-private sphere, which users can shape any way they want.

All these developments entail both opportunities and risks, and this is precisely why they are relevant to the debate on media literacy.

2.1.1 Values and principles

The study commission's goal is to help optimise the framework in place in our society for acquiring media literacy. This should result in individuals improving their ability to use media – particularly interactive media – to ensure they are able to confidently determine and decide their own media environment. Specifically, this also includes the ability to produce and distribute media content oneself, although individuals should be free to choose how much they use the media, and for what purposes.

The study commission wants to see users becoming sophisticated and confident; it wants them, for example, to be able to use media creatively while acting responsibly with their own personal information and respectfully with that of others. The study commission expressly wants people to use interactive media in a number of various ways, to act as both senders and receivers, as consumers and producers, and as teachers and learners. According to the study commission's understanding of the term, “media literacy” means that users approach a medium with a certain level of maturity and responsibility. At an individual level, this means actively working with media on the one hand, viewing information reviewed critically and, on the other, creatively producing one's own media content. The commission considers the ability to create and distribute content a core aspect of media literacy.

The study commission also believes that media literacy is a social skill. Media create a kind of social reference system that enables individuals to understand complex social processes and to act in a socially responsible fashion.²⁷

²⁶ Cf. Süß, Daniel / Lampert, Claudia / Wijnen, Christien, *Medienpädagogik. Ein Studienbuch zur Einführung*. Wiesbaden: 2010

²⁷ Dissenting opinion by parliamentary groups of the SPD, The Left Party and Alliance 90/The Greens, as well as the experts Dr Wolfgang Schulz, Alvar Freude and Annette Mühlberg: “Media

2.1.2 The opportunities of interactive media

Interactive media offer a wide range of opportunities, but they also carry specific risks for various user groups. Naturally, how these risks are assessed varies according to who is being asked – the users themselves or someone else, such as a parent or teacher.

The value of internet-based communications

An important starting point for the study commission's work was recognising that children and young people now consider the internet to be a useful tool and an indispensable enrichment to their social lives and learning environment. In other words, the internet has become a part of normal everyday life for children and teenagers. That means that the assessments and expectations of children and young people are dominated by positive experiences and a desire for the internet to be more fully integrated into their school and training environments.

Important insight on children and teenagers' use of interactive media has come from two long-term projects carried out by the *Medienpädagogischer Forschungsverbund Südwest*: the KIM (Children + Media, Computer + Internet) and JIM studies (Youth, information [multi]media).²⁸ In addition, in 2010 the first results of EU Kids Online II were published – a Europe-wide study involving more than 23,000 nine to 16-year-olds in 25 European states.²⁹ The Federal Association for Information Technology, Telecommunications and New Media e.V. (BITKOM) also publishes regular studies showing how various population groups are using the internet. Its most recent study was Jugend 2.0 (Youth 2.0).³⁰ The studies named above show, for example, that in 2010 young people aged 12 to 19 spent an average of 138 minutes on the internet each day (JIM 2010). Younger children, too, are spending more time online. The primary carers surveyed

estimated that children aged 6 to 13 spend an average of 24 minutes online each day. A quarter of children in this age group cannot imagine doing without computers and the internet (KIM 2010). The current KIM study shows that the importance children attribute to the internet increases with their age. Younger children still chose the television as the medium that they would least like to do without, whereas the majority of children aged 12 to 13 were more in favour of keeping the internet.

The BITKOM Jugend 2.0 questionnaire confirmed these findings and provided more differentiated information:

- 43 percent of children and teenagers stated that they could not imagine life without the internet. This percentage rose to 55 percent among the group of 16-to-18-year-olds.
- 98 percent of teenagers said that friendships were particularly important to them and 96 percent said the same of family – 86 percent said this of internet access.
- That means that internet access is almost as important to young people as, for example, getting good grades at school (93 percent).

These findings show that children and teenagers now see the internet as a normal part of their everyday lives. Their view of the internet as a completely normal thing has implications for how they assess its opportunities and risks. One young internet user encapsulated this nonchalant attitude during a conference at a workshop entitled *Das Internet in Kinderaugen* (The internet through the eyes of a child) involving users of fragFINN, a search engine aimed at children, with the words “The internet's nothing special, but it's okay.”³¹

The JIM and the EU Kids Online studies have shown that children and teenagers most frequently use the internet for doing schoolwork and for learning. The JIM study from 2010 states: “In the context of school and leisure purposes, just under half of young people gave their main reasons for using computers and the internet as learning at home and doing schoolwork.”³² Also, 84 percent of respondents to the EU Kids Online survey stated that they use the internet for school.

literacy also includes awareness of information technology's ability to influence (social) norms, knowledge of how technology, law and the economy interrelate, and of (technical) control mechanisms. This knowledge aids individuals in their personal interaction with information and communications technologies, and is a requirement for the responsible design of IT infrastructures, organisation of work processes and introduction of software.”

²⁸ Cf. <http://www.mpfs.de/index.php?id=192> (for KIM) and <http://www.mpfs.de/index.php?id=181> (for JIM)

²⁹ Cf. <http://www.eukidsonline.de>

³⁰ The results of the study are summarised on: http://www.bitkom.org/files/documents/BITKOM_Studie_Jugend_2.0.pdf. This page provides more details about the results for different age groups.

³¹ Cf. Barcamp on the Netzpolitischen Kongress 2010, *Das Internet in Kinderaugen – ein Expertengespräch*, 3 and 4 November 2010 in Berlin

³² Quote from Medienpädagogischer Forschungsverbund Südwest, *JIM-Studie 2010*, p. 34

The Jugend 2.0 study by BITKOM yielded the following findings about respondents' positive experiences of the internet:

- 38 percent confirmed that they had been able to improve their performance in school or training thanks to using the internet. 64 percent of children and teenagers stated that they were able to expand their knowledge thanks to the internet.
- 28 percent had made new friends through the internet.

But the investigations also provided insight into their negative experiences on the internet. Every fourth teenager said that a friend of theirs had been “bullied” online (JIM 2010). But the questionnaires also revealed that young people's and parents' perceptions of the threats are not the same as those that are the topics of public debate. According to the 2010 JIM study, young people are more wary of issues like scams, data abuse/manipulation and viruses than, for example, being targeted sexually.

In March 2010 another BITKOM study entitled Connected World³³ looked at how lifestyle and technology have become fused in Germany. Unlike Jugend 2.0, this survey also considered adults, including senior citizens. The results were striking:

- 58 percent of respondents could not imagine life without the internet. It is the most important media for a remarkable proportion (86 percent) of 14-to-19-year-olds.
- 62 percent stated that using the internet had improved their general knowledge; 51 percent said it had helped their professional training.
- 44 percent had used the internet to establish professional contacts, 57 percent had used it to revive friendships, and 46 percent had used it to enhance their leisure time and get more involved in their hobbies.
- 48 percent of internet users stated that they turn to reviews by other consumers for advice before making a major purchase. This figure jumped to 65 percent among internet users over the age of 65.

The study also showed that the majority of respondents (72 percent of men and 70 percent of women) had never had any negative experiences

³³ The results of the study are summarised on: http://www.bitkom.org/files/documents/BITKOM_Connected_Worlds_Extra_net.pdf

online. Only a few users had been subjected to sexual harassment, slander, lies or bullying.

The study also showed that 62 percent of 50-to-64-year-olds are internet users. However, only a third (32 percent) of those aged 65 and over are active internet users. That means that in general adults are now well connected. The digital divide remains, but has been pushed back to the 65-plus age group.

An interesting aspect of cross-generational internet use is that while in the 1990s studies showed use of online networks tended to have an isolating effect, more recent studies, such as Social Consequences of the Internet for Adolescents³⁴ now suggest that social networks are mainly used for keeping up contacts in the real world.

Overall, the opportunities for networking lie in the unhindered exchange between users and in the diversity of the information or content available online. Furthermore, interactive media open up low-threshold opportunities for conveying information, giving guidance, stimulating creativity, getting educated and taking part in social and political debate.

However, the chances offered by interactive media are restricted to those who can afford internet access and who possess the necessary technology. Any attempt to encourage social participation that does not define the internet (and access to interactive media) as a basic provision will exclude anybody who does not have the financial means to acquire internet access and the necessary technology.

Initial findings of the project *Die Bedeutung des Internets für gesellschaftliche Teilhabe – am Beispiel alltäglicher Praktiken Erwerbsloser* (“The significance of the internet for social participation, taking everyday behaviour of the unemployed as an example”) at Hamburg University of Technology (TUHH)³⁵, funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG), show, for example, that the unemployed, who are limited by financial constraints, are aware of the opportunities of the web and attempt to use them as far as possible in order to participate in society.³⁶

³⁴ Cf. Valkenburg, Patti / Peter, Jochen, *Social Consequences of the Internet for Adolescents*, University of Amsterdam 2009

³⁵ Cf. Winker, Gabriele / Englert, Kathrin / Gerbig, D. / Schwarz, Betje, *Die Bedeutung des Internets für gesellschaftliche Teilhabe am Beispiel alltäglicher Praktiken Erwerbsloser*, a project conducted by Hamburg University of Technology (TUHH) from 2009 to 2011

³⁶ Cf. Englert, Kathrin / Gerbig, D. / Schwarz, Betje, *Digitale Spaltung per Gesetz. Das Internet und soziale Ungleichheit im Alltag von Erwerbslosen*, available online at:

Media literacy in society, public life and politics

Interactive media can be used to acquire all kinds of different information. They have also given broad sections of the population many new ways to get involved politically. Interactive media are well suited to making socially significant decision-making processes more transparent and easier to understand. At the same time, they allow people to make their opinions heard and thus influence public debates, mainly by allowing them to communicate directly with one another irrespective of time or location.

We saw recently in Tunisia and Egypt, for example, how the mobilisation and networking of people via interactive media can bring about political change. Eye witness reports posted on interactive media are important sources of information from trouble spots, particularly when traditional forms of journalism are impeded by work bans and censorship. During Barack Obama's 2008 campaign for the US presidency, his supporters were organised and motivated via interactive media, meaning that the campaign messages quickly reached an extraordinarily large number of people. The e-petitions used by the German Bundestag also show the potential of online participation in the political process.³⁷ In addition, citizens are more likely to participate in municipal decision-making processes if the necessary information and materials are available and accessible online – whatever the time and wherever they happen to be. But it is not only the near-limitless possibilities for disseminating information and opportunities to participate in social processes through commentaries, forums, self-created blogs and online networks that show how important media literacy is for democratic participation. The fact that more and more decision-making processes are becoming entirely or at least partially digital shows just how crucial it is for citizens to be able to use interactive media with confidence. These purely digitally services range from information and guidance for making applications at job centres, insurance providers, banks, etc. to opinion-forming and participation processes, such as public consultations, participatory

budgeting, referendums and even elections. The latter are still rarely carried out online, but internet-based citizen participation projects and virtual local associations for clubs and parties do exist – and their numbers are growing all the time.

Media literacy in education, business and working life

Media literacy is considered an interdisciplinary skill. It needs to be regarded as an educational norm – something that is needed to gain professional qualifications and to start work in any independent business venture. It is now standard practice for businesses in all sectors to assume that employees have the skills necessary for using IT in general and the internet in particular, in addition to the specific expertise needed for the job itself, when they join a company, and that they will not require initial training in this area. In the IT sector, media literacy skills often make up the most important part of professional qualifications.

Taking this into consideration, media literacy – both as an understanding of how to use information technology and as a skill needed for evaluating online content – is an issue of considerable economic importance for Germany. Media literacy is a key requirement in the high-tech sector and a basic requirement in nearly all other economic sectors right through to craft trades. The study commission therefore views as positive the fact that children and young people regard the internet and its use as a normal part of everyday life and as something closely intertwined with many other aspects of their lives.

As mentioned above, in addition to being an understanding of how to use IT, the term “media literacy” also comprises the ability to understand the economic opportunities inherent in these new media. Germany still does not have an entrepreneurial culture like that of the US, and this is particularly true of the media, IT and internet sector. The reasons for this include, on the one hand, a lack of structural incentives and, on the other, an inadequate focus on business skills in schools and universities.

The confident use of interactive media in education and business presents educational institutions and companies with new opportunities for working together:

- Greater potential for sharing knowledge and skills within institutions and organisations such as schools, universities and companies

http://events.ccc.de/congress/2010/Fahrplan/attachments/1727_Paper_Digitale%20Spaltung%20per%20Gesetz.pdf

³⁷ When applying to be set up on 3 March 2010 (Bundestag printed paper 17/950), the Study Commission on the Internet and Digital Society also committed to “[involve] the public in its work to a considerable degree” and to offer means of public participation “that allow the public’s comments and suggestions to flow into the commission’s work in an appropriate manner”, <https://www.enquetebeteiligung.de/>.

- A new culture of learning and teaching using interactive media
- Networking between pupils, trainees, students and workers, regardless of time and location, particularly within decentralised and/or international structures
- A dynamic and innovative environment for creating new business models and further developing existing ones, thanks to constant technical innovations
- Greater opportunities for further training and development (for example, at online seminars or in virtual academies)

From an educational policy and economics point of view, media literacy is regarded as an interdisciplinary skill. As it comprises theoretical and – in this age of digital interactive media – ever more practical skills, media literacy includes the technical skills needed for using the programmes and devices associated with interactive media alongside the basic abilities traditionally required for inclusion in society (reading, writing and arithmetic).

In addition, media literacy encompasses cognitive skills, such as the ability to appropriately filter online content according to, for example, relevance, the vested interests of the information providers, and users' own personal interests. Media literacy training should not focus too heavily on the use of specific types of media, as the pace of digital development and the introduction of new forms of media is only set to increase. The focus should always lie on conveying a fundamental understanding of these media.

The breadth of information, the possibility of performing targeted searches and gaining expert information beyond the general public's attention, and the fact that more and more information is being made available primarily or even exclusively online (for example via open access projects) demonstrate that media literacy has become a prerequisite for accessing and using knowledge in the digital age. In this respect, media literacy is equivalent to information literacy.

2.1.3 The risks inherent to interactive media

2.1.3.1 The risks of interacting with other users

The risks associated with interactive media can be grouped into two categories. Firstly, there are the risks of users being confronted by threats, criminal

behaviour or interference from external sources. Secondly, a lack of expertise or skill increases the risk that users will have negative online experiences relating to their personal development or interaction with others. Problems in either area can have social, personal, legal, financial or technical consequences.

It is important to recognise that problematic content or illegal/criminal behaviour associated with interactive media are not caused by the media themselves but are always the result of human behaviour.

The following section outlines some of the potential risks in both categories.

The current debate on the risks of interactive media, particularly as far as children and teenagers are concerned, is dominated by issues like cyber-bullying, grooming, and the dangers of divulging personal information. As with most of the risks mentioned below, bullying is not a new phenomenon created by the digital society – it has simply found a new form of expression on the internet, as has also been the case with mobile phones.

Cyber-bullying is particularly prevalent on social networks and in forums, and may take the form of slander, defamation of character, harassment or coercion by, for example, fellow pupils, who can use false names or avatars³⁸ to conceal their identity. Grooming is the targeted sexual harassment of young people via the internet. According to recent studies (such as Jugend 2.0, KIM 2010 and EU Kids Online), this phenomenon is less common than the attention it receives in the public sphere would suggest. Studies also show that sexual harassment is most often carried out by peers in the same age group.

Young people can avoid these dangers by handling their personal information with care as well as by demonstrating personal awareness and a healthy suspicion of strangers. Generally, it is advisable to divulge as little personal information as possible and, before each instance of passing on personal information, to evaluate what the benefits and consequences might be. Even though the value of and necessity for a private sphere seems to be diminishing at the moment, it is still better to be careful with such information.

The BITKOM study Jugend 2.0 also looked at the above-mentioned risks of the internet. One in five respondents said they had been harassed or abused at

³⁸ Note: An avatar is a graphical representation of a person on the internet.

least once via the internet. Eight percent of the young people surveyed said that lies had been spread about them on the internet. The number of negative experiences such as sexual advances (usually by coevals), scams (while shopping online, for example) and the publishing of embarrassing photos by a third party increases with age and heightened internet use. While eight percent of the 16-to-18-year-old respondents had experienced these problems, they were rarely mentioned by children aged 10 to 12.

2.1.3.2 The threat of harmful content and programmes

We now have some insight into minors' negative experiences online – thanks in particular to the above-mentioned KIM, JIM, EU Kids Online and BITKOM studies.

The latest KIM study shows that eight percent of children who use the internet have come across images, information or other content that they found unpleasant. Three percent said they had come across content that frightened them and 16 percent said they had been on websites that they themselves would deem to be unsuitable for children. Of this unpleasant, frightening or unsuitable content, 54 percent featured erotic or pornographic material, 20 percent included scenes of violence or brutality, and nine percent were horror videos.

The reality is that, just as with other types of media, on the internet children and teenagers may unintentionally come across age-inappropriate content including depictions of violence, war or pornography. The EU Kids Online study, for example, comes to the conclusion that an average 12 percent of European children that use the internet have had negative experiences online. "At eight percent, the number of German children who have had negative online experiences is lower than the European average."³⁹

In terms of economic threats, the internet poses the risk that users may end up with unwanted subscriptions and incur costs they did not plan for. These traps not only affect children and teenagers but all active online user groups. In addition, there are repeated cases of children and teenagers unwittingly posting copyrighted works on online file-sharing sites.

Easier to define are the dangers presented by computer viruses, worms and Trojans, which all aim

to plant software on third-party computers.

Computer viruses and worms then try to spread via the infected computer. While viruses generally alter files on the affected computer (e.g. start programmes, boot sectors), worms do not usually manipulate content. Trojan horses, or Trojans for short, are computer programmes that pose as more or less useful applications and then carry out other functions without the user knowing.

Today, the main aim of viruses, worms and Trojans is to set up so-called botnets. This can result in thousands or even millions of computers' capacities (processing power, network connection, etc.) being placed at the disposal of the person behind the attack. Security service providers estimate that some botnets may consist of up to 30 million computers.⁴⁰ These are normally used to send spam mail, to attack servers or to crack passwords. Owners of infected computers often do not notice the infection and unwittingly spread it further.

Spyware, on the other hand, is software that aims to spy on users in order to determine their online habits and then to target them with advertising. Scareware is also becoming increasingly widespread. This is software whose aim is to frighten and unsettle users by, for example, warning them about a fictitious virus on their computer and offering to remove the alleged infection for a fee. In this case, the user is usually directly affected, whereas viruses, worms and Trojans mainly affect third parties.

More media-literate users know how to avoid most infections or can at least identify them. This does not just involve securely configuring the computer, but also keeping oneself informed of the dangers and closing security gaps in good time.

Phishing ("password fishing") is a related danger that attempts to lure users into divulging passwords or other information (dropping the bait and then reeling them in). Attackers may try to steal users' passwords, credit card numbers and PINs (personal identification numbers) or TANs (transaction numbers) for home banking. This is done by, for example, recreating banks' websites as realistically as possible and then asking users to enter their PINs or TANs. Attackers then use this data to carry out bank transfers themselves. These types of attacks are now often carried out with the support of Trojans that record these types of data when they are entered into an infected computer.

These risks can be significantly reduced by improving media literacy. Competent users

³⁹ Quote from
http://www.eukidsonline.de/index_erweitert.html#meldung

⁴⁰ Cf. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Botnet>

recognise phishing mails that ask them to enter their password or a PIN or TAN. Media literate users can also see when a third-party website is posing as their bank or is a fraudulent scam website.⁴¹

The consequences of inadequate media literacy

Users are not just subject to external threats; their own use of the internet and its content can also cause problems.

A lack of media literacy can have many consequences, among them a deficient and uncritical evaluation of media content. This is particularly problematic with regard to children, who often cannot tell the difference between advertising and editorial content. The simple fact that there is an enormous quantity of information online does not automatically mean that everyone is in a position to form a reasoned opinion. Instead, people may well feel overwhelmed by the vast amount of information and the number of communication channels available and choose to stick to a limited, more one-sided way of gathering information.

Users also often fail to consider how their actions may infringe on the rights of others. A lack of understanding and knowledge constantly leads to breaches of copyright and to violations of data protection and personal rights. With regard to violations of personal rights, a lack of media literacy always goes hand in hand with a lack of social skills.

Another critical aspect is how long people spend consuming media. In this regard, a lack of media literacy can lead users to lose sight of the real world and increasingly focus their attention on their movements in the virtual world. As well as potentially losing touch with social contacts and letting relationships slide – meaning they are not exposed to normal aspects of human interaction (facial expressions, body language, physical sensations) – people who use online media excessively may also suffer from physical and psychological impairments.

A lack of media literacy can also have noticeable effects on users' education, participation in society and social advancement, since the internet offers many different ways to follow social debates and make one's own contribution. In addition, media literacy has become an essential skill with great significance for scholastic, vocational and professional success.

⁴¹ Note: These issues have been thoroughly investigated by the Online Access, Structure and Security project group within the Study Commission on the Internet and Digital Society.

Achieving greater media literacy allows users to minimise or even completely avoid many of the above-mentioned risks. One of the study commission's primary objectives is therefore to develop ideas for improving media literacy among all social groups. However, it is also clear that media literacy alone cannot solve all problems associated with the risks mentioned above. It is equally important to develop better protection for young people and consumers.

Media literacy gives users digital independence. In today's knowledge and information society it has become a basic necessity for democratic participation, equal economic opportunities and free personal expression. If it is lacking, individuals cannot use media and media content to adequately meet their needs or achieve their goals.

2.1.3.3 Media addiction and prevention

The fact that interactive media offer people so many opportunities and so much entertainment is not without consequences – for example, people may become addicted to them. *Suchtmed. Suchtmedizin in Forschung und Praxis*, a specialist addiction medicine journal, reported that “Epidemiological studies show that approximately three to five percent of users are internet addicts, although no differentiated data are available on the individual forms this addictive behaviour takes.”⁴² International studies, too, show that the proportion of users categorised as addicted to the internet lies between one and, at most, five percent. The figures vary from study to study, but in general the people described as addicts spend up to 40 hours a week online, whereas people who are not considered addicted spend a maximum of 20 hours surfing the web.⁴³

The Hamburg-based Hans Bredow Institute recently conducted a survey to investigate computer game addiction in Germany. Its representative survey found that German gamers (aged 14 and above) spent an average of 6.25 hours playing computer

⁴² Cf. Müller, Kai W. / Wölfling, Klaus, “Pathologische Computerspiel- und Internetnutzung. Der Forschungsstand zu Phänomenologie, Epidemiologie, Diagnostik und Komorbidität”, *Suchtmed. Suchtmedizin in Forschung und Praxis* 12 (1/2010), pp. 45-55

⁴³ Aufenanger, Stefan, “Written statement at the official hearing on media literacy by the Study Commission on the Internet Digital Society of the German Bundestag on 13 December 2010”, Committee printed paper 17(24)014-I, p. 3., available online at: http://www.bundestag.de/internetenquete/dokumentation/Sitzungen/20101213/A-Drs__17_24_014-I_-_Stellungnahme_Univ_-_Prof__Dr__Aufenanger.pdf

games each week. “17 percent of them refer to themselves as ‘extensive gamers’ who spend more than 90 minutes playing computer games each day.” Assessing gaming behaviour using the KFN-CSAS-II video game dependency scale, the researchers found that 98.6 percent of computer gamers behaved normally, 0.9 percent were “at risk” and 0.5 percent were considered “addicted”.⁴⁴ However, the qualitative interviews carried out as part of the study showed “that there is fine line between intensive, extensive and excessive use. Gamers often look back on different phases in computer game play – sometimes back to puberty, but also often back to other periods when their time was not so regimented – when external factors (e.g. difficult life situations or a lack of social contacts) and game-related factors (e.g. the ambition to reach a certain level or score, or gaming within a social group) led to more extensive gaming.”⁴⁵

The trigger, mechanisms and symptoms of media addiction are similar to those of other non-substance addictions. The consumption of certain types of media causes the body’s reward system to kick in, when a release of dopamine leads to a sense of achievement, a feeling some people come to crave. Common signs of dependency include uncontrolled consumption for hours on end, a consistent upping of the “dose”, constantly thinking about the source of the addiction, failed attempts to cut down on consumption, and withdrawal symptoms including aggressive behaviour when the source of the addiction is not available.

