

Introducing the panspectric challenge: A reconfiguration of regulatory values in a multiplatform media landscape



Jonas Andersson Schwarz

SÖDERTÖRN UNIVERSITY, SWEDEN

Karl Palmås

CHALMERS UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, SWEDEN

ABSTRACT: Taking Sweden as a case study, the role of public service broadcasting (PSB) is explored, with a focus on issues of data retention and innovation that accompany web distribution. The issue of predicting audience preferences by means of data retention is investigated, and the related problem of organizational autonomy when interacting with commercial actors in the digital sphere. We hypothesize that previous tendencies towards paternalism might be equally supplemented by tendencies towards so-called “panspectric” surveillance and tracking, given a technological environment where such practices are increasingly common. We argue that the absence of advertising partially helps keep these broadcasters from panspectric temptation. Still, practices such as Facebook integration entail a panspectric element. We ask whether the potential increase in the efficacy of targeting audiences promised by panspectric practices might be offset by its negative impact on civic accountability. Is there a possibility for a “benign,” democratically accountable panspectrocinism?

KEYWORDS: media policy, public service broadcasting, public service media, innovation, management, prediction, paternalism, panspectrocinism



INTRODUCTION

Our over-arching aim is to explore the notion of audience management within public service broadcasting (PSB), as broadcasting is increasingly taking place in a multiplatform landscape where monolithical channels and programming schedules of old media institutions are increasingly supplemented by granular, hybrid, individually tailored forms of dissemination, where predictive algorithms — aimed at tracking the affects of audiences — become instrumental for the planning of reaching audiences. Sweden, the world’s most web-oriented country (WWWF, 2012) — while having an equally strong tradition of autonomous PSBs — is an illustrative case in point.

Within the public service remit, broadcaster policy has always involved an estimation of the nature and inclinations of audiences (Hall, 1980). In order to maintain a public service that is broadly enjoyed — and thereby relevant — the concept of anticipating audience preferences has, increasingly, become central to the strategic management of PSB. However, with the emergence of new modes of social control, based on technological aids such as data mining, pattern recognition and predictive algorithms, an alternative to the traditional notion of audience prediction is emerging.

It has been established that commercial actors like Google and Wal-Mart employ vast data mining operations in order to identify behavioral patterns that can be harnessed in order to maximize profit. As PSB is also increasingly taking place on Internet-mediated platforms — the transmission increasingly digitized and the ecosystem increasingly competitive — we ask whether the temptation to conduct similar data mining operations is present also within the PSB remit. We hypothesize that the vastly different purposes