Media addiction – like other addictions – does not just have negative psychological effects. It can also damage addicts’ physical health and impact on their social lives. It often leads to them neglecting their own needs, work or school commitments, and social contacts. Those affected often hide or trivialise their addictive behaviour. Some may even run into debt because of it.

So far, media addiction has received inadequate attention in society and among scientists. It has rarely been the subject of empirical research. Although there have been some informative studies, there is still a lack of sufficiently reliable data. One study carried out on behalf of the Federal Ministry of Health from 2008 to 2010 established that “an

⁴⁴ Cf. Jürgen, Fritz / Lampert, Claudia / Schmidt, Jan-Hinrik / Witting, Tanja, “Kompetenzen und exzessive Nutzung bei Computerspielern. Gefordert, gefördert, gefährdet. Zentrale Ergebnisse der Studie”, *Medienforschung* series by the Media Authority of North Rhine-Westphalia, Volume 66. Berlin: 2011, p. 1

⁴⁵ Cf. http://www.hans-bredow-institut.de/webfm_send/563

interdisciplinary longitudinal study is needed that follows children from when they start using the internet to adulthood, using methods from the fields of neurobiology, genetics and developmental psychology.”⁴⁶

We also need to get media addiction recognised as a form of addiction in its own right. The study commission regards media addiction as a distinct non-substance addiction and feels it should be recognised as an illness in accordance with the World Health Organisation’s International Classification of Diseases (ICD). The study commission thus also considers that a more comprehensive study of this illness is required.

To date, the counselling and therapy services in Germany for those afflicted with media addiction have been very limited. The preventative measure that promises the most success is to supervise children and teenagers while they interact with media. This is first and foremost the responsibility of families. However, when parents have no or very few media pedagogical skills, they must be able to fall back on the appropriate information and support. It is also important to make sure that enough qualified media education professionals and support services are available in schools, in vocational training institutions and in extra-curricular activities.

2.1.3.4 Structural deficits

The *Digitale Gesellschaft* (digital society) study carried out by the D21 Initiative in 2010⁴⁷ clearly showed that the digital divide in our society is growing qualitatively rather than quantitatively. The proportion of people unable to use the internet may be shrinking, but the skills of these digital outsiders are also deteriorating. However, above all the study shows that this digital divide is also a social divide: the outsiders are mainly low-income households. Promoting media literacy must therefore involve promoting blanket internet coverage regardless of users’ financial situation. That applies both to networks and to network-capable devices.

⁴⁶ Quote from University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf / German Center for Addiction Research in Childhood and Adolescence, *Studie für das Bundesministerium für Gesundheit zum Projekt Beratungs- und Behandlungsangebote zum pathologischen Internetgebrauch in Deutschland*. Hamburg: 2010, p. 5

⁴⁷ Cf. Initiative D21, *Digitale Gesellschaft. Die digitale Gesellschaft in Deutschland. Sechs Nutzertypen im Vergleich. Eine Sonderstudie im Rahmen des (N) Onliner Atlas*, conducted by TNS Infratest in 2010, available online at: http://www.initiaved21.de/wp-content/uploads/2010/12/Digitale_Gesellschaft_2010.pdf

At the study commission's expert hearing on media literacy on 13 December 2010, Hannes Schwaderer emphasised that people's educational opportunities should not be dependent on their social milieu or background. He went on to say that as intelligence is spread in equal measure across all social strata, it is important to give special consideration to the needs of children from socially deprived backgrounds. Access to digital learning tools should therefore always be provided by educational institutions and not be dependent on youngsters having the necessary equipment at home.⁴⁸

However, others hold the opinion that the reasons for the digital divide have less to do with access to the internet and the necessary infrastructure and more to do with the way the internet is used. They point out that differences are primarily regional or are related to users' sex, age, financial situation or level of education. For example, uneducated users are most likely to use the internet for shopping and will make little use of the opportunities for getting involved and gathering information.⁴⁹

There is a wide-ranging consensus that radio and television are not an adequate substitute for internet access. These traditional media not only lack the participative opportunities that online services offer; they have also been thoroughly outstripped in terms of their ability to provide information. Most recently, this has been evidenced in the fact that there is less spoken content on radio programmes and in the increased number of references during televised news programmes to the presence of additional information online.

The study commission is keen to find ways to bridge the digital divide as quickly as possible. The following courses of action are being considered:

- Improving the provision of IT equipment in kindergartens, schools, colleges, youth centres, universities, etc.
- Encouraging the use of e-learning services

⁴⁸ Cf. Schwaderer, Hannes, Verbal statement at the official hearing on media literacy by the Study Commission on the Internet Digital Society of the German Bundestag on 13 December 2010, Committee printed paper 17(24)014-E, p. 6, available online at: http://www.bundestag.de/internetenquete/dokumentation/Sitzungn/20101213/A-Drs_17_24_014-E_-_Stellungnahme_Schwaderer.pdf

⁴⁹ Cf. also Wagner, Ulrike / Eggert, Susanne "Quelle für Information und Wissen oder unterhaltsame Action? Bildungsbenachteiligung und die Auswirkung auf den Medienumgang Heranwachsender", *medien + erziehung*, Issue 05/2007, pp. 15–23

- Improving availability of freely accessible internet facilities that also offer guidance and assistance (particularly at work) to people of all ages
- Improving teacher training and further development
- Aligning the varying curricula and requirements of the different German states, educational authorities and science ministries
- Offering specific support to certain target groups (women, senior citizens, unemployed people, people from immigrant families, people with mental and physical disabilities, children and teenagers from uneducated families) through public and private educational institutions
- Introducing peer-to-peer concepts to alleviate the problem in the short term until the training of teachers, childcare workers and social workers takes effect.

3 Protection of minors

3.1 Status quo of statutory protection of minors from harmful media

Constitutional law requires the state to protect minors from harmful media. Relevant legal measures are based on constitutionally guaranteed human dignity in accordance with Article 1 of the Basic Law and on the free development of personality in accordance with Article 2 (1) of the Basic Law. However, measures to protect minors from harmful media also affect basic rights, especially the freedom of communication in Article 5 (1) of the Basic Law. Any intervention that occurs for the purpose of protecting minors in accordance with Article 5 (2) of the Basic Law should therefore be preceded by due consideration.

German law currently defines the protection of minors from harmful media as legal measures intended to ensure that media content that could have a negative influence on the physical, intellectual or psychological well-being of children or teenagers, or that could prevent children or teenagers developing and growing into responsible, socially competent individuals, should not be circulated by providers or should only be circulated in such a way that it does not reach people in that age group.⁵⁰

⁵⁰ Cf. Schriefers, Annette / Bischoff, Sandra, "Medienkompetenz. Eine Aufgabe nimmt Gestalt an", *Schriftenreihe der*

The current legal framework for protecting minors from harmful media is shaped by the Federal Youth Protection Act (JuSchG) and the Inter-State Treaty on the Protection of Human Dignity and the Protection of Minors in Broadcasting and Telemedia Services (JMStV). The latter went into force on 1 April 2003 and continues to apply after the failure of the 14th amending Inter-State Treaty on Broadcasting, which was last updated on 30 October 2009.

These regulations have each been applied to a specific category – physical media (JuSchG) and online media (JMStV) – yet the lines between these two categories are becoming increasingly blurred. One peculiarity of German legislation for protecting minors from harmful media is the concept of (regulated) self-regulation, which gives part of the responsibility for supervision to businesses themselves. Experience gained in the area of protection of minors from harmful media has led to debate on the use of similar approaches in other areas too, such as data protection.

The Hans Bredow Institute in Hamburg compiled a full academic evaluation of the applicable legal framework for the Interstate Treaty on the Protection of Minors in the Media in 2008. Their evaluation says the principle of (regulated) self-regulation is highly effective. But it also points out structural weaknesses as well as shortcomings in its application and enforcement in some subareas, and makes suggestions for revisions.⁵¹

Current laws for the protection of minors from harmful media on the internet follow the development path of broadcasting law, though some points in the development concept have been adjusted. Yet the internet is not a further development of broadcasting. It is a worldwide means of communication that allows for every conceivable method of communication and an unlimited number of recipients, senders and participants. This means it could be compared to a telephone, a radio, a newspaper, a pub, a brochure, a department store, a library, a magazine, and a video

Landesanstalt für privaten Rundfunk und neue Medien Hessen, Volume 16. Munich: 2002, p. 14

⁵¹ Note: Part of the evaluation was an independent partial study by JFF – Institut für Medienpädagogik in Forschung und Praxis. It attests that the current legal framework for the internet is in need of improvement for daily use. Cf. also Theunert, Helga / Gebel, Christa, *Untersuchung der Akzeptanz des Jugendmedienschutzes aus der Perspektive von Eltern, Jugendlichen und pädagogischen Fachkräften*. JFF – Institut für Medienpädagogik in Forschung und Praxis, Munich: 2007. Available online at: http://www.jff.de/dateien/JFF_JMS_LANG.pdf

rental shop – and yet no comparison can give an exhaustive idea of what the internet is capable of, just as it cannot replace conventional communication.

3.2 Guiding principle: Relationship between protection of minors (from harmful media) and media literacy

The current debate on the need to protect minors from harmful media has on various occasions propagated media education and conveying sufficient media literacy as an alternative option. Either because protecting minors from harmful media with legal regulations is considered impractical, inadequate, as censorship or bad for business – or because people believe that media-literate children and teenagers do not need to be protected from harmful media.

The question of what role media literacy can and should play relative to the protection of minors has not yet been answered conclusively. What role the media literacy approach plays as a compensatory instrument versus legal protection differs depending on what perspective is taken. Yet at the very least we can all agree that there are certain types of content that children and teenagers cannot process and should not and must not be exposed to, no matter how media literate they may be.⁴⁴ There is a risk that they could unintentionally come into contact with such content on the internet. Then there is the more practically relevant phenomenon whereby many children and youth specifically search for such content because it has a certain allure for them or because their peer groups encourage them to take an interest in it.

The study commission therefore does not see the legally regulated protection of minors and promoting media literacy as alternative concepts, but rather as overlapping, complementary approaches. Laws that protect minors from harmful media do not make the promotion of media literacy superfluous, nor can media literacy be used by the government as grounds for legitimising a complete withdrawal from its constitutional obligation to protect children and teenagers. Nor can parents use media literacy as an argument for completely giving up their right to restrict their children's media use. In a similar vein,

⁴⁴ Cf. Grimm, Petra / Rhein, Stefanie / Müller, Michael, *Porno im Web 2.0. Die Bedeutung sexualisierter Web-Inhalte in der Lebenswelt von Jugendlichen*. Berlin: 2010 and Grimm, Petra / Rhein, Stefanie / Clausen-Muradian, Elisabeth, *Gewalt im Web 2.0. Der Umgang Jugendlicher mit gewalthaltigen Inhalten und Cyber-Mobbing sowie die rechtliche Einordnung der Problematik*. Berlin: 2008

legislation on the protection of minors from harmful media must not lead us to neglect the promotion of media literacy.

This means that policymakers' demands for greater media literacy must lead to practical solutions, and these must not be limited to well-worded political ideals or calls for public service campaigns.

Unlike the repressive protection of minors from harmful media, measures aimed at developing media literacy have not yet been systematically integrated in a regulatory approach. Media literate children and young people are able to use the internet in a self-directed manner. Developing media literacy is therefore an important goal for the protection of minors.

3.3 Guiding principle: Statutory protection of minors between entitlement to protection and practicability

Contemporary regulations protecting minors from harmful media need to take into account various framework conditions and guidelines if they are to be accepted across society. First, it is important to bear in mind that legal regulations are primarily intended to support parents, childcare workers and teachers in their role as guardians and to make it easier for them to carry out their media education responsibilities. Questions about direct statutory protection mechanisms such as bans and usage restrictions should be considered secondary to this fundamental support function.

Our power of influence on the internet is also very different from the measures we can take to protect minors in retail. As a result, we have to assume that young people who wilfully and intently search out specific content on the internet are also likely to find it. Providing full protection from internet content that could endanger or negatively influence minors is therefore not a realistic goal. This assumption leads to the conclusion that the primary focus of protecting minors on the internet should be on preventing them from unintentionally coming in contact with unsuitable material. And yet restricting intentional exposure, especially among children, should also be a priority.

Solutions in these areas should be assessed for practicability, as approaches that are formally solid but that ignore the real-world situation are subject to the accusation that lawmakers are merely providing fig-leaf solutions.

No matter how well thought out our technical solutions and measures are, we should not give the

false impression that everything is taken care of. More than in the past, we need to provide clear reminders that every kind of "child safety lock" for the internet can be circumvented, no matter how well designed it is, and that there can never be a 100-percent guarantee of protection. These reminders should also appear on parental control software packaging and on screen when parents install such software. All improvements to protection should be seen as something positive, and the regulatory concept for the protection of minors from harmful media should acknowledge and accept them accordingly. At the same time, we need to remember that continuous technological improvements are the norm in this area.⁴⁵

Another fundamental question for the statutory protection of minors concerns the decision about which target groups need to receive the most attention. As they grow up, children and teenagers acquire media skills that include the ability to get around technical obstacles. As a result, it can be assumed that obstacles set up to prevent access for children may no longer be effective for technologically advanced teenagers. At the same time, the danger posed by certain types of content decreases with increasing age. Yet there are some types of content that are completely illegal to disseminate, even to adults. Still other types, such as content that shapes social behaviour, pose a greater threat to teenagers than to children.

The current legislation on the protection of minors focuses its energy on eliminating dangers that arise when young people are exposed to inappropriate content, particularly pornography and violence. It is worth asking whether the dangers associated with exposure should continue to be the main action area in the future, or whether it might be better to focus on phenomena connected with social behaviour. This is especially relevant for young people, who now say that sexual harassment and bullying are much bigger problems for them than sexual or violent content.⁴⁶

Another area that has received little attention is self-destructive and mutually destructive behaviour among youth, such as distorted self-representation on the web. Efforts to protect minors from harmful

⁴⁵ Cf. also Theunert, Helga / Gebel, Christa, *Untersuchung der Akzeptanz des Jugendmedienschutzes aus der Perspektive von Eltern, Jugendlichen und pädagogischen Fachkräften*. loc. cit.

⁴⁶ Cf. Age cohort survey results, BITKOM, *Jugend 2.0. Eine repräsentative Untersuchung zum Internetverhalten von Zehn- bis 18-Jährigen*. p. 33/39, available online at: http://www.bitkom.org/files/documents/BITKOM_Studie_Jugend_2.0.pdf.

media must give this phenomenon much greater weight than it currently has.

Many real-world dangers are often forgotten in the debate surrounding the protection of minors on the internet. One of these is data protection. Children and teenagers are often very generous with their personal information and data collectors often exploit children's naïveté. Practical, effective solutions are needed.

Like adults, teenagers can become victims of online scams, computer viruses and computer worms. Media literacy is the key to enabling them to better protect themselves against such threats. Media-literate users are less likely to fall prey to scams, they are more careful with their personal information and they can protect themselves more effectively against computer bugs. Commercial advertising aimed at children also needs to be watched closely.

3.4 The role of age ratings

The Federal Youth Protection Act and the Interstate Treaty on the Protection of Minors in the Media both involve a system of protection that is structured according to target age groups. In essence, this means that certain media content cannot be made accessible to minors who have not reached the applicable age. To be specific, the two regulations use the ages 0, 6, 12, (14), 16 and 18 for media.

On the one hand, these classifications can give parents a quick point of reference to help them decide whether certain content will be appropriate for their children. On the other hand, the age-based system also has its shortcomings and practical problems. In general, there are no set, scientifically sound criteria for assigning certain content to a certain age group. This is because, among other reasons, every young person develops at a different pace and every parent has a different idea of how to raise their children.

3.4.1 Offline media / Youth Protection Act

The problem is currently less difficult to address in the area of application of the Youth Protection Act (i.e. access to physical media) because the provider is not responsible for assigning an age rating and because the media content in question is closed and cannot be modified. Age ratings are decided by organisations for voluntary self-regulation – which normally have pluralistic evaluation bodies. The highest state authorities for children and young people participate in the vote on a binding age rating, which takes the form of a state sovereign act and gives providers legal certainty.

3.4.2 Online media / Inter-State Treaty on the Protection of Minors

The situation is different in the area of application of the Interstate Treaty on the Protection of Minors in the Media (especially telemedia). For content that can only be accessed on the internet, there is no legally prescribed, government-backed way for correctly classifying media. Given the amount of content on the internet and the speed at which it changes, this would not be affordable or sensible from an organisational point of view.

Here, it is up to the providers to decide (self-assessment or self-classification) which age groups might be harmed by the content they provide and then to take any precautions that might be necessary. One serious practical problem for online content is that there are currently no legally binding criteria for the legally prescribed age groups. In addition, assigning internet content to a certain age group depends on contextual factors that quickly lead to complex assessment procedures, which in turn entail legal uncertainties and which are often not affordable for a single entity (especially without support from bodies of experts).

3.4.3 International problems

Age ratings are always a reflection of the moral values of a specific community. It would be unrealistic to aim for a protection concept that unites providers all over the world under one set of standards. The average citizen of the United States, for example, has a completely different idea of how much nudity or violence a 12-year-old should be allowed to see, than a German citizen. International providers would therefore have to categorise and label content separately for every cultural circle that requires it, which greatly increases costs.

The World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) recognised this challenge back in 1995, when it began to develop a standard for content rating, the Platform for Internet Content Selection (PICS).⁴⁷ In 2000 the Bertelsmann Stiftung helped create the Internet Content Rating Association (ICRA), which developed an assessment scheme based on PICS. PICS and ICRA both failed, as did a pilot run of the ICRAplus filter program undertaken by the Commission for the Protection of Minors in the Media (KJM).

ICRA's websites went offline in 2010. The rating systems expected website operators to categorise their content themselves based on various criteria

⁴⁷ Cf. <http://www.w3.org/PICS/>

such as how much nudity or violence it contains. As a successor for PICS, the W3C developed a new standard called Protocol for Web Description Resources (POWDER). It has not been put into use yet.

German laws for the protection of minors are particularly differentiated, since they go beyond just acknowledging that minors are at risk and trying to protect them to considering the negative impact on the development of children and youth in certain age groups. Attempts to correctly define these age groups are complicated by continual changes in the speed at which children develop and increasingly individualised development patterns. There is no longer such a thing as a typical 12-year-old or an average 16-year-old. On the other hand, the general public must be familiar with age ratings if they are to have the desired effect. Accordingly, we need to design them for the long term and strive for consistency across different areas. The categories established by the Youth Protection Act are a good example; their many years of use in voluntary self-regulation has made them quite well known among the general public. This enables them to have a significant effect on behaviour control in situations where the protection of minors relies on voluntary cooperation.⁴⁸

3.5 Thoughts on further developing the technology-based protection of minors

Like all broadcasting and telemedia legislation, the protection of minors on the internet focuses on providers. Independently of the questions this raises in itself, certain concepts in the technology-based protection of minors depend on providers taking steps to meet the relevant legal requirements. This creates a number of problems.

3.5.1 Self-rating

One problem involves providers self-rating content as a prerequisite for ratings that can be read by content filters. Experts have been hotly debating the strengths and weaknesses of self-rating since the mid to late 1990s.⁴⁹ Proponents see it as an opportunity –

sometimes even as the only way – to support content filter programs and make it easier for them to correctly categorise content. Their arguments are as follows:

- In light of the quantity and fluidity of content, self-categorisation is the most effective way of achieving the goal of evaluating all content, and seen as a whole it is also efficient.
- Providers know their content better than anyone else and are able to evaluate it accurately.
- External monitoring is only required for problematic cases.
- Errors made by automated rating systems can be avoided. The overall system is more effective, which improves acceptance.
- Increased responsibility for providers.

Internationally, self-rating has yet to catch on for a variety of reasons and is mainly used by providers of sexually explicit content.

Critics counter the advantages of self-rating cited above as follows:

- Self-rating is time-consuming, inconvenient and expensive for providers. In March 2011 there were over 14.2 million .de domains with over 1.9 billion pages (as counted by Google), not to mention the innumerable images and graphics on those pages. Clearly, it is next to impossible to perform self-ratings for all of them.
- National laws are the only way to drive the implementation of ratings systems. This isolates countries – a situation that is only made more extreme when age categories are rigid.
- It suppresses controversial language. (For example, drug education and AIDS education for youth in socially deprived areas have to use their language. But then this content would be rated in a way that makes the filter programs block it.)
- Commercially and financially advantaged providers receive preferential treatment and diversity suffers. Self-rating is not affordable, especially not for micromedia.
- Providers would have to go back and re-evaluate massive amounts of old content. The

⁴⁸ Cf. JFF – Institut für Medienpädagogik in Forschung und Praxis, *Fokuspunkte und Optimierungshinweise zum Jugendmedienschutz aus der alltagspraktischen Perspektive*. Munich: 2007, p. 18/34

⁴⁹ On the debate over self-classification cf. Garfinkel, Simson L., *Good Clean PICS*, Hotwired Network, 5 February 1997, available online at: <http://www.wired.com/science/discoveries/news/1997/02/1867> and in Strossen, Nadine, “Kommentar zum ‘Memorandum zur Selbstregulierung von Internet-Inhalten’”, Waltermann, Jens /

Machill, Marcel (eds.): *Verantwortung im Internet, Selbstregulierung und Jugendschutz*. Gütersloh: 2000, p. 120 ff.

German-language Wikipedia alone contains over 1.2 million articles (as of March 2011).

Self-rating can work for content that has been classified offline or which is already classified, such as cinema films or computer games. Costs are small compared with the cost of production, and rating systems normally already exist. Standardised ratings can therefore be useful for online sales of such products. Using age categories from the offline world provides guardians with a trusted frame of reference.

Beyond this, even the study commission cannot agree on the potential of self-rating and in turn of the technology-based protection of minors in general.⁵⁰

3.5.2 Software to protect minors and the role parents play

For software that is intended to protect minors to have an effect, parents need to install and activate it. Otherwise, neither the software's functions nor the self-rating programming on the part of providers are of any use. Those assessing parental control software need to consider that it typically allows parents to customise settings. This means that parents are in a position to explicitly allow certain pages. Using this kind of software can therefore promote dialogue between parents and children. For example, when a child tries to access an off-limits website and the parent is informed of this by the program, the parent can either unblock it or explain why it is off-limits.⁵¹

These solutions need to be affordable so a large number of parents will use them. They also need to provide reliable support for parents to teach their children about media use. The challenge here is to achieve acceptance for recognised parental control software from as broad a base as possible. For such software to be successful on the market, it needs to be very user friendly. It also needs to be easy to install and configure even for parents who do not know a lot about computers.

This is a good example of how the statutory protection of minors relies on media literacy – in this case the parents' media literacy – if it is to function

⁵⁰ Cf. Chapter 5

⁵¹ Note: In practice this option often proves to be unrealistic, because it takes a lot of time and energy to customise filter lists. Parents often end up deactivating filters completely or their children find ways around them. On challenges to acceptance see also Theunert, Helga / Gebel, Christa, *Untersuchung der Akzeptanz des Jugendmedienschutzes aus der Perspektive von Eltern, Jugendlichen und pädagogischen Fachkräften*. loc. cit.

effectively. It also shows that this literacy requires support.

3.5.3 The approval problem

Providers of content that is harmful to minors have legal certainty when they mark their content for a KJM-approved program. It is therefore very much in their interest that such a content filter be approved.

Since the Interstate Treaty took effect in 2003 not a single manufacturer has managed to get its parental control software approved by the KJM. None of the software submitted has been programmed well enough to handle a task of such complexity and provide the kind of protection needed to receive approval. Approving one of these solutions for end users could suggest that it did in fact offer that kind of comprehensive protection and that a government-sponsored body, the KJM, stood behind the assessment. This situation impedes the development of solutions that make the most of the current state of technology.

Further, self-rating could make the "provider's privilege" independent of the approval of a specific parental control program. However, a technological standard could be approved that numerous parental control programs could then build upon. The market could be left to develop them on its own. Tests to see whether the programs meet the standard do not, in fact, need to be the job of the regulators for the protection of minors.

4 Media literacy target groups

4.1 Preschool children

Children explore the world in their very own way. Initially, they look to people they know in order to find out about topics that interest them, but they are also open to information from other sources.⁵² Most children are accustomed to using various media such as televisions, radios, audio formats, telephones, games consoles and more from an early age. This has been proved in a number of scientific studies. However, to date there is very little reliable data about the use of computers and the internet by preschool children. The KIM studies usually only include children aged six and above.

We can generally assume, however, that all family members in households with a computer and an

⁵² Cf. Feil, Christine / Decker, Regina / Gieger, Christoph, *Wie entdecken Kinder das Internet? Beobachtungen bei fünf- bis 12-jährigen Kindern*. Wiesbaden: 2004, p. 161

internet connection make use of these.⁵³ Computers, smartphones, tablets, etc. are a source of visual and auditory fascination even for the very youngest members of the family. However, due to their more limited fine motor skills, children under six tend to handle computers differently to their older siblings, for instance. Preschool children have no trouble using a touchscreen or mouse, but they are rarely able to use a keyboard.⁵⁴ The spread of tablet PCs will probably, in any case, make keyboards much less essential in the future.

But pre-schoolers do face the challenge of learning to interact physically with media – coordinating their eye and hand movements with what is happening on the computer screen.

Younger children also have a different concept of “surfing”. They usually only move around a single website. Their search strategy – if they have one at all – is very simple and usually follows a system of entering www.name.de. As a rule of thumb, the younger the child, the lower the number of websites he or she will use. Preschool children usually concentrate on single sections of a website as a flood of images and sound can be too much for them. They primarily focus on entertaining content like pictures, videos and games. Studies also show that the attention pre-schoolers give to websites usually wanes after a maximum of 15 minutes. Adults do not lose interest until after up to two hours.⁵⁵

Naturally, preschool children do not yet use many internet communication tools such as chatrooms as they cannot read or write well enough. Problems of understanding also arise when children are confronted with metaphorical language or foreign words. The same applies to the use of search engines. The search results are often so voluminous that children, with their limited ability to categorise and classify, can make little use of them.

Not all the hurdles in early-childhood media education can be overcome through mere practice. Younger children depend to a large degree on their parents’ assistance. They should not sit alone in front of the computer – and should not even be there

at all until they show an interest of their own accord. Child-appropriate internet use should involve themes that children are familiar with from their everyday life to ensure that they are not overwhelmed and are instead able to have a successful learning experience.

The web content for very young users should take their motor skills into account. They should be specifically designed to foster existing skills. Preschool children can benefit from the targeted incorporation of visual and acoustic features on websites as these make it easier for them to experience a sense of achievement. Children should also be encouraged to independently apply the knowledge gleaned from the internet to their everyday lives. Parents and kindergarten teachers can support this process by ensuring children spend only a limited amount of time in front of the computer and by offering them plenty of alternative leisure and learning experiences in the real world.⁵⁶

4.2 Schoolchildren

Early-childhood media education and adequately equipped classrooms are of decisive importance if all schoolchildren are to be given access to the opportunities the digital society offers. However, separate computer rooms are now increasingly becoming a thing of the past. These days, an individual portable computer for each and every schoolchild is the key to making the most of the knowledge available in the World Wide Web.

For example, in a pilot project launched by Hamburg’s Senate in 2009 around 640 netbooks sponsored by various companies were used in lessons. They were used for reference purposes, to play audio and video material, and to make flexible use of teaching programs.⁵⁷ An analysis of the project and of lesson samples revealed that the netbooks improved children’s motivation and encouraged customised forms of teaching.⁵⁸ However, even portable computers are not a cure-all if pupils do not have the necessary media literacy. The most important thing is that teaching content is carefully prepared.

⁵³ Cf. Theunert, Helga (ed.), *Medienkinder von Geburt an. Medienaneignung in den ersten sechs Lebensjahren*. Munich: 2007

⁵⁴ Cf. Gebel, Christa / Wagner, Ulrike, “Kinder und Jugendliche im Internet. Ein aktueller Forschungsüberblick” (pp. 41-58), *Angebote für Kinder im Internet. Ausgewählte Beiträge zur Entwicklung von Qualitätskriterien und zur Schaffung sicherer Surfplätze für Kinder*, published by the Bavarian regulatory authority for commercial broadcasting (BLM). Munich: 2005

⁵⁵ Cf. Stuttgart Media University / User Interface Design GmbH study “Usability for Kids”, 2007

⁵⁶ Cf. also Stiftung Warentest: Feibel, Thomas, *Kindheit 2.0 – So können Eltern Medienkompetenz vermitteln*. Berlin: 2009

⁵⁷ Note: The project report on the Hamburg netbook project in the 2009/2010 school year is available online at <http://www.hamburg.de/hamburger-netbook-projekt/>

⁵⁸ Cf. Behörde für Schule und Berufsbildung Hamburg, *Hamburger Netbook-Projekt – Sekundarstufen-Schulen. Projektbericht, Dokumentation, Evaluation – Schuljahr 2009/10*, p. 135

The recent findings of the 2011 educational study “Digitale Medien in der Schule” carried out by the D21 Initiative show that there is a need for initiatives such as the Hamburg project. According to the study, 89.5 percent of German schools have computers, but it is rare for each pupil to have access to a PC, laptop or netbook in the classroom. The study also revealed that computers are used more frequently if they are portable devices.

“Although the majority of schools have computers available for use by pupils, this by no means translates into a ‘full supply’ for all pupils at those schools. In over half of the schools, computers are only available at central locations – for example, in the library or computer room – and available to pupils for specified, limited periods of time. Only a quarter of the schools have a computer in every classroom; a computer is available to every pupil in the classroom in just 7.5 percent of schools. This means that incorporating computers into lessons involves some kind of additional effort – for example, the class must move to a different room.”⁵⁹

As well as looking at equipment, the D21 study also focuses on the teaching staff. Teachers complain about the lack of media teaching concepts, the shortage of relevant further training options, and the fact that the available software and hardware is often not suitable for schools.⁶⁰

In order to adequately and sustainably integrate digital media into lessons in the future it is necessary for every pupil to have his or her own portable computer. This is not currently the case in the majority of German schools. Private computers are frequently not suitable for transportation to and from school. Educators and industry should therefore work together to develop a model computer that is portable and robust enough for use by schoolchildren.

However, it would only be possible to economically procure and maintain this number of devices if the scheme were coordinated at federal level. There would also need to be special insurance plans to ensure the computers are operational throughout their lifespan. Further, financing models are required that also foresee regular exchanges of the devices. The D21 Initiative, for example, has performed

preliminary work in this field that should be taken further.⁶¹

Beside the equipment itself, there is also much room for improvement in the way computers are used in schools. Research programmes can lay some foundations here and develop teaching support materials – particularly as media education does not yet have the status of a cross-cutting topic that is important to all subject areas.

The targeted use of so-called “viral marketing” could be another way to improve media literacy work with schoolchildren. This is a marketing tool, used mainly by social networks and social media, to draw attention to a particular product, event, etc. via attention-grabbing news items. If users “like” the item, it gets forwarded to their friends and acquaintances. In this way, campaigns can achieve maximum impact with a minimal financial investment. If appropriately prepared and applied, viral marketing could thus be an effective instrument for improving media literacy – especially since using the internet is the second-most popular leisure activity, after meeting with friends, of 10-to-18-year-old Germans.⁶²

A total of 77 percent of youngsters aged between 10 and 18 have signed up to social networks, and 74 percent actively use them.⁶³ Social networks could therefore be useful low-threshold venues for directly targeting young internet users. The special feature of viral marketing is that it is not immediately apparent that media literacy measures are being conveyed. Information about data protection on social networks, for example, can be attractively packaged in the form of interactive graphics, games or competitions to encourage participation. These measures can encourage users to think about their own internet behaviour, and also apply these insights to other areas of their lives.

The effectiveness of this approach is evidenced by, for example, the topic of managing privacy of photos on social networks. When it became clear that many young people were not taking the necessary steps to protect their privacy, viral videos were launched to warn them of the risks. Another important part of the campaign was the website www.watchyourweb.de, which is supported in its

⁵⁹ Quoted from (German source): Initiative D21 (2011), *Bildungsstudie. Digitale Medien in der Schule – Eine Sonderstudie im Rahmen des (N)Onliner Atlas 2011*, p. 9, available online at http://www.initiatived21.de/wp-content/uploads/2011/02/NOA_Bildungsstudie_140211.pdf, p. 9.

⁶⁰ Cf. *ibid.*, p. 9

⁶¹ Cf. *ibid.*, p. 9 ff.

⁶² Cf. BITKOM, *Internetnutzung auf Platz 2 der populärsten Aktivitäten von Teenagern*. Berlin: 2011, available online at http://www.bitkom.org/de/presse/8477_68089.aspx

⁶³ Cf. BITKOM, *SchülerVZ beliebteste Community bei Teenagern*. Berlin: 2011, available online at http://www.bitkom.org/de/presse/30739_66665.aspx

work by various federal ministries.⁶⁴ In the space of just a few weeks, the majority of children and teenagers had changed their privacy settings. In a survey by social networking site SchülerVZ, 45 percent of its young users stated that they now took more care when posting information and images online thanks to the campaign.⁶⁵

The methods that proved so successful here can be applied to many other issues relating to the internet, but only in an appropriately managed and moderated way. They should also always be flanked by parallel measures in traditional media, not just in the form of print and televised advertising, but also through increased editorial attention to the current, relevant issues. These measures could be coordinated at regular roundtable meetings with political and media representatives.

4.3 Students

Many universities and higher educational institutes offer media education courses that students can incorporate into modular degree courses as part of their professional training. However, these courses are often only optional and face competition from other elective subjects such as foreign languages and public speaking seminars, etc. Introductory sessions at the start of study courses mainly deal with the media skills needed for research. Furthermore, the section of this report on media literacy among university teaching staff (see chapter 4.5. University teaching staff) shows that media education and the use of interactive media are by no means integrated into all areas of teaching at university level.⁶⁶

A representative survey of media literacy among students carried out by the University of Passau in the winter semester of 2008/09 provides information on media literacy among students that can be regarded as typical in Germany. The results are summarised as follows. “On the whole, [...] it has been established that although students at the University of Passau are very familiar with standard

⁶⁴ Note: The website is supported by the Federal Ministry of Food, Agriculture and Consumer Protection and the Federal Ministry for Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth, and collaborates with many partners working in fields relating to social networks or other content providers, institutions that act to protect minors and voluntary self-regulating bodies.

⁶⁵ Cf. Jugend online / IJAB, *watch your web – Jugendkampagne zur Sensibilisierung im Umgang mit persönlichen Daten im Internet. Projektbericht 2009*, available online at: http://www.jugendnetz-berlin.de/ger/start/downloads/watch_your_web_projektbericht.pdf

⁶⁶ Cf. Haug, Simone / Gaiser, Birgit, *Schnittstellen im E-Learning. Zeitschrift für Hochschulentwicklung*, Year 5 / No. 4 (2010), pp. 211–227

software and internet research, they are much less likely to use computers and the internet for other purposes. Moreover, there are still large differences in use regarding aspects such as gender or type of course.⁶⁷

In summary, this study shows that while almost all students are able to confidently use interactive media for research, hardly a third actively create their own online content. When evaluating their own ability to use standard software and multimedia applications, 58 percent of respondents rated their skills here as “quite high”; only 22 percent rated their skills as “high”. In all areas, women rated their skills lower than men did. Of particular concern is that, according to the self-rating, the media literacy skills of those studying to be teachers at primary and secondary level are below average. The figures are actually worse than those of a study carried out in 2006.

4.4 Teaching staff

The use of interactive media is not yet such an integral part of school and university life that media education is a core part of the curriculum. During the study commission’s public hearing on media literacy on 13 December 2010, expert Stefan Anfenanger explained:

“A key problem in Germany is that acquiring and teaching media skills plays a minimal role in teacher training. Media education is an obligatory part of the curriculum in very few teacher training courses. Prospective teachers learn next to nothing about how to make effective use of digital media in their teaching or how to teach media literacy skills. Other European countries are way ahead here. The same goes for university teacher training staff. They hardly use any digital media in their teaching themselves. Although a range of options is available for further teacher training, these cannot adequately address the situation as a whole.”⁶⁸

The No Education Without Media initiative made a similar comment in 2009 in its *Manifesto on Media Education*:

“The vocational training of childcare workers, teachers, adult-education teachers, and social workers must include the basics of media education as a compulsory element of their curricula. Moreover, specific training on media education must be offered in the form of Master’s degrees and as

⁶⁷ Quote from http://www.intelec.uni-passau.de/studi_befragung_ws0708_teil_5.0.html

⁶⁸ Quote from Aufenanger, Stefan: *ibid.*, p. 2.

elective subjects on other courses. For this to be possible, we need significantly more professorships and chairs in media education along with the corresponding infrastructure at the universities.”⁶⁹

Compared with the number of empirical studies carried out to investigate media literacy among schoolchildren, there are relatively few that focus on teachers. Despite this, it can be said that:

“Depending on the type of school, about ten to 30 percent of teachers use digital media in their lessons. [...] A study by the European Commission provides more exact figures: In spring 2006, just under six percent of teachers in German schools used computers in over half of their lessons, while 23.2 percent used them in at most five percent of their lessons. [...] 22 percent of teaching staff have never used a computer in their lessons. [...] At the same time, most teaching staff have more digital media equipment at home than on average and most teachers use them to prepare their lessons.”⁷⁰

As with schoolchildren, it is also the case for teachers that the media education provided at a school is directly correlated to the media equipment available. Without the necessary infrastructure and compatible media systems (both hardware and software) in initial and further teacher training, as well as in the schools themselves, teaching staff can hardly apply, develop or teach the media skills they have acquired. The media education of teachers is key for the media education of schoolchildren. Studies show “that teachers generally have a positive attitude towards using digital media. [...] However, other studies reveal an extremely critical view of media and a conservative pedagogical approach among teacher training students or those starting out in the profession, which is bound to limit the extent to which they integrate media into teaching.”⁷¹

The idea that media teaching programmes might be developed and introduced into schools without consulting teachers, and the fear of losing control of the lesson if interactive media are used increase resistance to integrating interactive media into lessons. In reference to this, expert Jürgen Ertelt pointed out at the study commission’s public hearing on media literacy in December 2010 that teachers should see their role in the educational process as

guiding or catalytic rather than instructive.⁷² “We have to break the vicious circle whereby lecturers with scant media literacy skills train low-media-literate teachers, who then go on to teach expectant schoolchildren who have experienced a completely different kind of media socialisation.”⁷³

4.5 University teaching staff

A study by Haug/Gaiser in December 2010 showed that although e-learning and therefore interactive media are widely used in German universities, they are mainly used by teaching staff to organise their work rather than as a teaching tool. E-learning opportunities are generally available in a university’s computer centre, or in university libraries. An integrated use of interactive media within the departments and in teaching often only occurs on an informal basis due to the efforts of individual staff members, which means this is not permanently established practice. In addition, e-learning platforms tend to be managed with mainly technical aspects in mind, while educational aspects often play only a very insignificant role. According to results of the Haug/Geiser study, this is due to the inadequate media education skills at German universities.⁷⁴

E-learning in German universities is promoted by all kinds of initiatives in the various German states. These also focus on different aspects of media education. However, these initiatives were and still are generally restricted to the introductory phase. But as the use of interactive media entails additional costs for universities, it is by no means certain that e-learning programmes will continue beyond the end of the funding period.⁷⁵ Nonetheless, the use of

⁶⁹ Cf. http://www.keine-bildung-ohne-medien.de/?page_id=63

⁷⁰ Quote from Breiter, Andreas / Welling, Stefan, “Integration digitaler Medien in den Schulalltag als Mehrebenenproblem”, Eickelmann, Birgit (Ed.), *Bildung und Schule auf dem Weg in die Wissensgesellschaft*. Münster: 2010, p.13. See also <http://www.e-cade.mic.de/data/ebooks/extracts/9783830922421.pdf>

⁷¹ Quote from Breiter, Andreas / Welling, Stefan: l.c., p. 17

⁷² Cf. Official hearing on media literacy by the Study Commission on the Internet Digital Society of the German Bundestag on 13 December 2010, abridged minutes 17/8, p. 7, available online at: <http://www.bundestag.de/internetenquete/dokumentation/Sitzungen/20101213/index.jsp>

⁷³ Quote from Ertelt, Jürgen, Written statement at the official hearing on media literacy by the Study Commission on the Internet Digital Society of the German Bundestag on 13 December 2010, Committee printed paper 17(24)014-C, p. 10, available online at: http://www.bundestag.de/internetenquete/dokumentation/Sitzungen/20101213/A-Drs__17_24_014-C_-_Stellungnahme_Ertelt.pdf

⁷⁴ Cf. Haug, Simone / Gaiser, Birgit, “Schnittstellen im E-Learning”, *Zeitschrift für Hochschulentwicklung*, Year 5 / No. 4 (2010), pp. 211–227

⁷⁵ Cf. Bremer, Claudia / Göcks, Marc / Rühl, Paul / Stratmann, Jörg (eds.), *Landesinitiativen für E-Learning an deutschen Hochschulen. Medien in der Wissenschaft*, Volume 57, Münster: 2010, p. 7 ff.

interactive media in universities, particularly in lectures and seminars, and in purely conveying information, is leading to some fundamental changes:

“The use of new media in university teaching is increasingly leading to a division of labour in higher education. While lecturers using traditional teaching methods often plan, carry out and supervise their teaching sessions, we are seeing a more decentralised division of labour in net-based teaching sessions. [...] Alongside university teaching staff, who continue to compile the teaching content, and supervise and organise their teaching sessions, people such as media designers, media education specialists, programmers and online tutors also contribute to providing the complete production and supervision process of net-based teaching. For these tasks to be properly coordinated, university teaching staff also need to have project management skills. [...] However, it is not possible for university faculty to only concentrate on teaching the skills and knowledge of their subject, and delegate all the other (media) educational and design tasks to others. They must take on a whole range of new tasks themselves, which they were never, or hardly, required to perform in traditional teaching.

- These include preparing a detailed teaching plan for each teaching session. As the use of new media requires more long-term planning, teaching plans have to be more detailed and decided on further in advance, unlike face-to-face teaching, where short-term adjustments are possible.
- Teaching staff must have at least a basic understanding of how to prepare and use the media or at least be able to maintain an overview. This means they must be media literate to some extent, so that they can determine when and how the media should be used in a way that is compatible with specific features and technical requirements.
- University teaching staff are ultimately also responsible for carrying out and supervising the online teaching itself. Aside from supervising students via online tutoring, which to some extent can be delegated to online tutors, they must be able to supervise, maintain and update multimedia materials once they are online.”⁷⁶

⁷⁶ Quote from Bremer, Claudia, “Medienkompetenz von Hochschullehrenden im Kontext von Mediengestaltung und dem Erstellungsprozess netzgestützter Lehre”, Bett, Katja / Wedekind, Joachim / Zentel, Peter (eds.), *Medienkompetenz für die Hochschullehre*. Münster: 2004, p. 197 ff.

Both teaching staff and students must have the relevant media skills if this modern form of communicating knowledge is to be effective and established for the long term. At present, this means:

“E-learning scenarios will only be successful if both authors and tutors are trained in this area. Teaching staff often have good concepts and ideas for e-content, but they lack the knowledge to turn this into a professional technical product that meets the relevant norms and standards. This means that it takes them an enormous amount of time to produce e-content, and the content they produce tends to be rather amateur in appearance. E-learning requires its own didactics and methods. A teaching unit will only be successful if it is based on a clear concept, which means that both authors and tutors have to be familiar with a variety of e-learning concepts. They should be able to apply these as required by the situation and adapt their teaching modules accordingly.”⁷⁷

An overview of what is required in media education is also available at:

- <http://www.e-teaching.org/projekt/personal/medienkompetenz> (in German)
- <http://www.keine-bildung-ohne-medien.de/Manifesto-on-Media-Education.pdf> (in English)

The latter in particular, the Manifesto on Media Education, makes it clear that media education must move beyond the project funding phase and become an integral part of educational courses, curricula, etc. across the board.

4.6 Parents

Children’s habits and the way they use media are influenced from a very early age by those in their immediate surroundings – usually their family. Parents therefore need to develop greater awareness of this topic. But as it is often difficult to reach parents at all in this respect, children’s day-care centres and schools must try and actively involve them in their offspring’s media education. For example, the 2010 KIM study says:

“As was to be expected, there are clear differences here too depending on parents’ educational background. For 75 percent of parents who finished school with an East or West German lower

⁷⁷ Quote from http://www.bildung.at/files/downloads/Qualitaetskriterien_E-Learning.pdf, p. 47

secondary school-leaving certificate, television is the media they find most indispensable. This applies to only a third of parents with an *Abitur* (higher-education entrance qualification) and/or a university degree. The latter tend to favour the computer and the internet (23 percent, secondary school certificate: ten percent) or books (26 percent, secondary school certificate: five percent). The parents' preferences are reflected in those of their children."⁷⁸

It is therefore all the more important for educational establishments and public institutions such as libraries to offer children the chance to broaden the perhaps one-sided or limited scope of their media experiences. While many parents want to support and guide their children as they explore the world of the media, they do not feel sufficiently well informed to be able to do so. In fact, most children also feel that their parents are not very competent in matters relating to the internet. According to the EU Kids Online study, over a third (37 percent) of children aged nine to 16 agreed with the statement "I know more about the internet than my parents". A further 31 percent partly agreed with the statement. Only 32 percent of the children or teenagers surveyed said that their parents knew more about the internet than they did.

This is not due to a lack of interest from parents. The 2010 KIM study says: "49 percent of primary carers responded that they are very highly or highly interested in the topic 'children and media'."⁷⁹ Overall, 16 percent said they feel very well informed and 60 percent feel well informed. However, parents with a lower level of education feel less well informed and on the whole are less interested in changing the situation. A third of respondents are of the opinion that not enough information is available about "children and media". When asked about their preferred source of information here, 59 percent said other parents and 37 percent said their children's school or teachers.⁸⁰ The study's findings show once again that parents need and are interested in obtaining comprehensive and in-depth information about media use and literacy.

Parents play a crucial role in the development of their children's media literacy skills. The study commission acknowledges that the family home has a particular influence on whether and how children acquire these skills. Given the rapid pace of change

and development in available media, any measures intended to improve media literacy skills must also target parents. This can help reinforce their constitutional right to raise and educate their children. These measures should not, however, focus only on the risks associated with the internet. They should, above all, enable parents to recognise the countless opportunities the digital society affords their children.

Recent findings in media education research suggest that key future areas of focus should be to improve the knowledge and skills of parents. At the moment, parents often feel that they are less media literate than children and teenagers. Various state media authorities have launched pilot projects to address this issue and have gathered experiences. The Media Authority of North Rhine-Westphalia (LfM), for example, organises events where parents can learn more about the use of media, the internet, mobile phones and technology by young children.⁸¹ Such events should not, however, only focus on enhancing parents' technical skills. They should also help parents take a self-determined and critical approach to online content.

This also means that parents have to take an interest in their child's online activities. For young children, accompanying them while they surf the internet or installing parental control software are effective ways of fulfilling parental duties. In the case of teenagers, however, parents should focus on setting binding rules. Whether it is possible to establish fixed regulations on matters like the duration of media use or the use of specific content remains open to question. However, it is certainly also the job of parents to make sure their children are spending enough time on their schoolwork or training and on leisure activities away from the computer.

4.7 People with an immigrant background

"An immigrant background alone is not, as is often assumed, a decisive factor in the digital divide. Age, level of education and income have a similar impact on this group's media use as they do on the population without an immigrant background."⁸²

⁷⁸ Cf. Medienpädagogischer Forschungsverbund Südwest: *KIM-Studie 2010*, available online at: <http://www.mpfs.de/fileadmin/KIM-pdf10/KIM2010.pdf>, p. 59f.

⁷⁹ Quote from *ibid.*, p. 62

⁸⁰ Cf. *ibid.*, p. 62 ff.

⁸¹ Cf. Media Authority of North Rhine-Westphalia: www.eltern-undmedien.de. Note: For example, in Rhineland-Palatinate the 'Medienkompetenz macht Schule' (Media literacy goes to school) programme offered all participating schools €200 each to hold parents' evenings/afternoons. See also <http://eltern.medienkompetenz.rlp.de/>

⁸² Cf. Initiative D21, *Sonderauswertung zum (N)Onliner Atlas 2008 – Internetnutzung und Migrationshintergrund in Deutschland*. Berlin: 2008, p. 4

This was the conclusion Initiative D21 came to in its special evaluation for the *(N)Onlineratlas 2008*. A study by the ARD/ZDF media commission *Migranten und Medien 2007* came to similar conclusions.

Here are a few of the most striking findings of the *(N)Onlineratlas 2008*:

- 64.3 percent of people without an immigrant background are internet users.
- 66.8 percent of first-generation immigrants and 75.3 percent of second-generation immigrants use the internet.⁸³
- Female second-generation immigrants aged 14 to 29 make above-average use of the internet, whereas older immigrants aged 50 and over use the internet less than other age and population groups.
- Older female second-generation immigrants make less use of the internet than all other age and population groups.⁸⁴
- Generally, lower internet use by older people in general and older women in particular is also found by surveys that do not take account of a possible immigrant background.

Participation in the information society is generally seen as an important factor in achieving equal opportunities. “Internet use has additional relevance for disadvantaged members of society, which includes people with an immigrant background – particularly with regard to social participation and political equality. The internet provides this section of the population in particular with additional information resources that have the potential to significantly expand and improve the courses of action available to them.”⁸⁵

In 2008 the political sciences department at the University of Münster conducted a survey of internet use among immigrants from the former Soviet Union and found that on the one hand they use the internet to obtain information about local German organisations, e.g. the websites of municipal authorities, or to look for advice, to find a job or to find out about German traditions and lifestyle. On

the other hand, they also use the internet to keep up to date with events in their native country. They go online to stay in touch with friends and family living far away in their native country, and most of the communication takes place in their mother tongue.⁸⁶

A study by the Media Authority of North Rhine-Westphalia provided more detailed information on the findings outlined above for North Rhine-Westphalia. The most important findings of this survey were that the migration history of children and teenagers questioned had no significant impact on their media usage. The study by Weiß/Trebbe/Heft focused on 12-to-29-year-olds with a Turkish background and young immigrants from the former Soviet Union. It did not find any evidence for the supposed “digital divide” between young people with and without an immigrant background. Social factors had a much more significant impact on media usage. Socio-economic status and the level of formal education were particularly decisive. The higher their level of formal education, the more likely it is that young people will use computers and the internet as a work tool, regardless of whether they have an immigrant background or not. This background is, however, decisive when it comes to gender-specific media usage.⁸⁷

Even though Weiß/Trebbe/Heft were able to present solid findings in this area, further research is required. This is because the data regarding the internet usage of people with an immigrant background is still patchy and inconsistent, despite the above-mentioned studies.⁸⁸ “In general, assumptions that young people with an immigrant background are disadvantaged in terms of their access to and use of media are discredited by heterogeneous research findings. As well as finding differences in comparison to people of the same age without an immigrant background, some studies point to a variety of learning methods and opportunities the new media offers the population of young immigrants. Unfortunately the findings of

⁸⁶ Cf. *ibid.*, p. 31f.

⁸⁷ Cf. Trebbe, Joachim /Heft, Annett / Weiß, Hans-Jürgen, “Mediennutzung junger Menschen mit Migrationshintergrund. Umfragen und Gruppendiskussionen mit Personen türkischer Herkunft und russischen Aussiedlern im Alter zwischen 12 und 29 Jahren in Nordrhein-Westfalen”, *Medienforschung* series by Media Authority of North Rhine-Westphalia, volume 63, Berlin: 2010

⁸⁸ Cf. Ausführungen zur Datenlage: *ibid.*, p. 39ff and Federal Ministry for Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth: recommended courses of action to optimise immigrants’ online skills. Competence Center Technology-Diversity-Equal Chances (a non-profit organisation), 2009, p. 7/18

⁸³ Cf. *ibid.*, p. 10. Note: To interpret these figures correctly, it should be noted that the respondents with an immigrant background were on average ten years younger than those without an immigrant background.

⁸⁴ Cf. *ibid.*, p. 7.

⁸⁵ Cf. Kissau, Kathrin: “Internetnutzung von Migranten – ein Weg zur Integration”, *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte*, 39/2008, p. 29

these studies can hardly be generalised for methodological reasons.”⁸⁹

The expert advisory committee for the *Onlinekompetenz für Migrantinnen und Migranten in Deutschland* (“Online expertise for immigrants in Germany”) project of the Federal Ministry for Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth also said in its “suggested courses of action for optimising the online skills of people with an immigrant background” that “there is a considerable need for research regarding the online skills of people with an immigrant background.”⁹⁰

In view of the fact that many projects and initiatives put media at the heart of their social integration measures,⁹¹ we need comprehensive data on the qualitative use of online content. A comparison of people with and without an immigrant background from this perspective could reveal interesting findings and perhaps help explain why internet use is the same or even slightly higher among people with a migration background than among those without this background. This endeavour seems particularly worthwhile given that it is always assumed that people with an immigrant background make less use of traditional media such as print or radio.⁹² It could also help identify the factors that make media attractive to this target group and that motivate them to use it. Such information could then be usefully applied to other groups.

4.8 People with disabilities

In keeping with the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, Article 9 (1 and 2), the study commission advocates that people with disabilities should be able to participate in society in a self-determined way. Interactive media open up many new opportunities and prospects here. However, people with disabilities can only participate in a self-determined way if the disadvantages they face on a daily basis are redressed. Despite wide-ranging equality legislation,

⁸⁹ Cf. Federal Ministry for Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth: l.c., p. 49

⁹⁰ Cf. *ibid.*, p. 7/18

⁹¹ Cf. Medien und Integration dialogue forum led by the federal government commissioner for migration, refugees and integration Berlin: 2010 and Initiative D21, *IT-Roadmap zur gesellschaftlichen Integration. Ausgewählte Beispiele und Handlungsempfehlungen zum nationalen Integrationsplan*. Berlin: 2007

⁹² Cf. Federal Office for Migration and Refugees: *Mediennutzung von Migranten in Deutschland*, Working Paper 34, Nuremberg: 2010, p. 29 ff.

people with disabilities still constantly face obstacles of some kind. For example, in railway stations where there is no lift, on websites that are not designed in a “barrier-free” way – and in acquiring media literacy skills, when the courses available are not conceived with disabled people in mind.

To rectify this situation, media literacy learning opportunities must be designed in a way that takes special account of the needs of people with disabilities. This does not just mean providing the necessary technical requirements and support tools, but also involves adapting the didactic methods used. There must be both learning opportunities that cater exclusively to people with disabilities – for example, teaching them how to navigate the internet with the use of support tools – and others that allow both people with and without disabilities to learn or to create online content together.

To date, very little research has been carried out on the media literacy skills of people with disabilities in Germany. TU Dortmund University is currently collaborating with the Bethel Foundation on a local project entitled “Anschluss statt Ausschluss” (Inclusion instead of exclusion), which is investigating the participation of people with disabilities in modern information and communication technologies. After all, “media literacy is regarded as a factor in the development of an individual’s personality and as a decisive requirement for participating in society. [...] For people who need a high level of support [...] genuine equality of opportunity depends on the accessibility of the relevant medium. This applies both to technical aspects and to the design of teaching and learning processes related to acquiring media literacy skills.”⁹³

At present, projects that focus on accessibility are few and far between. For example, the *Landesarbeitsgemeinschaft Lokale Medienarbeit NRW*, the state working group for local media work in North Rhine-Westphalia, held a conference entitled *Digital ist besser! Medienprojekte für alle planen, gestalten, durchführen* (“Digital is better! Planning, designing and implementing media projects for everyone”) in March 2011. The conference was “aimed at all those interested in

⁹³ Cf. <http://www.fk-reha.tu-dortmund.de/Koerperbehinderten/cms/de/Forschung/Laufend/index.html>

offering media projects that are accessible to everyone.”⁹⁴

North Rhine-Westphalia is also home to another project that has done exemplary media education work with disabled people. A working group of mekonet, the Media Literacy Network, has set itself the goal of offering more accessible media literacy learning opportunities. Some of the projects take an exclusive approach (only people with disabilities take part), others are inclusive (people with and without disabilities learn together).⁹⁵

To ensure that more of these services become open to people with disabilities in future, teachers and multipliers across the board need to receive further training to increase their awareness of the accessibility factor, both in technical and didactic terms. It would be better still if project organisers were required to consider the accessibility aspect in all media literacy training programmes. The state media authorities play an important role here too. They must ensure that their projects and learning materials are designed to be accessible to everyone.

4.9 Senior citizens

A relatively large amount of data is available on internet use among older people. Although their internet use has significantly increased over the last few years, senior citizens still use the internet far less than other age groups. This is certainly not due to a lack of interest among the older generation. The popularity of the 87-page brochure *Wegweiser durch die digitale Welt für ältere Bürgerinnen und Bürger* (A senior citizen’s guide to the digital world) published by the Federal Association of Senior Citizens Organisations in 2008, which was reprinted four times in two years, shows the lively interest older people have in interactive media.

Just under 30 percent of those aged 60 or over are occasional internet users (2010 ARD/ZDF Online Study); less than 25 percent of women aged 65 and over use the internet (23 percent in the first quarter of 2010, according to the Federal Statistical Office); while internet use among men in the same age group is much higher at 42 percent. This difference may well be due to gender stereotypes, which are more

pronounced among the older generation with regard to their use of modern technology.⁹⁶

Older people are also keen users of social networks, although their use of these sites and of blogs is far below average. The following table from the 2010 ARD/ZDF Online Study shows this very clearly.

Obviously, as younger generations get older, media use among these age groups will change and they will naturally use more and more internet-based services. Media habits adopted in younger years influence behaviour in later years too. But at the same time, new interests and needs also come into play. Internet-based communication can take on much greater significance in old age than in other phases of life.

Several studies and many initiatives have focused on the specific needs and challenges of older people.⁹⁷

⁹⁴ Cf. <http://www.medienarbeit-nrw.de/cms-veranstaltungen/maerz-2011/>

⁹⁵ Cf. <http://www.mekonet.de/t3/fileadmin/fachtagung/0601/hasenkox.pdf>

⁹⁶ Cf. Erb, Ulrike, “Technikgestaltung aus Frauenperspektive”, Winker, Gabriele / Oechtering, Veronika (eds.), *Computernetze, Frauenplätze. Frauen in der Informationsgesellschaft*. Opladen: 1998, p. 186 and Wopfner, Eva, *Ältere Menschen und Internetnutzung*, thesis. Innsbruck: 2006, p. 20, available online at: <http://medien.paedagogik.kaywa.com/files/aeltere%20mensen%20und%20internet%20nutzung.pdf>

⁹⁷ Cf. overview e.g. in Gehrke, Barbara (ed.), *Ältere Menschen, Neue Medien. Entwicklungschancen für künftige Medienprojekte für Frauen und Männer mit Lebenserfahrung in Nordrhein-Westfalen*, Europäisches Zentrum für Medienkompetenz. Marl: 2008

Development of internet use in Germany between 1997 and 2010⁹⁸ (Occasional internet use)

	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Total	6.5	10.4	17.7	28.6	38.8	44.1	53.5	55.3	57.9	59.5	62.7	65.8	67.1	69.4
<i>Gender</i>														
Male	10.0	15.7	23.9	36.6	48.3	53.0	62.6	64.2	67.5	67.3	68.9	72.4	74.5	75.5
Female	3.3	5.6	11.7	21.3	30.1	36.0	45.2	47.3	49.1	52.4	56.9	59.6	60.1	63.5
<i>Age</i>														
14-19	6.3	15.6	30.0	48.5	67.4	76.9	92.1	94.7	95.7	97.3	95.8	97.2	97.5	100.0
20-29	13.0	20.7	33.0	54.6	65.5	80.3	81.9	82.8	85.3	87.3	94.3	94.8	95.2	98.4
30-39	12.4	18.9	24.5	41.1	50.3	65.6	73.1	75.9	79.9	80.6	81.9	87.9	89.4	89.9
40-49	7.7	11.1	19.6	32.2	49.3	47.8	67.4	69.9	71.0	72.0	73.8	77.3	80.2	81.9
50-59	3.0	4.4	15.1	22.1	32.2	35.4	48.8	52.7	56.5	60.0	64.2	65.7	67.4	68.9
60 +	0.2	0.8	1.9	4.4	8.1	7.8	13.3	14.5	18.4	20.3	25.1	26.4	27.1	28.2
<i>Occupation</i>														
In education	15.1	24.7	37.9	58.5	79.4	81.1	91.6	94.5	97.4	98.6	97.6	96.7	98.0	100.0
Working	9.1	13.8	23.1	38.4	48.4	59.3	69.6	73.4	77.1	74.0	78.6	81.8	82.3	82.4
Retired/ unemployed	0.5	1.7	4.2	6.8	14.5	14.8	21.3	22.9	26.3	28.3	32.0	33.6	34.7	36.4

Basis: Adults aged 14 and above in Germany (2009: n=1806, 2008: n=1802, 2007: n=1822, 2006: n=1820, 2005: n=1857, 2004: n=1810, 2003: n=1955, 2002: n=2293, 2001: n=2520, 2000: n=3514, 1999: n=5661, 1998: n=9673, 1997: n=15431). From 2010: German speaking population aged 14 and above (2010: n=1804)

Web 2.0 use according to age and sex⁹⁹

(Used at least rarely; figures in percent)

	Total	Men	Women	Aged 14-19	Aged 20-29	Aged 30-39	Aged 40-49	Aged 50-59	Aged 60+
Wikipedia	73	76	70	95	85	80	71	58	45
Video portals (e.g. YouTube)	58	66	50	95	85	65	51	34	14
Private networks/ communities	39	35	43	81	65	44	20	17	9
Photo albums, communities	19	18	20	28	27	17	14	17	13
Professional networks/ communities	7	8	5	5	6	14	5	3	5
Weblogs	7	9	6	14	12	7	6	6	2
Bookmark lists	2	2	2	1	4	4	0	2	0
Twitter	3	4	2	9	4	2	2	4	0

⁹⁸ Cf. *ARD online 1997*, ARD/ZDF online studies 1998 to 2010

⁹⁹ Cf. *ibid.*

Some particular needs of senior citizens are:

- Aging today no longer necessarily means that a person's physical or mental capacities are reduced, even though they have officially retired from working life. A growing number of senior citizens want to continue to play an active role in society – professionally, politically or socially – and the internet can be very useful here.
- At the same time, factors like leaving employment, changes in the family situation, health problems and reduced mobility can make it more difficult for older people to participate in society in general and to take advantage of media literacy courses. The internet can help “to reduce the impact or balance out the effects of these personal and social changes in the lives of older people.”¹⁰⁹
- One of the characteristics of life in old age can be having to leave familiar surroundings — e.g. due to care needs. In such cases, older people often have a great interest in maintaining a link with their former surroundings. The internet and, in particular, social networks can play an important role here.

However, older people also face particular challenges when it comes to accessing and using the internet:

- The digital age is making it increasingly difficult for older people to organise their daily lives. Online banking, online medical advice and information, travel bookings and support and emergency systems, as well as video calling and communication with friends and family via VoIP (Voice over Internet Protocol), are all developments that should and could make life easier. However, many older people are still not able to access them.
- Limited motor skills: Old age can lead to restrictions, for example in hand-eye coordination, making internet use difficult.
- Impaired vision: In spite of all efforts at accessibility, many websites remain strongly visually oriented. Impaired vision therefore makes it more difficult to take advantage of the internet.
- Inadequate services: Many websites are still designed by young people for young people, meaning that old people cannot cognitively and emotionally identify with them.

¹⁰⁹ Cf. here: Wopfner, Eva: l.c., p. 8 ff.

- Today's senior citizens may also still have psychological barriers preventing them from finding out what the internet can offer them. It is also possible that they do not consider the possibilities offered by the internet to be particularly attractive. This lack of understanding about the potential of the internet can also be a hindrance.

There are still significant shortcomings regarding media education for senior citizens:

The teaching of media literacy skills mostly focuses on the younger generation. Children and youth are growing up with a whole variety of new ways of accessing information and communicating. Many educational institutions and recreational facilities offer suitable environments to learn about and use modern forms of communication. Working adults also have access to various types of education and training through which they can improve their media literacy skills. However, at the end of their working lives, many older people find themselves excluded from the formal educational and training programmes which were previously often automatically available to them. As the above-mentioned examples show, in a few years it will be almost impossible to deal with all aspects of everyday life without being able to use interactive media. At the same time, interactive media offers all kinds of opportunities, not least in old age.

This requires the older generation to engage in lifelong learning and in some cases to change their attitude and start actively acquiring competence in this field. To make this easier, media literacy courses should be much more tailored to the needs and abilities of older people. For example, they should focus on helping them to use new forms of communication that are open to them despite their restricted mobility, e.g. chat, VoIP and video calling.

“Older people's ability to make use of technological developments and the internet depends in part on their particular social and material situation, while media jargon, insufficient media literacy skills, gender-specific attitudes to technology and non-user-friendly devices are further factors hindering their use of the internet.”¹¹⁰

As well as conveying the key skills needed to use interactive media, media education for senior citizens must take into account the particular requirements of the older generation (e.g. in terms of computer and software design). In addition, media

¹¹⁰ Quote from Wopfner, Eva: l.c., p. 24

literacy teaching must develop approaches tailored specifically to this target group so that media forms that are largely designed by and for young people are also useful and attractive to older people.

4.10 Journalists and multipliers

Journalists also face new challenges with regard to interactive media. The rapid dissemination of information over the internet places news producers under pressure. There is often little time to check the facts if they are to succeed in breaking a story before their competitors. A watchblog for German media, bildblog.de, gathers countless cases where journalists have published error-ridden information from unreliable sources or from other media without checking them first.

As journalists devote their working lives to producing media content, they are (still) the multipliers with the greatest online reach. This places them in a particular position of responsibility with regard to the information they publish, as other multipliers put their faith in the reliability of this information. Journalists therefore have to be particularly adept at making the best use of the vast quantities of easily and rapidly available information on the internet. In other words, those creating media content need to be particularly media literate.

Interactive media skills

As part of the study entitled *Journalismus und Twitter. Der Einfluss des "Social Web" auf die Nachrichten* (Journalism and Twitter. How the "social web" influences the news), the Media Authority of North Rhine-Westphalia surveyed online news editors. In answer to the question "How would you rate the skills of your editorial staff regarding social web services?" only seven percent of respondents answered with "no need for improvement". In contrast, 60 percent of respondents replied with "a strong need for improvement" and a third said there was "some need for improvement" in their team.¹¹¹

In response to the question on how journalists had acquired the skills needed for using the social web, learning by doing (98 percent) and informal discussions with colleagues (71 percent) were the

¹¹¹ Cf. Neuberger, Christoph / vom Hofe, Hanna Jo / Nuernbergk, Christian, *Twitter und Journalismus. Der Einfluss des 'Social Web' auf die Nachrichten*, Media Authority of North Rhine-Westphalia, LfM document No. 38. Düsseldorf: 2010, p. 66, available online at: http://lfmpublikationen.lfm-nrw.de/catalog/downloadproducts/LfM_Doku38_Twitter_Online.pdf

most frequent answers. Twenty-eight percent of respondents said they had had in-house training, while only 17 percent said they had taken part in external training measures.

At present, social web skills are rarely taught during a traineeship (13 percent) or other type of journalism course (10 percent), showing a significant need for improvement in systematically teaching social web skills as part of initial and further journalism training. Given these observations, it is hardly surprising that 85 percent of news office editors agreed with the statement "The social web should play a greater role in training programmes for journalists".¹¹²

Research skills

The Media Authority of North Rhine-Westphalia also collaborated with Universität Leipzig to conduct a comprehensive multi-method research study called *Journalistische Recherche im Internet. Bestandsaufnahme journalistischer Arbeitsweisen in Zeitungen, Hörfunk, Fernsehen und Online*. ("Journalistic research online. Current working methods in newspapers, radio, television and the internet.")

Based on the findings, the researchers produced a list of recommendations for action. The study commission found the following suggestions to be particularly relevant.

- Institutionalising research – particularly fact checking – in the individual departments by setting up specialised research teams
- Ensuring that online research skills form a firmly integrated and standardised part of the training offered by journalism schools, universities and traineeship providers
- An "online research excellence initiative" for small editorial offices¹¹³

¹¹² Cf. Neuberger, Christoph / vom Hofe, Hanna Jo / Nuernbergk, Christian, LfM study, *Twitter als Resonanzraum und Recherchehilfe. Redaktionsbefragung der Universität Münster. Mangelhafte Ausbildung für den Microblogging-Dienst*, Münster: 2010, p. 4, available online at: http://lfm-nrw.de/fileadmin/lfm-nrw/Pressemeldungen/LfM-Studie_Twitter_als_Resonanzraum_und_Recherchehilfe_Zusammenfassung.pdf

¹¹³ Cf. Machill, Marcel / Beiler, Markus / Zenker, Martin, *Journalistische Recherche im Internet. Bestandsaufnahme journalistischer Arbeitsweisen in Zeitungen, Hörfunk, Fernsehen und Online. Abstract, Zusammenfassung und Handlungsempfehlungen*. Berlin: 2008, available online at: http://www.lfm-nrw.de/fileadmin/lfm-nrw/Veranstaltungskalender/zus-jourrech_01.pdf

As a result of the study, training measures to improve the online research skills of journalists were developed. These were published in October 2009 in a book entitled *Online-Recherchestrategien für Journalistinnen und Journalisten. Workshopmaterialien für die Aus- und Weiterbildung* (“Online research strategies for journalists. Training materials for workshops”).¹¹⁴

4.11 The unemployed

In view of the fact that good media skills are becoming a prerequisite for playing an active role in society and as employers increasingly demand these skills, media literacy training should not just be offered to those in employment, but also to those seeking work as a means of boosting their employability.

The first results of a project entitled “Die Bedeutung des Internets für gesellschaftliche Teilhabe am Beispiel alltäglicher Praktiken Erwerbsloser” (“The importance of the internet for participation in society, taking the everyday life of the unemployed as an example”) by the Hamburg University of Technology (TUHH) found:

“The internet functions as a compensatory medium in the area of culture and education, helps to pass time and is an outlet for leisure activity, empowers people to exercise their rights, provides an alternative or additional source of income, helps structure the days, offers social environments and a place to feel at home, serves as a platform for solidarity or as a tool for political involvement. The internet has long been more than a source of information.”¹¹⁵

This means that those who are temporarily out of work must not lose touch with developments in the digital world. Media literacy information and training programmes must be specifically available to population groups that are at risk of being excluded from the opportunities of the digital world.¹¹⁶

¹¹⁴ Cf. <http://www.lfm-nrw.de/medienkompetenz/Foerderung-der-aus-und-fortbildung/qualifizierungsangebot-journalistische-recherche-im-internet.html>

¹¹⁵ Quote from Englert, Kathrin / Gerbig, Do. / Schwarz, Bentje: l.c., p. 4.

¹¹⁶ THE LEFT parliamentary group has inserted additional text here, which has also been approved by the ALLIANCE 90/THE GREENS parliamentary group. See Chapter 6, Dissenting opinions and supplements.

4.12 The employed

Those in employment fall into many of the categories already discussed. However, the working population also has particular needs of its own. It is not a homogenous group and the skills individuals must have are too diverse for media literacy programmes to effectively target this group as a whole. The use of interactive media is already a part of daily working life in many professions across almost all sectors – particularly for communication purposes, both internally or externally with business partners or clients. It is therefore particularly important to firmly incorporate practical media education in professional and vocational training programmes. Further and in-service training measures are also an effective way of bringing the working population up to date with developments in interactive media.

Media literacy programmes should not only be provided outside the workplace, but should also be specifically job-related. A positive side effect of professional media literacy training is that it also enables employees to actively participate in digital society outside the workplace. As acquiring media literacy skills is a continual process and must be learnt in a practical way, employers should place as few limitations as possible on the use of interactive media in the workplace.

As job profiles vary so widely, it is particularly important that social partners develop and implement additional media literacy training opportunities for employees. Measures aimed at employees that also directly benefit employers by increasing the skills of their workforce would be most suitable in this context.

Media literacy training during initial and further training still makes sense even if most of the tasks performed in a job are not carried out online. The rapid pace of digital developments means that professions currently requiring almost no interactive media skills may soon require more. Media literacy training can therefore benefit people in these professions by equipping them with the skills necessary for participating more fully in the digital society, while also equipping them with skills they may well need in their workplace in the future.¹¹⁷

¹¹⁷ Amendment added by THE LEFT parliamentary group and expert Annette Mühlberg: “13. Decision-makers / An appreciation of information technology’s power to influence norms and standards and an understanding of how technological, economic, legal (constitutional) and social issues interrelate is key to creating IT infrastructure, organising work and introducing

With regard to all the above-mentioned groups, we can conclude that:

Media literacy, as the ability to use media responsibly, should not just be taught according to age groups. In future, we will increasingly see children, teenagers, adults and senior citizens learning and working together. The younger generation can introduce older people, who are not confident about using the internet, to the possibilities of the World Wide Web, especially social networks. Conversely, younger people can also benefit from the older generation's expertise in sorting and evaluating information.

5 Recommendations for action and other key questions

5.1 General

The study commission believes the real, self-guided participation of everyone in the information society ("digital self-reliance") should be a central goal. For this to happen, certain prerequisites need to be in place regarding access, ability and activity – prerequisites that cannot as yet be found in all sections of the population.

Whether or not a person has the skills needed for digital self-reliance also depends on his or her specific circumstances. Children and young people, for example, have particular needs. Yet new circumstances, such as taking on the role of a responsible parent, can also bring new challenges and open up questions of how to acquire the necessary skills.

Skills can be acquired in a wide variety of ways. In view of the importance of digital self-reliance for participation in society, continuous scrutiny is necessary to determine which prerequisites must exist for which circumstances, so that this type of self-reliance is achievable for everyone. When deficits are found, they should be compensated for with suitable services that allow people to develop the necessary skills.

5.2 Objectives

One framework condition for teaching media literacy (besides long-term investment in the required infrastructure) is an innovation-friendly climate in the educational system that encourages

software in a responsible manner. It is therefore vital for decision-makers in business, politics and administration to be highly media literate."

individuals to show initiative, thereby promoting pedagogical and didactic innovations.

During the study commission hearing on media literacy on 13 December 2010, the expert Jürgen Ertelt pointed out that teachers would need to give up their current ideas of what teaching is in favour of reciprocal learning. Their new role is one of a navigator and catalyst. Young people in particular need to be acknowledged as experts and need to be won over for peer-to-peer teaching.

The study commission identified the following goals:

- Basic skill: mastery of reading and writing
- Technical skills (using hardware and software, basic understanding of how the internet is set up, basic programming knowledge, etc.) that aim primarily at understanding contexts and enabling self-directed learning
- Critical questioning of content (assessing sources, recognising the intentions of senders, being aware of advertising messages, etc. This is equally important for using conventional media – newspaper projects, for example, could also contain useful lessons on how to approach online content)
- Dealing effectively with the information explosion (basic understanding of how search engines work; preventing one-sided selection of information in favour of a sensible use of the diversity of opinions on the web)
- Risk-awareness (hidden costs, data protection, scams, abuse)
- Creative use and design of content, including basic principles like social values and social competence (awareness of cyber-bullying; responsible behaviour within a more or less anonymous space)
- Information literacy, which is the ability to evaluate and use information, to eliminate useless items, and to estimate how much information can or must be provided for a specific situation
- Enabling people to create their own content (websites, blogs, films, music, possibly software)

Technical skills should be conveyed in a way that does not favour certain technologies or manufacturers. Someone who has learned how to create form letters using one specific word processing program, for example, is not media literate. However, that person *is* media literate if, given a reasonable amount of time, they are able to create form letters in any word-processing program without having learned how to do it beforehand. A

lack of media literacy can also have serious potential for conflict in areas such as data protection (of one's own data and that of others) and consumer protection. The same is true for other social values and protection targets such as copyrights.

On the subject of information literacy, the use of quality media also plays an essential role. Such media include publishing houses as well as public service broadcasters. These are proven sources of high-quality material and can offer reliable points of reference in the vast expanses of the internet.

In his position paper for the study commission's public hearing on media literacy on 13 December 2010, expert Harald Gapski wrote: "On the basis of a systematic and constructivist approach to promoting media literacy, emphasis should be placed on the target-group-appropriate design of environments and spaces where media literacy can develop. Strictly speaking, it is not about conveying media literacy from a literate transmitter to a less literate recipient, but about development in the sense of individuals bringing out this literacy in themselves through need-based, real-world-oriented learning."¹⁰⁹

In this respect, the study commission calls readers' attention to the recommendations of the inter-state conference on media education (*Länderkonferenz Medienbildung*). Its 2008 position paper entitled *Kompetenzorientiertes Konzept für die schulische Medienbildung* says:

"Media education is divided into six areas of literacy: information, communication, presentation, production, analysis, and media society. These areas have [...] a variety of correlations: The areas of information, communication and presentation can be assigned primarily to methodological-didactical 'learning with media' while the areas of production, analysis and media society can be assigned to content-based 'learning about media'."¹¹⁰

For adult education, the study commission sees a need for action in processing information with new digital means. In many cases adults are able to easily identify information sources but lack the ability to

¹⁰⁹ Quoted from Gapski, Harald, *Schriftliche Stellungnahme zur öffentlichen Anhörung „Medienkompetenz“ der Enquete-Kommission Internet und digitale Gesellschaft des Deutschen Bundestages am 13. Dezember 2010*, Committee printed paper 17(24)014-D, p. 8, available online at: http://www.bundestag.de/internetenquete/dokumentation/Sitzungn/20101213/A-Drs__17_24_014-D_-_Stellungnahme_Gapski.pdf

¹¹⁰ Cf. <http://www.laenderkonferenz-medienbildung.de/LKM-Positionspapier.pdf>

make those sources useful to them in the long term, by using archiving and sharing tools, for example. Providing them with these organisational and networking abilities can gradually lead them towards new opportunities for participation, including socio-political participation.

Part of the job of the study commission is to set realistic goals for conveying media literacy. As numerous projects in the states and municipalities show, good results can be achieved in all areas through media literacy teaching. More importantly, adequate services need to be offered in all areas, and these need to be high-quality, tightly integrated and build upon one another.

During the study commission's public hearing on media literacy on 13 December 2010, expert Kathrin Demmler said: "All actors and institutions, especially those responsible for shaping education policy within family, youth, schools and cultural policy, are encouraged to promote media literacy by establishing lasting joint initiatives and measures that have a solid technical and structural foundation."¹¹¹

5.3 Media literacy projects and initiatives

The study commission recognises that many of these shortcomings have already been proactively addressed by states and municipalities, public service broadcasters, businesses, and civil-society actors. The No Education Without Media initiative also offered valuable recommendations.¹¹² The study commission believes these can help spur further debate for improving media literacy. But there is always room for more ideas on how to further improve the range of media literacy projects and initiatives, and several of our proposals appear below.

1. Media education is everyone's responsibility

Media literacy acquisition is first and foremost the responsibility of individuals themselves. However, when support is needed, the government and especially society can step in. Companies that profit from the digital society carry a special responsibility

¹¹¹ Quoted from Demmler, Kathrin, *Schriftliche Stellungnahme zur öffentlichen Anhörung „Medienkompetenz“ der Enquete-Kommission Internet und digitale Gesellschaft des Deutschen Bundestages am 13. Dezember 2010*, Committee printed paper 17(24)014-B, p. 3, available online at: http://www.bundestag.de/internetenquete/dokumentation/Sitzungn/20101213/A-Drs__17_24_014-B_-_Stellungnahme_Demmler.pdf

¹¹² Cf. <http://www.keine-bildung-ohne-medien.de/>

in this regard, which they need to accept more readily than they have until now.

This responsibility to provide support includes offering up-to-date equipment at publicly funded educational, community and cultural institutions and access to interactive media.¹¹³

2. Objectives and evaluation

The topic of media literacy funding is in danger of being instrumentalised by policy-makers for use in sensationalistic campaigns. To prevent this, we should clearly define what is needed and thoroughly evaluate the measures to be taken.

Measures and campaigns aimed at promoting media literacy need to be more focused than in the past, especially when public funds are involved. Clearly defined objectives and regular evaluations are an essential part of this, as they help to avoid misallocation of resources.

3. Improved interlinking of media education activities at the federal and state level

Framework conditions for media education cannot be judged separately according to individual sectors. Media literacy is a cross-disciplinary issue so it involves different areas of policy, such as family and youth policy, education and research policy, and media, internet and economic policy, to name just a few. Considering the numerous initiatives, scientific approaches, funding projects and campaigns that already exist, a primary goal of future policymaking should be to achieve better coordination. This includes improved consultation and coordination between the federal and state levels.

The federal government supports media education activities in various ways, even though the states have the regulatory authority. The *Netz für Kinder* (“Network for Kids”) is one of the many initiatives worth mentioning.¹¹⁴ In the past, the connections

¹¹³ The SPD parliamentary group delivered a supplementary dissenting opinion on this point: “Legislators should check to see whether there are shortcomings with regard to access and, if so, what their nature is, and they should determine what action needs to be taken to enable socially disadvantaged persons to independently pursue media education and participate in digital media.” The Left Party parliamentary group also delivered a supplementary dissenting opinion, which the Alliance 90/The Greens parliamentary group endorsed: “Legislators should check whether internet-ready terminals can be included in the definition of basic needs to enable socially disadvantaged persons to independently pursue media education and participate in digital media.”

¹¹⁴ Cf. Appendix 1: Media literacy projects, initiatives and institutions

have been rather arbitrary, and this needs improvement. As an example, once the states have decided on parental control software, the federal government could explain how to use it and promote its widespread adoption.

The study commission recommends setting up an interdisciplinary panel of experts to improve collaboration across different policy fields (education, media, youth, business, etc.) and to improve how they respond to new technologies and social phenomena on the web. This panel should meet regularly (at least once every six months) to discuss new developments and analyse their associated opportunities and risks and to develop new concepts for responding to them. The panel should then make those concepts available to media education practitioners.

4. A portable computer for every schoolchild, in the interest of new education concepts and new teaching methods

Media literacy needs to be given from an early age so that everybody can take advantage of the opportunities of the digital society.

But German schools are still a long way from providing each and every child with his or her own portable computer that can be taken to class. Nor can teachers make the internet and new media a compulsory part of homework, as some children still do not have access to a personal computer. Furthermore, there are indications that some schoolchildren, especially those from uneducated households, are more likely to get access to entertainment media than to full-fledged computers that enable them to use the educational resources on the web. Last but not least, teachers need to be informed, proficient media users themselves, and they need better support when they use computers in the classroom.

Against this background, the study commission recommends providing all secondary school pupils with portable computers. Ideally, they would be equipped with free hardware and software, provided this is economically feasible. In addition, teachers and students should be able to use them anywhere and for any subject, not just in computer rooms, and they should be encouraged to integrate them in all types of lessons. This would mean pupils would always have their learning environment with them.

Equipping schoolchildren with up-to-date hardware and giving them permanent access to modern digital technology is therefore a worthy goal that we should continue to pursue. Yet this strategy absolutely

needs to be accompanied by didactical qualification measures for teachers and a proactive, media-appropriate educational campaign. The appropriate use of digital technology in schools will require a new understanding of teaching and learning that does justice to the new possibilities of networked, collaborative learning and self-directed acquisition of knowledge. The changes that the internet and digital media have brought to information access, content sharing and learning are radical and irreversible.¹¹⁵

The study commission would encourage the Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF) to create research programmes that explore possible digital education concepts as well as model system structures and configurations that could be used in schools and with schoolchildren. The BMBF should also continue to endorse research programmes that aim to identify model usage approaches for teachers and schools.

The results of this research should be available to all states as they elaborate the programme. In addition, all states should help evaluate the results. Existing initiatives and the insights they provide should also be considered. The study commission sees an urgent need for coordination on classroom application and device procurement and believes this need should be solved at the national level.

The study commission recommends investigating how parents' contributions could be made tax-deductible as part of a financing model for the portable computers for schoolchildren.¹¹⁶ Every child needs to receive a good-quality computer so that none are at a disadvantage as a result of their socioeconomic background.

Besides providing the necessary personnel and integrating this new technology in teaching models, the study commission believes there is an urgent need to digitise schoolbooks and teaching and learning materials and to make them available on the internet or on an intranet. More information is

¹¹⁵ The SPD parliamentary group and the experts Dr Wolfgang Schulz and Alvar Freude delivered a dissenting opinion on this topic (Cf. Chapter 6, Dissenting opinions and supplements).

¹¹⁶ Dissenting opinion from the SPD and Alliance 90/The Greens parliamentary group and experts Dr Wolfgang Schulz and Alvar Freude: "Precisely low-income parents would benefit the least from this, as they cannot afford to buy a PC for their children. The child tax credit satisfies the children's general education needs. Schools could ensure that new computers come with the right software, they can handle quality control, they can pay less because they buy in bulk, and they can pass that savings on to parents. Such an approach is likely to help more than new tax laws."

needed about how the federal and state governments can support and promote relevant projects within the framework of the free supply of teaching materials.

5. Media literacy through viral campaigns

New ways of promoting media literacy should supplement the conventional tools. Media campaigns and viral campaigns – marketing that disseminates messages via social networks and social media – can be an effective way of improving media literacy by teaching people about risks or making them aware of new possibilities. The study commission therefore suggests that the federal government hold regular meetings – which could include the new Stiftung Datenschutz that is currently being set up – at least every six months to discuss the topics that need to be covered by such media and viral campaigns. Both conventional and new media should be involved.

6. Goal-oriented parental involvement

Parents are a key group for media literacy work, one that should receive more attention than has been the case until now. Media education for parents also requires a goal-oriented plan that defines how, where and with what tools they can be approached. One useful method is to combine centralised information resources with decentralised action plans that enable customised, situation-appropriate adjustments for different municipalities.¹¹⁷

7. Initiatives for parental involvement

The study commission advocates doing more to provide parents with targeted advice, especially on low-threshold services. One way to do this is could be to hold information evenings at child day-care centres and schools. The study commission also proposes creating an alliance for the media education of parents (*Bündnis für elterliche Medienbildung*). We appeal to the Federal Government Commissioner for Culture and the Media to work with the central associations of German business to determine whether they can launch an initiative that would enable volunteers from the business world to advise parents. The goal should be to bring IT experts on board as volunteers who will organise informational evenings for parents at schools and day-care centres. To make things

¹¹⁷ Note: The Medienanstalt Hamburg Schleswig-Holstein is a good example. It works with project management agency TIDE to train parents to act as media scouts: <http://www.ma-hsh.de/medienkompetenz/ma-hsh-projekte/eltern-lehrer-u.-multiplik./eltern-medien-lotsen.html>

easier for these volunteers, a central authority should develop and supply sample presentations.

8. Improving child-friendly online services

Child-friendly search machines like fragFINN and Blinde Kuh serve an important purpose and are a great help to parents. Providers should continue to develop these sites and upgrade their technology so that they remain appealing, reliable sources of high-quality content. Publishers and public-service broadcasters have a special responsibility to expand their web services that are appropriate for children.

9. Teacher training and the establishment of media education chairs at universities

Initial and further training for teachers in Germany give insufficient attention to media education. Making pedagogically beneficial use of interactive media and the training of media literacy skills are rarely on the agenda. The further training courses currently on offer do not make up for those shortcomings.

What is needed is a permanent structural reform that will provide the prerequisites for change. This includes having enough media education specialists at universities who can train educators in a practical yet research-oriented manner. There are still not enough of these specialists. The term “educators” not only includes teachers, but also:

- Childcare workers
- Social workers
- Educators in youth work
- University lecturers
- Librarians

10. Making media education an essential element of all educational practice

The study commission advocates making media education a more significant, required element in the curricula of all types of schools. In addition, the study commission recommends explicitly adopting media education as one of the tasks of extracurricular educational work – in places such as child day-care centres, youth clubs, public libraries, adult education centres, senior citizen centres and family centres.

11. Promoting peer-to-peer learning

“The study commission recommends that the states create the right framework conditions for independent, media-relevant action. This includes providing spaces for both formal and informal

education. Intensive peer-to-peer learning needs to be promoted, especially in the context of the social web. There is a need for places and structures that create space for independent, self-guided, interest-led action.”¹¹⁸

12. Incorporating computer games into media teaching

“The study commission recommends that the states view computer games as an essential part of media teaching and promote teaching about them. Computer games can be regarded both as games and as media. The significance of playing for personal development and within our culture is beyond dispute. To accommodate this fact, we advocate making media teaching that includes computer games as a component in the convergent media world and in our culture a part of all subjects in schools and of extracurricular education.”¹¹⁹

5.4 Media literacy research

To improve media literacy in all the fields referred to, all actors will need knowledge at various levels. Research activities can help broaden the base for this knowledge. In this regard, the study commission sees the following options for action:

1. Relevant research programmes, initiated for example by the BMBF, could encourage researchers to address questions that serve efforts to promote improved media literacy. Until now, researchers’ interests have tended to bypass the needs of practitioners.
2. Alongside application-oriented research, more theory-led basic research would help to develop a consistent, empirically verifiable concept of media literacy. It seems sensible for this to incorporate interdisciplinary approaches as well as to consider points of contact with international studies. Additional funding activities should also include long-term studies,

¹¹⁸ Note: This recommendation for action was submitted by members of the public via the study commission’s website and was unanimously adopted without changes by the members of the Media Literacy project group. The project group drew on suggestions and ideas from the public in other chapters of this report as well. These appear either exactly as submitted (as quotations) or loosely paraphrased in a more complex context without any reference to their source.

¹¹⁹ This demand was submitted by the Computer Games and Education working group of the No Education Without Media congress (<http://www.keine-bildung-ohne-medien.de>) via the study commission’s website. It was unanimously adopted without changes as a recommendation for action by the members of the Media Literacy project group.

which are typically unaffordable without such funding, as such studies are necessary for reliably documenting mediatization and media socialisation processes.

3. Although good data exist on how children and youth use new types of media, the German-speaking world lacks comparable studies on media literacy in other groups, such as the socially disadvantaged, the unemployed, people from immigrant backgrounds, senior citizens and people with disabilities.

We also lack research into the effects of digital media on cognitive abilities, the acquisition of digital risk awareness, effective methods of self-discipline,¹²⁰ and the successes of serious game-based learning.

4. With an eye to specific measures for promoting media literacy, evaluation studies that document the quality and longevity of relevant programmes and services would also be desirable.¹²¹

5.5 Further issues

Especially in areas like media literacy and the protection of minors, it is not the job of the study commission to find definitive solutions – which are mainly implemented through states' legislative powers – but rather to ask the right questions. Our primary goal is to discover whether and how the internet requires us to change the way we think.

Regarding risks

The following questions need to be asked about the risks:

- 1 Which guiding principle is right for the internet?

The study commission sees internet safety as a matter of risk management. While most internet experts would agree on this, it is worth reiterating

¹²⁰ Cf. Gigerenzer, Gerd, *Schriftliche Stellungnahme zur öffentlichen Anhörung „Medienkompetenz“ der Enquete-Kommission Internet und digitale Gesellschaft des Deutschen Bundestages am 13. Dezember 2010*, Committee printed paper 17(24)014-F, available online at: http://www.bundestag.de/internetenquete/dokumentation/Sitzungn/20101213/A-Drs__17_24_014-F_-_Stellungnahme_Gigerenzer__Gerd_Prof__Dr.pdf

¹²¹ To supplement points 1 and 4, the SPD parliamentary group and experts Dr Wolfgang Schulz and Alvar Freude submitted a dissenting opinion as Point 5, entitled Regulatory Goals for the Protection of Minors. The parliamentary groups of The Left Party and Alliance 90/The Greens gave their support to it. See Chapter 6, Dissenting opinions and supplements.

here because it is currently anything but a given for German law. Legal regulation often operates on the assumption that the only possible options are yes or no, access or no access. Thinking instead in terms of risks has profound consequences. It entails a reassessment of certain notions, such as the idea that all age cohorts should be handled the same online as offline. It may be enough to create safe-surfing areas for children based on lists of benign sites as has been done with *Netz für Kinder*, while accepting that comprehensive protection for over-16s is a goal that is too laborious to pursue (with the exception of barring content that is deemed harmful to young persons). In light of this, an intelligent strategy would be to focus on sites that have a broad reach, where minors could unintentionally come in contact with harmful content. Ultimately, this means that a strategy for minimising risk must involve all actors who have real influence – parents, childcare workers, educational institutions, businesses and many more.

- 2 What exactly is the goal of this protection strategy?

It makes sense to recall the goals set out for the protection of minors from harmful media. Are they geared to combat unintentional exposure or deliberate searches? The answer determines what measures are appropriate. Attempting the latter for older minors will entail more work than it is worth. We also need to clarify whether we are talking solely about content from external parties or whether we are also including self-endangerment, such as when minors divulge their own information. Legal concepts are often oriented around the content, but in practice it becomes clear that the actions of minors or third parties are what create the risks. This is mainly true for social media but also for other realms. Internet bullying, fraud, data protection and technical security are all important new challenges. Little attention has been given to them in the past and that has to change. The legal foundations do not yet adequately reflect this need. Data protection for minors and consumer protection are two areas that need to be part of a coherent development plan in this regard. Clearly defined goals may also be able to help prevent or calm the political hysteria that follows regrettable incidents connected with media use.

- 3 Does the internet have a special status with respect to the freedom of communication?

Much of the controversy surrounding the Interstate Treaty on the Protection of Minors from Harmful Media (JMStV) can be traced back to the fact that opinions vary on whether the internet has a special

status. If we assume that the internet *does* qualify as a special place for the freedom of communication, there may be legal consequences. For example, deliberations could give preference to the freedom of communication rather than the protection of minors when all other circumstances are equal. Legal professionals may at first consider this misguided, given that the value of objects of legal protection is independent of where they are located, whether in the real world or in virtual space. Nevertheless, this matter appears to be worthy of further consideration. After all, it is completely possible that limitations on communication on the internet could have a larger, more disproportionate impact than elsewhere, such as in conventional media. Until now, arguments from both sides have been based on conjecture. As a result, specialists need to give more effort to determining what peculiarities do or do not exist.

4 How can the responsibility for protecting minors online be distributed fairly?

If the risk management hypothesis holds true, how responsibility is distributed will be a crucial factor in minimising risks. What can be achieved through self-protection? What can parents do? And what responsibility do providers and other actors have in protecting minors? There has yet to be a broad analysis of the situation that also takes into account the interactions between these different actors. Less technology-based protection, for example, would mean more responsibility for parents, childcare workers and teachers, who in turn would need support measures to develop their own knowledge and skills.

5 What kind of balance should there be between protective measures and skills development?

The study commission decided early on not to view protective measures and skills development as being in conflict with one another. They are discrete, but they can also complement one another. Yet as the report makes clear, whether a person believes that skills development is sufficient in a particular case can depend on their political stance. Political issues aside, experts face the challenge of finding a way of combining the two elements that provides optimal protection while also safeguarding the interests of those affected. At this point it should be mentioned that certain protection concepts, such as those that require the voluntary cooperation of parents or educators, assume that the people involved possess the necessary skills. If they do not, the entire protection concept can fall apart. It is therefore important to define who exactly is responsible for what.

6 Can we prevent protection from falling by the wayside?

The convergence enabled by the internet leads to problems when differentiating between the areas of application of the Youth Protection Act and the Interstate Treaty on the Protection of Minors from Harmful Media. How the federal system deals with these convergence processes is therefore of pivotal importance. At the present time, we can certainly say that it tends to be slow to react. In addition, collaboration is desirable in areas that actually belong to very different policy fields – school policy, education policy, media policy and youth policy, to mention just a few. There has been little coordination so far. When a new phenomenon appears, such as interaction via social media, there has been nothing to guarantee that an analysis of the risks and opportunities will be performed or that concepts for responding to them will be developed and provided in a coordinated fashion to all those who need them – such as educators both inside and outside schools.

Regarding participation

There are fewer questions surrounding participation in internet-based communication than on the risks it entails because citizens of all ages are increasingly tapping this potential on their own.

1 How can we recognise where support will be useful?

Attributes that are typically seen as disadvantages do not necessarily transfer to active internet participation. For example, one might think that immigrants tend to be at a disadvantage in this area. But, as explained in Chapter 4, the fact is that their situation gives them a strong incentive to network in Germany and also to remain in touch with their native culture. The internet is well suited to the task, and immigrants use it regularly for precisely that. On the other hand, a lack of financial resources is something that does restrict a person's access to the opportunities offered by digital independence. The same is true of a person's educational level. There is not currently a monitoring scheme that systematically uncovers the requirements for specific groups and circumstances.

2 What levels of access should we focus on?

Digital independence entails the existence of prerequisites at all levels, from quality physical web access to the intellectual competence needed to critically assess information for credibility. Action is therefore needed in a variety of realms. A rural

schoolteacher may be able to evaluate content but may not have broadband access. An urban university student has broadband and good technical skills to find relevant content but might not have the ability to recognise when he or she is at risk of being manipulated. Media literacy education must therefore be directed at all levels.

3 Can we agree on basic skills?

The internet has become a basic technology without which many doors remain closed. Digital independence of all citizens is therefore an important goal. Picking out the opportunities and skills that are needed in general and for specific circumstances will probably not be as clear-cut as adding items to a shopping basket. Yet we still need to specify them so that we can determine when government support schemes are necessary.

Being able to use media and the internet in an informed, creative way enables individuals to participate in social discourse. This makes media literacy a key to being able to participate fully – in education and training, work, community affairs and politics. Media literacy is a basic skill for anyone living in the digital society.

6 Dissenting opinions and supplements

Chapter 4 Media literacy target groups

11 Unemployed persons

Supplementary text from The Left Party parliamentary group:¹²² “Furthermore, unemployed persons have no guaranteed legal right to personal internet access, which makes it difficult for them to pursue independent media education and participate in a digital society. Although basic social benefits (ALG II) have in principle allowed for regular telecommunication needs by enabling recipients to finance an internet connection since 1 January 2011,¹²³ ALG II does not provide reimbursement for the initial investment in web-ready hardware. A verdict by the Higher Social Court of North Rhine-Westphalia from 23 April 2010 found that a “household without a PC can function without any problems. A PC is not required for basic information needs either.”¹²⁴ The

¹²² The Alliance 90/The Greens parliamentary group gave their support to this.

¹²³ Note: Nine percent of the current amount of €364, that is €32.76

¹²⁴ Paraphrased from:
http://www.justiz.nrw.de/nrwe/sgs/lsg_nrw/j2010/L_6_AS_297_10_Beschluss20100423.html

Higher Social Court of Bavaria reached a similar judgement in December 2009 when it dismissed the action of an ALG II recipient who had not been given a loan to buy a PC, saying that a PC is not an undeniable subsistence need.¹²⁵ As long as current legislation does not consider computers a subsistence need, they can also be seized in accordance with Section 811 of the Code of Civil Procedure.¹²⁶

Chapter 5 Recommendations for action and other key questions

5.3 Media literacy projects and initiatives

Dissenting opinion from the SPD parliamentary group and experts Dr Wolfgang Schulz and Alvar Freude: “In practice, such digital education concepts and competent teachers are unfortunately (still) lacking in many cases. Adding more hardware or equipping every pupil with a portable computer therefore only makes sense if every teacher has the skills and knowledge they need to use them and educational concepts are available for the integration of computers in classroom instruction. A good example of a media-appropriate education project is the One Laptop Per Child initiative,¹²⁷ which was explicitly conceived as a training project, not a laptop project.”“

5.4 Media literacy research

In relation to Chapter 5.4/4, the SPD parliamentary group and experts Dr Wolfgang Schulz and Alvar Freude submitted a dissenting opinion that is to be considered a separate subchapter. The parliamentary groups of The Left Party and Alliance 90/The Greens gave their support to this.

Dissenting opinion of the SPD, The Left Party and Alliance 90/The Greens parliamentary groups and experts Dr Wolfgang Schulz and Alvar Freude:

5. Regulatory goals for the protection of minors

Current legislation make the protection of minors on the internet the task of the individual states, but the study commission would still like to make some specific suggestions, given the scope of the debate and the significance of the topic.

¹²⁵ Cf.

<https://sozialgerichtsbarkeit.de/sgb/esgb/show.php?modul=esgb&id=128020>

¹²⁶ Cf. also <http://www.feministisches-institut.de/wp-content/uploads/2010/09/DigitaleSpaltung.pdf>, p. 1

¹²⁷ Cf. <http://one.laptop.org/> and <http://www.olpc-deutschland.de/>

To find media-adequate solutions for the internet, we need to take into account the special characteristics of this global communication space. This means not focusing solely on technical tools and filter programs. These can make an important contribution, but technology can and should not replace education and guidance.

In the eyes of children, young people, parents and educators, the key challenges presented by the

internet are bullying, fraud, data protection and technical security. These challenges have hardly been addressed thus far, and they deserve to be a greater part of regulatory goals in the future.

Web censorship should be abandoned completely and self-protection options strengthened. It is important to bear in mind that Germany's policy for protecting minors online is strict compared with other countries in the Western world.”“

Appendices

1. Media literacy projects, initiatives and institutions

(A selection¹¹¹)

National or multi-state projects

- Medienpädagogischer Atlas (Atlas of media education) published by the Federal Department for Media Harmful to Young Persons (Only available in German):
<http://www.bundespruefstelle.de/bpjm/Jugendmedienschutz-Medienerziehung/Erziehung-Medienkompetenz/medienkompetenz-vor-ort,did=107164.html>
- Nationale Initiative Printmedien (National print media initiative):
<http://www.bundesregierung.de/Webs/Breg/DE/Bundesregierung/Beauftragter-fuerKulturundMedien/Medienpolitik/InitiativePrintmedien/nationale-initiative-printmedien.html>
- Deutscher Computerspielpreis (German computer game awards): <http://deutscher-computerspielpreis.de>
- Ein Netz für Kinder (A network for children): http://www.ein-netz-fuer-kinder.de/gemeinsame_initiative/index.php
- FragFINN (search engine for children): <http://www.fragFINN.de>
- Schulen ans Netz e.V (Schools going online, a non-profit organisation): <http://www.schulen-ans-netz.de>
- Schau Hin! Was Deine Kinder machen. (Look! What your children are doing): <http://www.schau-hin.info>
- Blinde Kuh (search engine for children): <http://www.blinde-kuh.de>
- Jugend Online (Youth online) – an online media pedagogical service for information for young people: www.netzcheckers.de – the youth portal for digital culture: <http://www.netzcheckers.de>
- Promoting media literacy in media gaming: <http://www.spielbar.de>
- Educational film projects: <http://www.kinofenster.de>; <http://www.filmportal.de>
- Media educational materials: <http://www.bmfsfj.de>
 - Ein Netz für Kinder – Surfen ohne Risiko? (The internet for kids – surfing without risk?) brochure
 - Handy ohne Risiko? Mit Sicherheit mobil – ein Ratgeber für Eltern (Using mobiles without risk? Secure mobility) parents' guide

¹¹¹ The number of links listed here gives no indication of the number of projects taking place in each federal state as some links provide overviews of multiple projects and some lead to websites about specific projects.

- Spiel- und Lernsoftware – pädagogisch beurteilt (Gaming and learning software – a pedagogical evaluation) guide
- Chatten ohne Risiko? (Chatting without risk?) brochure
- Developing online information for young people in Germany: <http://www.jugendinfonetz.de>
- A media pedagogical division is being set up at the Federal Department for Media Harmful to Young Persons: <http://www.bundespruefstelle.de>
- Studentische Initiative Medienkompetenz 2.0 e.V (Non-profit student initiative for media literacy 2.0): <http://medienkompetenz20.de>
- Internet ABC: <http://www.internet-abc.de>
- Klicksafe.de. The EU initiative for increasing online safety: <http://www.klicksafe.de>
- Jugendschutz.net (Protecting youth.net): <http://www.jugendschutz.net>
- KIM studies /JIM studies: <http://www.mpfs.de>
- Erfurter Netcode e.V.: <http://www.erfurter-netcode.de>
- Seitenstark e.V.: <http://www.seitenstark.de>
- Lehrer-Online (Teachers online). Using digital media in teaching: <http://www.lehrer-online.de>
- Informationssystem Medienpädagogik (Information system for media pedagogy). A specialist portal for media and information literacy: <http://www.ism-info.de>

German states

Baden-Württemberg

- Media Authority of Baden-Württemberg (LFK): [http://www.lfk.de/medienkompetenz-
fortbildung/projekte-lfk.html](http://www.lfk.de/medienkompetenz-
fortbildung/projekte-lfk.html)
- Initiative Kindermedienland Baden-Württemberg (Children's media state Baden-Württemberg): <http://www.kindermedienland-bw.de/index.php?id=3814>
- Partners of Stiftung Medienkompetenz Forum Südwest (Foundation Media Literacy Forum Southwest): <http://www.mkfs.de/links.html>
 - Bildungszentrum BürgerMedien (educational centre for community media): <http://www.bz-bm.de>
 - connex. Informative magazine about community media: <http://www.connex-magazin.de>
 - handysektor. Sicherheit in mobilen Netzen (Mobile sector. Security on mobile networks) – an information portal for young people: <http://www.handysektor.de>
 - SWR Kindernetz (SWR children's network): <http://www.kindernetz.de>
 - Klicksafe.de. The EU initiative for increasing online safety: <https://www.klicksafe.de>
 - Medienpädagogischer Forschungsverbund Südwest (Media pedagogical research association for south-west Germany): <http://www.mpfs.de>
 - Ohrenspitzer: <http://www.ohrenspitzer.de>

- Further education and training projects:
 - <http://www.lfk.de/medienkompetenz-fortbildung/projekte-lfk.html>
 - <http://www.lfk.de/medienkompetenz-fortbildung/projekte-lfk/projekte-bewerbungstraining.html>
 - “Koffer-Trick” animation film competition: www.koffertrick.de
- Other projects:
 - Aktion Jugendschutz (youth protection programme): <http://www.ajs-bw.de/>
 - “Mikrowelle” radio programme – produced by and for kids: <http://www.etage-ulm.de>
 - A platform for schools: <http://mediaculture-online.de>
- Practical projects for radio and audio-visual media: <http://www.soundnezz.de>
 - InternetHochschulRadio (online university radio station): <http://www.IHR-portal.de/home>
 - Informationssystem Medienpädagogik (Information system for media pedagogy). A specialist portal for media and information literacy: <http://www.ism-info.de>
- Police campaigns to promote media literacy:
 - <http://www.propk.de>
 - <http://www.chatten-ohne-risiko.de>
 - <http://www.girlsgomovie.de>
 - <http://www.black-dog-ev.de>
 - <http://www.helmholzfilm.com>
- Further education and training programmes offered by the Landesanstalt für Kommunikation Baden-Württemberg (Baden-Württemberg authority for communication) and private TV broadcasters: <http://www.medienring.de>

Bavaria

- Bavarian regulatory authority for commercial broadcasting (BLM): <http://www.blm.de/de/pub/medienkompetenz/projekte.cfm>
- Stiftung Medienpädagogik Bayern (Media education foundation Bavaria): <http://www.stiftung-medienpaedagogik-bayern.de>
- Medienführerschein Bayern (Bavarian media license): <http://www.medienfuehrerschein.bayern.de>
- JFF - Institute for media research and media education: <http://www.jff.de>
- Elterntalk (Parent talk): <http://www.elterntalk.net>
- SchulKinoWoche Bayern (Bavarian school cinema week): <http://www.schulkinowoche-bayern.de>
- Youth protection campaign by the Bavarian state government (what is my child playing?): <http://www.was-spielt-mein-kind.de>
- Aktion Jugendschutz, Landesarbeitsstelle Bayern e.V. (Youth protection programme in Bavaria, a non-profit organisation) : <http://www.bayern.jugendschutz.de>
- Medienzentrum München (Munich media centre): <http://www.medienzentrum-muc.de>

- Medienzentrum Parabol e.V. (Parabol media centre, a non-profit organisation): <http://www.parabol.de>
- MSA – Medienstelle Augsburg (Augsburg media centre): <http://www.medienstelle-augsburg.de>
- SIN – Studio im Netz e.V. (online studio, a non-profit organisation): <http://www.sin-net.de>
- afk. (media literacy network offering educational media channels): <http://www.afk.de>
- FLIMMO – parental information about TV programmes: <http://www.flimmo.de>
- FLIMMO – specialist portal for media education: <http://www.flimmo-fachportal.de>
- In eigener Regie. (Direct it yourself) A funding programme for youth media groups in Bavaria: <http://www.ineigenerregie.de>
- Schulradio Bayern (School radio in Bavaria): <http://www.schulradio-bayern.de>
- Stiftung Zuhören (Listening foundation): <http://www.stiftung-zuhoeren.de>
- Stiftung Prix Jeunesse (Youth prize foundation): <http://www.prixjeunesse.de>
- Stiftung Bildungspakt Bayern (Bavarian educational pact foundation): <http://www.bildungspakt-bayern.de>
- Landesmediendienste Bayern e.V. (Bavarian state media services, a non-profit organisation): <http://www.mediendienste.info>
- Medienpädagogisch-informationstechnische Beratung (Guidance and information about media education): <http://www.mib-bayern.de>
- Services offered by the ISB – Staatsinstitut für Schulqualität und Bildungsforschung (State institute for quality at school and educational research): <http://www.medieninfo.bayern.de>
- Objektiv. Arbeitsgemeinschaft Behinderung und Medien (Objective. Working group on disability and media): <http://www.objektiv.abm-medien.de>
- Hört Hört! (Listen listen!): <http://www.hoert-hoert.info>
- JuFinale. (Bavarian youth film festival): <http://www.jufinale.de>
- tat:funk: <http://www.tatfunk.de>
- Treffpunkt Filmkultur e.V. (Film culture meeting point, a non-profit organisation): <http://www.treffpunkt-filmkultur.de>
- Filmkiste. Filmerziehung im Elementarbereich (Film box. Film education at elementary level):
 - <http://www.blm.de/apps/documentbase/data/pdf1/FilmKiste-2010.pdf>
 - <http://www.mediendienste.info>

Berlin-Brandenburg

- Medienanstalt Berlin Brandenburg (Media authority for Berlin Brandenburg, MABB): <http://www.mabb.de/medienkompetenz.html>
- Medienkompetenzzentrum Berlin (Berlin Media literacy centre): <http://www.jugendnetz-berlin.de>
- Youth information and media centres in Brandenburg: <http://www.jim.netzcheckers.net>

- Landesarbeitsgemeinschaft Multimedia Brandenburg e.V. (Working group for multimedia in Brandenburg, a non-profit organisation): <http://lag-multimedia.de>
- Medienpädagogischer Stammtisch der Berliner LAG Medienarbeit e.V (Media literacy discussion group of the Berlin association for media, a non-profit organisation): <http://www.gmk-net.de/index.php?id=50>
- State Institute for School and Media Berlin-Brandenburg (LISUM): <http://www.lisum.berlin-brandenburg.de/sixcms/detail.php/bb2.c.423542.de>
- Berliner Jugendserver Spinnenwerk (An online platform for and about young people in Berlin): <http://jugendserver.spinnenwerk.de>
- BITS 21 further education centre: <http://www.bits21.de>
- Medienkompetenz Berlin-Brandenburg e.V. (Media literacy Berlin, a non-profit organisation): <http://www.mkbb.eu>
- Aktion Kinder- und Jugendschutz Landesarbeitsstelle Brandenburg e.V. (Campaign by the child and youth protection centre in Brandenburg, a non-profit organisation):
 - http://www.jugendschutz-brandenburg.de/cms/front_content.php?idcat=58
 - <http://emt-brandenburg.de/cms>
- Other projects:
 - <http://www.metaversa.de>
 - <http://www.medienwerkstatt-potsdam.de>
 - <http://www.loewenkind.de>
 - <http://www.bewegliche-ziele.de>
 - <http://www.dubistgeschichte.de/>
 - <http://www.jim-filmfestival.de>
- Computerspielmuseum Berlin (Berlin computer games museum): <http://www.computerspielmuseum.de>

Bremen

- Bremische Landesmedienanstalt (Bremen media authority, (bre(ma): <http://www.bremische-landesmedienanstalt.de/medienkompetenz/projekte.html>
- ServiceBureau Jugendinformation (Service bureau for youth information):
 - <http://www.servicebureau.de>
 - <http://jugendinfo.de/medienpraxis/>
- Landesinstitut für Schule / Zentrum für Medien (State institute for schools / media centre): <http://www.lis.bremen.de>
- Blickwechsel e.V. (non-profit organisation): <http://www.blickwechsel.org>

- Runder Tisch Bremer Medienkompetenz (Bremen media literacy round table):
<http://www.medienkompetenz-bremen.de>

Hamburg

- Medienanstalt Hamburg Schleswig-Holstein (Hamburg and Schleswig-Holstein media authority, MA HSH): <http://www.ma-hsh.de/medienkompetenz/ma-hsh-projekte/eltern-lehrer-u.-multiplik./projekte-fr-eltern-lehrer-und-multiplikatoren.html>
- Departmental authority for Culture and Media: <http://www.hamburg.de/bkm>
- Departmental authority for schools and vocational training: <http://www.hamburg.de/bsb>
- Arbeitsgemeinschaft Kinder- und Jugendschutz Hamburg e.V. (Hamburg association for child and youth protection, a non-profit organisation): <http://www.ajs-hamburg.de>
- ABC Bildungs- und Tagungszentrum e.V. (ABC education and meeting centre, a non-profit organisation): <http://www.abc-huell.de>
- Brakula – Bramfelder Kulturladen e.V. (Brakula – Bramfeld cultural centre, a non-profit organisation): <http://www.brakula.de>
- Büro für Suchtprävention Hamburg (Hamburg addiction prevention office): <http://www.sucht-hamburg.de>
- Gesellschaft für Medienpädagogik und Kommunikationskultur e.V. (Association for media education and communication culture, a non-profit organisation): <http://www.gmk-net.de>
- Hans Bredow Institute for media research, Universität Hamburg: <http://www.hans-bredow-institut.de>
- Hamburg University of Applied Sciences: <http://www.haw-hamburg.de>
- Jugendfilm e.V. (Youth film, a non-profit organisation): <http://www.jugendfilm-ev.de>
- Jugendinformationszentrum (Youth information centre): <http://www.hamburg.de/jiz>
- Junge Volkshochschule – VHS Hamburg (youth education centre in Hamburg): <https://www.vhs-hamburg.de/kurse/kurse-fuer/junge-leute-297>
- Landesarbeitsgemeinschaft Jugend und Film, Hamburg (Hamburg association for youth and film): <http://www.lag-hh.bjf.info>
- Landesinstitut für Lehrerbildung und Schulentwicklung (Hamburg institute for teacher training and school development): <http://www.li-hamburg.de>
- Landesjugendring (Hamburg youth association): <http://www.ljr-hh.de>
- Universität Hamburg, Department of Education, specifically media and aesthetic education: <http://epb.uni-hamburg.de/de/Medienpaedagogik>
- Mediennetz Hamburg e.V.: <http://www.mediennetz-hamburg.de>
- Radio Funkstark: <http://www.funkstark.de>
- Sasel-Haus e.V. (Sasel House, a non-profit organisation): <http://www.saselhaus.de>

- Stadtkultur Hamburg e.V. (Hamburg city culture, a non-profit organisation): <http://www.stadtkultur-hh.de/>
- Church, cultural and social centre: <http://www.barmbek-basch.info>
- PIF! Computer and internet license for children: http://www.blickwechsel.org/ueberall_pifhtm
- Jugendfilmwerkstatt, Gemeinwesenarbeit St. Pauli e.V. (Youth film workshop, community work in St. Pauli, a non-profit organisation): <http://www.gwa-stpauli.de>
- Meine Daten kriegt ihr nicht (You won't get my data) pilot project: <http://www.datenschutz-hamburg.de>
- Other projects:
 - Klickerkids, Verein für medienpädagogische Praxis e.V. (association for practical media education, a non-profit organisation): <http://www.jaf-hamburg.de>
 - Ohrlotsen, MOTTE: <http://www.diemotte.de>
 - Medienbox, step 21 – Initiative für Toleranz und Verantwortung (Media box, step 21 – initiative to promote tolerance and responsibility): <http://www.step21.de>
 - Eltern-Medien-Lotsen (Parent media guides), Schnappfisch Media – – a TIDE youth project: <http://www.tidenet.de>
 - Radiofüchse (Radio Fox) – the Hamburg intercultural children's radio station: <http://das-haus-der-familie.de/>; <http://www.radiofuechse.de/>
- Other projects in Hamburg and Schleswig-Holstein:
 - <http://www.ma-hsh.de/medienkompetenz/ma-hsh-projekte/eltern-lehrer-u.-multiplik./projekte-fr-eltern-lehrer-und-multiplikatoren.html>

Hesse

- Regulatory authority for commercial broadcasting in Hesse (LPR Hessen): <http://www.lpr-hessen.de/default.asp?m=86>
- Offener Kanal (open channel) media project centres in Kassel, Fulda, Gießen, Offenbach/Frankfurt: <http://www.lpr-hessen.de/default.asp?m=2>
- Teacher training projects organised by the Hessian Ministry of Education and Cultural Affairs, teacher training authority: http://www.hessen.de/irj/HKM_Internet?cid=77721ac75239651aa1f4f09f79e1636b
- Schule@Zukunft (school@future) media initiative: <http://www.schuleundzukunft.de/>
- Other projects:
 - <http://dms.bildung.hessen.de/ereignisse/projekte/index.html>
 - <http://www.medienblau.de>
 - <http://www.muk-hessen.de/>
 - <http://www.blickwechsel.org/>
 - <http://www.horizonte-team.de>

- <http://www.filmreflex.de/medienpaedagogik>
- <http://www.avipop.de>
- <http://www.medienaldente.de>
- <http://www.wiesbadener-medienzentrum.de>
- <http://www.ev-medienhaus.de>
- <http://www.kinderschutzbund-hessen.de/eltern/medienkompetenz.html>
- <http://www.bonifatiushaus.de>
- <http://www.galluszentrum.de>
- Training in higher education: http://www.hmwk-hessen.de/hochschulen_uebersicht.php
- Hessian education server: <http://mauswiesel.bildung.hessen.de/>
- Institut für Medienpädagogik und Kommunikation (Institute for media education and communication: <http://www.muk-hessen.de>)

Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania

- Medienanstalt Mecklenburg-Vorpommern (Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania media authority, MMV): <http://medienanstalt-mv.de/medienkompetenz/index.html>
- <http://www.alm-medienkompetenz.de>
- <http://www.mekonet.de>
- <http://www.medienpaedagogik-online.de>
- <http://www.teachsam.de>
- <http://www.klicksafe.de>
- <http://www.promix-online.de>
- <http://www.tlm.de/gamequiz>
- <http://www.medienwissen-mv.de>
- <http://www.juuuport.de>
- <http://www.medienundschule.inmv.de>
- <http://www.fragfinn.de>
- Media education in schools: <http://www.bildung-mv.de/de/medien>
- Institutions and institutes that organise projects:
 - http://www.ifnm.de/neu/ifnm/_medienprojekte.255.html
 - <http://lagmedien.inmv.de/wp>
 - <http://www.film-mv.de>
 - <http://www.latuecht.de>
 - <http://www.ev-akademie-mv.de>
 - <http://www.identityfilms.de>
 - <http://www.ueaz-waren.de>

- <http://www.grevesmuehlen-tv.de/>
- <http://www.lohro.de>
- <http://www.liwu.de>
- <http://www.stic-er.de>
- <http://www.jugend.inmv.de>
- <http://www.elf-tv.eu>
- Courses at university level: University of Greifswald: <http://www.theologie.uni-greifswald.de/studieren/lehrstuehle/ptreligions-und-medienpaedagogik.html>
- University of Rostock: <https://www.phf.uni-rostock.de/imd>

Lower Saxony

- State Media Authority of Lower Saxony (NLM): <http://www.nlm.de/medienkompetenz.html>
- Runder Tisch Medienkompetenz (media literacy round table): <http://www.medienkompetenz-niedersachsen.de>
- Tag der Medienkompetenz Niedersachsen (Lower Saxony media literacy day): <http://nline.nibis.de/tag-der-medienkompetenz/menue/nibis.phtml?menid=44>
- Institutions and associations that organise projects: <http://www.aewb-nds.de>; www.ljr.de; <http://www.blickwechsel.org>
- Central, state (and national) initiatives:
 - <http://www.nlm.de/multimediamobile.html>
 - <http://www.nlm.de/sicheres-internet.html>
 - <http://www.juuuport.de>
 - <http://www.medienpaedagogischeratlas-niedersachsen.de/aktuelles.html>

North Rhine-Westphalia

- Media Authority of North Rhine-Westphalia (LfM): <http://www.lfm-nrw.de/medienkompetenz.html>
- Internet ABC by LfM NRW for children and teenagers (also available in Turkish): <http://www.internet-abc.de>
- Medienkompetenzportal (Media literacy portal): <http://www.medienkompetenzportal-nrw.de/medienpaedagogischer-atlas-nrw.html>
- Arbeitsgemeinschaft Kinder- und Jugendschutz NRW e.V. (AJS) (Child and youth protection association NRW, a non-profit organisation): <http://www.ajs.nrw.de>
- Gesellschaft für Medienpädagogik und Kommunikationskultur (GMK) (Society for Media Education and Communications Culture): <http://www.gmk-net.de/>
- IJAB Fachstelle für Internationale Jugendarbeit der BRD e.V. (IJAB – International Youth Service of the Federal Republic of Germany, a non-profit organisation): <http://www.ijab.de>

- Media centre: <http://www.jfc.info>
- Grimme Institute: <http://www.grimme-institut.de/html>
- <http://www.spieleratgeber-nrw.de>
- <http://www.filmothek-nrw.de>

Rhineland-Palatinate

- State Media Authority of Rhineland-Palatinate (LMK): <http://www.lmk-online.de/medienkompetenz/medienprojekte>; <http://www.lmk-online.de/medienkompetenz/kooperationsprojekte>
- Medienkompetenz Forum Südwest (Media Literacy Forum Southwest) projects: http://www.mkfs.de/index.php?bundesland=2&bildungsniveau=ALLE&typ=3&command=showList&no_cache=1&id=75
- Bildungsserver Rheinland-Pfalz (Educational server for Rhineland Palatinate): <http://medienkompetenz.rlp.de>

Saarland

- Landesmedienanstalt Saarland (Saarland media authority, LMS): <http://www.lmsaar.de/medienkompetenz/projekte>
- Ministry of Education: <http://www.bildung.saarland.de>
- Other projects:
 - <http://www.medienladen-saar.de>
 - <http://www.landesfilmdienste.de>
 - <http://www.quarternet.de>
 - <http://www.jugendserver-saar.de>
 - <http://www.filmbuero-saar.de>
 - <http://www.streiflichter.net>
 - <http://www.onlinerland-saar.de>
- Media literacy training offered by various regional providers:
 - www.saarland.de/landesjugendamt.htm
 - <http://vhssaar.erlebe-es.de>
 - <http://www.keb-saar.de>
 - <http://www.eva-a.de>
- Initiatives:
 - AG Internet (no website), under the direction of Landesmedienanstalt Saarland
 - <http://www.kinderschutzbund-saarland.de>.

Saxony

- Sächsische Landesanstalt für privaten Rundfunk und neue Medien (Media authority for Saxony, SLM): <http://www.slm-online.de>
- Sächsische Ausbildungs- und Erprobungskanäle (Saxon educational and testing channels) : <http://www.saek.de>
- SLM Medienmobil (SLM media mobile): <http://www.slm-online.de/psk/slmo/powerslave,id,235,nodeid,235.html>
- School radio stations: <http://www.slm-online.de/psk/slmo/powerslave,id,237,nodeid,237.html>
- Projects to promote media education: <http://www.slm-online.de/psk/slmo/powerslave,id,145,nodeid,145.html>
- Media education institutions: <http://www.slm-online.de/psk/slmo/powerslave,id,37,nodeid,37.html>
- Media education initiatives: <http://www.slm-online.de/psk/slmo/powerslave,id,234,nodeid,234.html>
- Media education: <http://www.slm-online.de/psk/slmo/powerslave,id,147,nodeid,147.html>

Saxony-Anhalt

- Medienanstalt Sachsen-Anhalt (Media authority for Saxony-Anhalt, MSA): <http://www.msa-online.de/index.php?content=Medienkompetenzzentrum>
- Media mobile: <http://www.msa-online.de/index.php?content=Medienkompetenzzentrum&menu=Medienmobile>
- Parents' evenings: <http://www.msa-online.de/index.php?content=Medienkompetenzzentrum&menu=Elternabende>
- Public-access channels and non-commercial local radio: <http://www.msa-online.de/index.php?content=Buergermedien>
- Landesstelle Kinder- und Jugendschutz Sachsen-Anhalt (Saxony-Anhalt association for child and youth protection): <http://www.jugendschutz.jugend-lsa.de/angebot/angebot.html>
- Kinderschutzbund (Saxony-Anhalt Alliance for the Protection of Children): <http://web2.cylex.de/firma-home/deutscher-kinderschutzbund-landesverband-sachsen-anhalt-e-v--1257954.html>
- Medientreff ZONE! (Media meeting zone): <http://www.medientreff-zone.de/index.php?menue=angebote>
- Trickfilmmobil Köthen (mobile animation studio in Köthen): <http://www.trickfilmmobil.de/tfm/Beispiele.html>
- Pulsschlag (Pulsebeat – an association for cultural and media education): <http://www.pulsschlag-online.com/>
- GMK Landesgruppe Sachsen-Anhalt (Saxony-Anhalt branch of the Society for Media Education and Communications Culture): <http://www.gmk-net.de/index.php?id=174>
- Spikker e.V. (non-profit youth media centre in Halle): <http://www.spikker.de/html/tv.html>

- LAG Jugend und Film Sachsen-Anhalt e.V. (Saxony-Anhalt association for youth and film, a non-profit organisation): <http://www.lagfilm.jugend-lsa.de>
- Thalia Theater Halle (Thalia theatre in Halle): <http://www.thalia-theater.de/paedagogik>
- Aktion Musik/local heroes e.V. (a band contest, a non-profit organisation): <http://www.local-heroes.de>
- Association for cultural child and youth education in the federal state Saxony-Anhalt (a non-profit organisation): http://www.lkj-sachsen-anhalt.de/?page_id=6
- Freiwilligen-Agentur Halle-Saalkreis e.V. (Halle-Saal district volunteer agency, a non-profit organisation): http://freiwilligen-agentur.de/?page_id=30
- Werkleitz – Centre for Media Art (a non-profit organisation): <http://www.werkleitz.de>
- Landesarbeitskreis Medien Sachsen-Anhalt (Saxony-Anhalt media association): <http://www.medienstellen.bildung-isa.de/lak.html>
- Landesfilmdienst Sachsen-Anhalt (Saxony-Anhalt film service): <http://www.landesfilmdienst-sachsen-anhalt.de>
- Media education training courses at Merseburg University of Applied Sciences: <http://www.hs-merseburg.de/~brandi/>
- Otto-von-Guericke University Magdeburg: <http://www.ovgu.de/medienbildung>
- Landesinstitut für Schulqualität und Lehrerbildung, Sachsen-Anhalt (Saxony-Anhalt institute for quality at school and teacher training): <http://www.bildung-lsa.de/bildungsland/lisa.html>
- MSA media literacy centre: <http://www.msa-online.de/index.php?content=Medienkompetenzzentrum&menu=Editorial>

Schleswig-Holstein

- Medienanstalt Hamburg Schleswig-Holstein (Hamburg and Schleswig-Holstein media authority, MA HSH): <http://www.ma-hsh.de/medienkompetenz/ma-hsh-projekte/eltern-lehrer-u.-multiplik./pojekte-fr-eltern-lehrer-und-multiplikatoren.html>
- Media literacy network: <http://www.schleswig-holstein.de/medienkompetenz>
- Aktion Kinder- und Jugendschutz Landesarbeitsstelle Schleswig-Holstein e.V. (Schleswig-Holstein campaign to protect children and teenagers, a non-profit organisation): <http://www.akjs-sh.de>
- Der Kreisjugendring Stormarn e.V (Stormarn youth associations union, a non-profit organisation).: <http://www.kjr-stormarn.de>
- Gesellschaft für Medienpädagogik und Kommunikationskultur Schleswig-Holstein (Schleswig-Holstein branch of the Society for Media Education and Communications Culture): <http://www.gmk-net.de/schleswig-holstein>
- Kinder- und Jugendkulturhaus Röhre (Röhre cultural centre for children and teenagers) in Lübeck: <http://www.kjhroehre-luebeck.de>

- Institut für Qualitätsentwicklung an Schulen Schleswig-Holstein (Institute for quality development in schools in Schleswig-Holstein, IQSH): http://www.schleswig-holstein.de/IQSH/DE/IQSH_node.html
- Landesverband Jugend & Film Schleswig-Holstein (Schleswig-Holstein association for youth and film): <http://www.jugendundfilm.de/cms>
- Offener Kanal Schleswig-Holstein (Schleswig-Holstein public-access television and radio): <http://www.oksh.de>
- Schnittpunkt e. V. (a non-profit forum for media training and political education): <http://www.schnittpunkt-ev.de/wb>
- SchulKinoWochen Schleswig-Holstein (Schleswig-Holstein school cinema week): <http://www.schulkinowoche.lernnetz.de/content/index.php>
- Unabhängiges Landeszentrum für Datenschutz Schleswig-Holstein (Independent centre for data protection in Schleswig-Holstein): <http://www.datenschutzzentrum.de>
- Freelance media education specialists: Uli Tondorf, Henning Fietze
- Media literacy in higher education:
 - University of Applied Sciences Kiel, Faculty of Media: <http://www.fh-kiel.de/index.php?id=39>
 - Institut für Medieninformatik und technische Informatik (Institute of media IT and computing) at Flensburg University of Applied Sciences (INF): <http://www.inf.fh-flensburg.de>
 - Institut für Multimediale und Interaktive Systeme (Institute for multimedia and interactive systems) at the University of Lübeck (IMIS): <http://www.imis.uni-luebeck.de>
 - Zentrum für Medien- und Informationstechnologien (Centre for media and information technology) at the University of Flensburg: <http://www.kunst-textil-medien.de/medienpaedagogik.html>

Thuringia

- Thüringer Landesmedienanstalt (Thuringia media authority, TLM): <http://www.tlm.de/tlm/medienkompetenz>
- Community media in Thuringia: <http://www.tlm.de/tlm/buergerrundfunk/> (see media literacy projects and community media projects – in German)
- Other projects:
 - Landesfilmdienst Thüringen e.V. (Thuringia film service, a non-profit organisation): http://www.landesfilmdienst-thueringen.de/cms_1/index.php?id=638, http://www.landesfilmdienst-thueringen.de/cms_1/index.php?id=592
- LAG Kinder- und Jugendschutz Thüringen e.V. (Saxony-Anhalt association for child and youth protection, a non-profit association): <http://www.jugendschutz-thueringen.de/>

- KI.KA-Trickbox (KI.KA kids animation studio):
http://www.kika.de/fernsehen/a_z/t/trickboxx/index.shtml

Public broadcasting services (ARD/ZDF)

A selection of media literacy programmes and projects by public broadcasters:*

- Planet Schule (Planet School – a series of education programmes aimed at schools broadcast by SWR and WDR. The series is complemented by an internet platform): <http://www.planet-schule.de>
- dok' mal! (WDR uses the internet to explain how documentaries are made. Taking six films as examples, the internet portal shows children and teenagers how films are made and the cinematic techniques used.) <http://www.dokmal.de>
- ARD.de comprises a special section devoted to media literacy: <http://www.ard.de/home/medienkompetenz/-/id=1455040/o98kl7/index.html>
- Educational pack for use in schools: <http://www.schlauer.wdr.de>
- Educational websites for teaching children about new media technology and content:
 - <http://kikaninchen.de> (ARD and ZDF)
 - <http://kika.de> (ARD and ZDF)
 - <http://www.wdrmaus.de> (WDR; website based on *The Programme with the Mouse*)
 - <http://tivi.de> (ZDF)
- Website based on the *The Programme with the Elephant* aimed at three to six-year-olds who are starting to use the internet. All text on the site is optional): <http://www.wdrmaus.de/elefantenseite/>
- *Lilipuz macht Schule* (Lilipuz goes to school – a media education project by WDR radio. Once a week radio producers work with primary school pupils and teachers to make a radio show and broadcast it from their classroom.): <http://www.lilipuz.de/>
- Zapp plus (NDR): <http://www.ndr.de/fernsehen/sendungen/zapp/zappplus/index.html>
- Stiftung Zuhören (The “listening foundation” uses multimedia to teach technical and content-related skills, and is supported by public broadcasters BR, HR and NDR, as well as the media authorities of the relevant states): <http://www.stiftung-zuhoeren.de/>
- Educational projects run by Bayerischen Rundfunk (Bavarian TV and radio, BR): <http://www.br-online.de/unternehmen/bildungsprojekte-DID1195677436585607/>
- Medienkompetenz Forum Südwest (Media Literacy Forum Southwest – part of SWR): <http://www.mkfs.de/>
- Annual meeting for protecting youth in the media, attended by the youth protection officers at ARD and ZDF and those involved in media work for the Protestant and Catholic churches.
- Klangkiste (sound box – encourages children to listen to classical music): <http://www.klangkiste.wdr.de>
- Jugendradio 103.7 Unser Ding (An SR youth radio station that organises themed weeks on topics such as cyberbullying and events like the Unser Ding (our thing) schools tour.): <http://www.unserding.de>

Sources:

Federal Government Commissioner for Culture and the Media

Media Authority of Baden-Württemberg (LFK) / Stuttgart

Bavarian regulatory authority for commercial broadcasting (BLM) / Munich

Medienanstalt Berlin Brandenburg (Media authority for Berlin Brandenburg, MABB) / Berlin

Bremische Landesmedienanstalt (Bremen media authority, (bre)ma) / Bremen

Regulatory authority for commercial broadcasting in Hesse (LPR Hessen) / Kassel

Medienanstalt Hamburg Schleswig-Holstein (Hamburg and Schleswig-Holstein media authority, MA HSH) / Nordstedt

* Note: The public broadcasters do not regard promoting media literacy as an isolated educational topic, but in accordance with their programme mandate, as a cross-cutting task that is relevant to all programmes..

Medienanstalt Mecklenburg-Vorpommern (Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania media authority, MMV) / Schwerin

State Media Authority of Lower Saxony (NLM) / Hanover

Media Authority of North Rhine-Westphalia (LfM) / Düsseldorf

State Media Authority of Rhineland-Palatinate (LMK) / Ludwigshafen

Landesmedienanstalt Saarland (Saarland media authority, LMS) / Saarbrücken

Sächsische Landesanstalt für privaten Rundfunk und neue Medien (Media authority for Saxony, SLM) / Leipzig

Medienanstalt Sachsen-Anhalt (Media authority for Saxony-Anhalt, MSA) / Halle

Thüringer Landesmedienanstalt (Thuringia media authority, TLM) / Erfurt

Public broadcasters (ARD/ZDF)

2: The public hearing on media literacy by the Study Commission on the Internet and Digital Society

The study commission held a public hearing on media literacy on 13 December 2010. The hearing took place from 1 to 5 p.m. and was broadcast live over the internet. The study commission invited the following external experts to speak at the hearing:

- **Appelhoff, Mechthild**
(Head of the media literacy and community media division at Media Authority of North Rhine-Westphalia)
- **Aufenanger, Stefan** (Professor)
(Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz, working group “media education” / Institute of Education)
- **Demmler, Kathrin**
(Director of the Institut für Medienpädagogik in Forschung und Praxis – the institute for media education in research and in practice)
- **Ertelt, Jürgen**
(Coordinator of the Jugend online (youth online) project by the IJAB (International Youth Service of the Federal Republic of Germany, a non-profit organisation)
- **Gapski, Dr Harald**
(Grimme-Institut Gesellschaft für Medien, Bildung und Kultur mbH)
- **Gigerenzer, Gerd** (Professor)
(Director of the Max-Planck Institute for Human Development)
- **Gröschel, Philippe** (VZnet Netzwerke Ltd.)
- **Jantke, Prof. Dr. rer. nat. Dr. sc. nat. Klaus P.**
(Fraunhofer Institute for Digital Media Technology, IDMT)
- **Schwaderer, Hannes**
(Initiative D21 e.V., a non-profit organisation)
- **Unger, Thorsten**
(CEO of Zone 2 Connect GmbH)

Bibliography and references

Books

- Bremer, Claudia / Göcks, Marc / Rühl, Paul / Stratmann, Jörg (eds.), *Landesinitiativen für E-Learning an deutschen Hochschulen. Medien in der Wissenschaft*, Volume 57, Münster: 2010
- Gapski, Harald (ed.), *Medienkompetenzen messen? Verfahren und Reflexionen zur Erfassung von Schlüsselkompetenzen*. Munich/Düsseldorf: 2006
- Gapski, Harald (ed.), *Medienkompetenz. Eine Bestandsaufnahme und Vorüberlegungen zu einem systemtheoretischen Rahmenkonzept*. First edition, Wiesbaden: 2001
- Gehrke, Barbara (ed.), *Ältere Menschen, Neue Medien. Entwicklungschancen für künftige Medienprojekte für Frauen und Männer mit Lebenserfahrung in Nordrhein-Westfalen*. European Centre for Media Competence (ecmc), Marl: 2008
- Grimm, Petra / Rhein, Stefanie / Müller, Michael, *Porno im Web 2.0. Die Bedeutung sexualisierter Web-Inhalte in der Lebenswelt von Jugendlichen*, Berlin: 2010
- Grimm, Petra / Rhein, Stefanie / Clausen-Muradian, Elisabeth, *Gewalt im Web 2.0. Der Umgang Jugendlicher mit gewalthaltigen Inhalten und Cyber-Mobbing sowie die rechtliche Einordnung der Problematik*, Berlin: 2008
- Feil, Christine / Decker, Regina / Gieger, Christoph, *Wie entdecken Kinder das Internet? Beobachtungen bei fünf- bis 12-jährigen Kindern*. Wiesbaden: 2004
- Schmidt, Jan-Hinrik / Paus-Hasebrink, Ingrid / Hasebrink, Uwe (eds.), *Heranwachsen mit dem Social Web. Zur Rolle von Web 2.0-Angeboten im Alltag von Jugendlichen und jungen Erwachsenen*. Berlin: 2009
- Stiftung Warentest. Feibel, Thomas, *Kindheit 2.0 So können Eltern Medienkompetenz vermitteln*. Berlin: 2009
- Süss, Daniel / Lampert, Claudia / Wijnen, Christien, *Medienpädagogik. Ein Studienbuch zur Einführung*. Wiesbaden: 2010
- Theunert, Helga (ed.), *Medienkinder von Geburt an. Medienaneignung in den ersten sechs Lebensjahren*. Munich: 2007
- Treumann, Klaus Peter / Baacke, Dieter / Haacke, Kirsten / Hugger, Kai-Uwe / Vollbrecht, Ralf, *Medienkompetenz im digitalen Zeitalter. Wie die neuen Medien das Leben und Lernen Erwachsener verändern*. In collaboration with Oliver Kurz. Opladen: 2002

Articles

- Breiter, Andreas / Welling, Stefan: "Integration digitaler Medien in den Schulalltag als Mehrebenenproblem", Eickelmann, Birgit (ed.), *Bildung und Schule auf dem Weg in die Wissensgesellschaft*. Münster: 2010
- Bremer, Claudia, "Medienkompetenz von Hochschullehrenden im Kontext von Mediengestaltung und dem Erstellungsprozess netzgestützter Lehre", Bett, Katja / Wedekind, Joachim / Zentel, Peter (eds.), *Medienkompetenz für die Hochschullehre*. Münster: 2004
- Erb, Ulrike, "Technikgestaltung aus Frauenperspektive", Winker, Gabriele / Oechtering, Veronika (eds.), *Computernetze, Frauenplätze. Frauen in der Informationsgesellschaft*. Opladen: 1998
- Groeben, Norbert, "Anforderungen an die theoretische Konzeptualisierung von Medienkompetenz", Groeben, Norbert / Hurrelmann, Bettina (eds.), *Medienkompetenz. Voraussetzungen, Dimensionen, Funktionen*. Weinheim: 2002
- Strossen, Nadine, "Kommentar zum 'Memorandum zur Selbstregulierung von Internet-Inhalten'", Waltermann, Jens / Machill, Marcel (eds.), *Verantwortung im Internet, Selbstregulierung und Jugendschutz*. Gütersloh: 2000

Treumann, Klaus Peter / Meister, Dorothee M. / Sander, Uwe et al., *Medienhandeln Jugendlicher. Mediennutzung und Medienkompetenz. Bielefelder Kompetenzmodell*. Wiesbaden: 2007

Newspapers/magazines/publications

Arbeitsgemeinschaft der Landesmedienanstalten in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland (ed.), Special edition “Medienkompetenz. Förderung, Projekte und Initiativen der Landesmedienanstalten”, *ALM-Jahrbuch 2009/2010. Landesmedienanstalten und privater Rundfunk in Deutschland*, Augsburg: 2010

Baacke, Dieter, “Medienkompetenz als Netzwerk. Reichweite und Fokussierung eines Begriffs, der Konjunktur hat”, *Medien praktisch*, Issue 2/1996

Gebel, Christa / Wagner, Ulrike, “Kinder und Jugendliche im Internet. Ein aktueller Forschungsüberblick”, *Angebote für Kinder im Internet Ausgewählte Beiträge zur Entwicklung von Qualitätskriterien und zur Schaffung sicherer Surfräume für Kinder*. Published by Bayerische Landeszentrale für neue Medien (BLM), Munich: 2005

Haug, Simone / Gaiser, Birgit, “Schnittstellen im E-Learning”, *Zeitschrift für Hochschulentwicklung*, Issue 04/2010

Jarren, Otfried / Wassmer, Christian: “Medienkompetenz Begriffsanalyse und Modell”, *merz. medien + erziehung. Zeitschrift für Medienpädagogik*, Issue 03/2009

Kissau, Kathrin, “Internetnutzung von Migranten ein Weg zur Integration”, *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte*, Issue 39/2008

Müller, Kai W. / Wölfling, Klaus, “Pathologische Computerspiel- und Internetnutzung. Der Forschungsstand zu Phänomenologie, Epidemiologie, Diagnostik und Komorbidität”, *Suchtmed. Suchtmedizin in Forschung und Praxis 12* (1/2010)

Schriefers, Annette / Bischoff, Sandra, *Medienkompetenz. Eine Aufgabe nimmt Gestalt an*. Series of works by Landesanstalt für privaten Rundfunk und neue Medien Hessen, Volume 16, Munich: 2002

Wagner, Ulrike / Eggert, Susanne, “Quelle für Information und Wissen oder unterhaltsame Action? Bildungsbenachteiligung und die Auswirkung auf den Medienumgang Heranwachsender”, *merz. medien + erziehung. Zeitschrift für Medienpädagogik*, Issue 05/2007

Wopfner, Eva, *Ältere Menschen und Internetnutzung*. Thesis, Innsbruck: 2006. Online at: <http://medienpaedagogik.kaywa.com/files/aeltere%20menschen%20und%20internetnutzung.pdf>

Public hearings/written statements/Bundestag printed papers

(Online sources were last checked on 27 September 2011)

Aufenanger, Stefan, “Written statement for the public hearing on media literacy by the Study Commission on the Internet Digital Society of the German Bundestag on 13 December 2010”, Committee printed paper 17(24)014-I. Online at: http://www.bundestag.de/internetenquete/dokumentation/Sitzungen/20101213/A-Drs__17_24_014-I_-_Stellungnahme_Univ_-Prof__Dr__Aufenanger.pdf

Demmler, Kathrin, “Written statement for the public hearing on media literacy by the Study Commission on the Internet Digital Society of the German Bundestag on 13 December 2010”, Committee printed paper 17(24)014-B. Online at: http://www.bundestag.de/internetenquete/dokumentation/Sitzungen/20101213/A-Drs__17_24_014-B_-_Stellungnahme_Demmler.pdf

German Bundestag, “Motion by the CDU/CSU, SPD, FDP and Alliance 90/The Greens parliamentary groups to found a Study Commission on the Internet and Digital Society”, 3 March 2010, Bundestag printed paper 17/950

Ertelt, Jürgen, “Written statement for the public hearing on media literacy by the Study Commission on the Internet Digital Society of the German Bundestag on 13 December 2010”, Committee printed paper 17(24)014-C. Online at: http://www.bundestag.de/internetenquete/dokumentation/Sitzungen/20101213/A-Drs__17_24_014-C_-_Stellungnahme_Ertelt.pdf

Gapski, Harald, “Written statement for the public hearing on media literacy by the Study Commission on the Internet Digital Society of the German Bundestag on 13 December 2010”, Committee printed paper 17(24)014-D. Online at: http://www.bundestag.de/internetenquete/dokumentation/Sitzungen/20101213/A-Drs__17_24_014-D_-_Stellungnahme_Gapski.pdf

Gigerenzer, Gerd, “Written statement for the public hearing on media literacy by the Study Commission on the Internet Digital Society of the German Bundestag on 13 December 2010”, Committee printed paper 17(24)014-F. Online at: http://www.bundestag.de/internetenquete/dokumentation/Sitzungen/20101213/A-Drs__17_24_014-F_-_Stellungnahme_Gigerenzer__Gerd_Prof__Dr.pdf

Schwaderer, Hannes, “Written statement for the public hearing on media literacy by the Study Commission on the Internet Digital Society of the German Bundestag on 13 December 2010”, Committee printed paper 17(24)014-E. Online at: http://www.bundestag.de/internetenquete/dokumentation/Sitzungen/20101213/A-Drs__17_24_014-E_-_Stellungnahme_Schwaderer.pdf

“The public hearing on media literacy by the Study Commission on the Internet Digital Society of the German Bundestag on 13 December 2010”, summary minutes 17/8. Online at: <http://www.bundestag.de/internetenquete/dokumentation/Sitzungen/20101213/index.jsp>

Online sources

(Last checked on 20 September 2011)

<http://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Botnet>

<http://eltern.medienkompetenz.rlp.de>

http://www.bildung.at/files/downloads/Qualitaetskriterien_E-Learning.pdf

http://www.bitkom.org/files/documents/BITKOM_Connected_Worlds_Extranet.pdf

http://www.bitkom.org/files/documents/BITKOM_Studie_Jugend_2.0.pdf

<http://www.e-cademic.de/data/ebooks/extracts/9783830922421.pdf>

<http://www.elternundmedien.de>

<http://www.eukidsonline.de>

http://www.eukidsonline.de/index_erweitert.html#meldung

<http://www.feministisches-institut.de/wp-content/uploads/2010/09/DigitaleSpaltung.pdf>

<http://www.fk-reha.uni-dortmund.de/Koerperbehinderten/cms/de/Aktuelles/Computerkurs-Bethel/index.html>

<http://www.gmk-net.de>

<http://www.hamburg.de/hamburger-netbook-projekt/>

http://www.hans-bredow-institut.de/webfm_send/563

<http://www.initiatived21.de>

http://www.intelec.uni-passau.de/studi_befragung_ws0708_teil5.0.html

http://www.justiz.nrw.de/nrwe/sgs/lsg_nrw/j2010/L_6_AS_297_10_Beschluss20100423.html

<http://www.keine-bildung-ohne-medien.de/>

http://www.keine-bildung-ohne-medien.de/?page_id=63

<http://www.laenderkonferenz-medienbildung.de/LKM-Positionspapier.pdf>

<http://www.lfm-nrw.de/medienkompetenz/Foerderung-der-aus-und-fortbildung/qualifizierungsangebot-journalistische-recherche-im-internet.html>

<http://www.ma-hsh.de/medienkompetenz/ma-hsh-projekte/eltern-lehrer-u.-multiplik./eltern-medien-lotsen.html>

<http://www.medienarbeit-nrw.de/cms-veranstaltungen/maerz-2011/>

<http://www.mekonet.de/t3/fileadmin/fachtagung/0601/hasenkox.pdf>

<http://www.mpfs.de/index.php?id=181> (JIM study)

<http://www.mpfs.de/index.php?id=192> (KIM study)

<http://www.mpfs.de/fileadmin/KIM-pdf10/KIM2010.pdf>

<http://one.laptop.org/und> <http://www.olpc-deutschland.de/>

<http://www.w3.org/PICS/>

<https://sozialgerichtsbarkeit.de/sgb/esgb/show.php?modul=esgb&id=128020>

Englert, Kathrin / Gerbig, D. / Schwarz, Betje, *Digitale Spaltung per Gesetz. Das Internet und soziale Ungleichheit im Alltag von Erwerbslosen*. Online at:

http://events.ccc.de/congress/2010/Fahrplan/attachments/1727_Paper_Digitale%20Spaltung%20per%20Gesetz.pdf

Garfinkel, Simson L., *Good Clean PICS. Hotwired Network*, 5 February 1997. Online at: <http://www.wired.com/science/discoveries/news/1997/02/1867>

Livingstone, Sonia / van Couvering, Elizabeth / Thumim, Nancy, *Adult Media Literacy. A review of the research literature. On behalf of Ofcom*, 2005, London. Online at: http://www.ofcom.org.uk/advice/media_literacy/medlitpub/medlitpubrss/aml.pdf

Studies/reports

Media Literacy Working Group, *Bericht über Möglichkeiten zur Stärkung der Medienkompetenz bei Kindern und Jugendlichen, Eltern sowie Fachkräften in Schulen und in der Kinder- und Jugendarbeit*, inter-departmental Media Literacy working group with representatives of the Conference of Interior Ministers, Conference of Justice Ministers, Conference of Youth and Family Affairs Ministers, Conference of Work and Social Affairs Ministers, Conference of Ministers for Culture and other experts, March 2010

AG ARD Multimedia, *ARD-Onlinestudie* 1997

ARD/ZDF-Onlinestudien 1998 to 2010

Behörde für Schule und Berufsbildung Hamburg, *Hamburger Netbook-Projekt Sekundarstufen-Schulen. Projektbericht, Dokumentation, Evaluation Schuljahr 2009/10*

BITKOM, *Jugend 2.0. Eine repräsentative Untersuchung zum Internetverhalten von zehn- bis 18-Jährigen*. Berlin: 2011. Online at: http://www.bitkom.org/files/documents/BITKOM_Studie_Jugend_2.0.pdf

BITKOM, *Internetnutzung auf Platz 2 der populärsten Aktivitäten von Teenagern*. Berlin: 2011. Online at: http://www.bitkom.org/de/presse/8477_68089.aspx

BITKOM, *SchülerVZ beliebteste Community bei Teenagern*. Berlin: 2011. Online at: http://www.bitkom.org/de/presse/30739_66665.aspx

Federal Office for Migration and Refugees, *Mediennutzung von Migranten in Deutschland*, Working Paper 34, Nuremberg: 2010

Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF), a report by a BMBF expert commission entitled: *Kompetenzen in einer digital geprägten Kultur. Medienbildung für die Persönlichkeitsentwicklung, für die gesellschaftliche Teilhabe und für die Entwicklung von Ausbildungs- und Erwerbsfähigkeit*. March 2009

Federal Ministry for Family Affairs, Senior Citizens, Women and Youth, *Handlungsempfehlungen zur Optimierung der Onlinekompetenz von Migrantinnen und Migranten*. Kompetenzzentrum Technik-Diversity-Chancengleichheit e.V., Berlin: 2009

“Medien und Integration” dialogue forum led by the federal government commissioner for migration, refugees and integration. Berlin: 2010. Hochschule der Medien Stuttgart/User Interface Design GmbH: *Studie Usability for Kids*, 2007

Initiative D21, *Bildungsstudie. Digitale Medien in der Schule Eine Sonderstudie im Rahmen des (N)Onliner Atlas 2011*. Online at: http://www.initiatived21.de/wp-content/uploads/2011/02/NOA_Bildungsstudie_140211.pdf

Initiative D21, Special evaluation of *(N)Onliner Atlas 2008 – Internetnutzung und Migrationshintergrund in Deutschland*. Berlin: 2008

Initiative D21, *Digitale Gesellschaft. Die digitale Gesellschaft in Deutschland. Sechs Nutzertypen im Vergleich. Eine Sonderstudie im Rahmen des (N)Onliner Atlas*. Conducted by TNS Infratest im Jahr 2010. Online at: http://www.initiatived21.de/wp-content/uploads/2010/12/Digitale_Gesellschaft_2010.pdf

Initiative D21, *IT-Roadmap zur gesellschaftlichen Integration. Ausgewählte Beispiele und Handlungsempfehlungen zum nationalen Integrationsplan*. Berlin: 2007

JFF – Institut für Medienpädagogik in Forschung und Praxis: *Fokuspunkte und Optimierungshinweise zum Jugendmedienschutz aus der alltagspraktischen Perspektive*. Munich: 2007

Jugend online / IJAB, *watch your web Jugendkampagne zur Sensibilisierung im Umgang mit persönlichen Daten im Internet. Projektbericht 2009*. Online at: http://www.jugendnetz-berlin.de/ger/start/downloads/watch_your_web_projektbericht.pdf

Jürgen, Fritz / Lampert, Claudia / Schmidt, Jan-Hinrik / Witting, Tanja, “Kompetenzen und exzessive Nutzung bei Computerspielern: Gefordert, gefördert, gefährdet. Zentrale Ergebnisse der Studie”, *Medienforschung* series by Media Authority of North Rhine-Westphalia (LfM), Volume 66, Berlin: 2011

Machill, Marcel / Beiler, Markus / Zenker, Martin, *Journalistische Recherche im Internet. Bestandsaufnahme journalistischer Arbeitsweisen in Zeitungen, Hörfunk, Fernsehen und Online. Abstract, Zusammenfassung und Handlungsempfehlungen*, Media Authority of North Rhine-Westphalia (LfM), Berlin: 2008. Online at: http://www.lfm-nrw.de/fileadmin/lfm-nrw/Veranstaltungskalender/zus-jourrech_01.pdf

Medienpädagogischer Forschungsverbund Südwest, *JIM-Studie 2010*

Neuberger, Christoph / vom Hofe, Hanna Jo / Nuernbergk, Christian, *Twitter und Journalismus. Der Einfluss des „Social Web“ auf die Nachrichten*. Media Authority of North Rhine-Westphalia (LfM), LfM document no. 38, Düsseldorf: 2010. Online at: http://lfmpublikationen.lfm-nrw.de/catalog/downloadproducts/LfM_Doku38_Twitter_Online.pdf

Neuberger, Christoph / vom Hofe, Hanna Jo / Nuernbergk, Christian, LfM study. *Twitter als Resonanzraum und Recherchehilfe. Redaktionsbefragung der Universität Münster. Mangelhafte Ausbildung für den Microblogging-Dienst*. Münster: 2010. Online at: http://lfm-nrw.de/fileadmin/lfm-nrw/Pressemeldungen/LfM-Studie_Twitter_als_Resonanzraum_und_Recherchehilfe_-_Zusammenfassung.pdf

Ofcom/UK Digital, *Report of the Digital Britain Media Literacy Working Group*. March 2009

Theunert, Helga / Gebel, Christa: *Untersuchung der Akzeptanz des Jugendmedienschutzes aus der Perspektive von Eltern, Jugendlichen und pädagogischen Fachkräften*. JFF Institut für Medienpädagogik in Forschung und Praxis, Munich: 2007. Online at: http://www.jff.de/dateien/JFF_JMS_LANG.pdf

Trebbe, Joachim/Heft, Annett/Weiß, Hans-Jürgen, “Mediennutzung junger Menschen mit Migrationshintergrund. Umfragen und Gruppendiskussionen mit Personen türkischer Herkunft und russischen Aussiedlern im Alter zwischen 12 und 29 Jahren in Nordrhein-Westfalen”, *Medienforschung* series by Media Authority of North Rhine-Westphalia (LfM), Volume 63, Berlin: 2010

University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf / German Center for Addiction Research in Childhood and Adolescence, *Studie für das Bundesministerium für Gesundheit zum Projekt Beratungs- und Behandlungsangebote zum pathologischen Internetgebrauch in Deutschland*. Hamburg: 2010

Valkenburg, Patti/Peter, Jochen, *Social Consequences of the Internet for Adolescents*. Universität Amsterdam, 2009

Winker, Gabriele / Englert, Kathrin / Gerbig, D. / Schwarz, Betje, *Die Bedeutung des Internets für gesellschaftliche Teilhabe am Beispiel alltäglicher Praktiken Erwerbsloser*, a project conducted by Hamburg University of Technology (TUHH) from 2009 to 2011

Members of the media literacy project group of the Study Commission on the Internet and Digital Society

Chairman: Thomas Jarzombek (Member of the Bundestag, CDU/CSU)

Research assistant: Dr Franca Wolff

Members entitled to vote:

Blumenthal, Sebastian (Member of the Bundestag, FDP)

Jarzombek, Thomas (Member of the Bundestag, CDU/CSU)

Özoğuz, Aydan (Member of the Bundestag, SPD)

Ring, Prof. Wolf-Dieter (Expert)

Rößner, Tabea (Member of the Bundestag, Alliance 90/The Greens)

Schulz, Dr Wolfgang (Expert)

Simon, Nicole (Expert)

Sitte, Dr Petra (Member of the Bundestag, The Left Party)

Tauber, Dr Peter (Member of the Bundestag, CDU/CSU)

Other members:

Beckedahl, Markus (Expert)

Freude, Alvar C. H. (Expert)

Gorny, Prof. Dieter (Expert)

Hofmann, Dr Jeanette (Expert)

Kurz, Constanze (Expert)

Osthaus, Dr Wolf (Expert)

padeluun (Expert)

Rohleder, Dr Bernhard (Expert)

von Notz, Dr Konstantin (Member of the Bundestag, Alliance 90/The Greens)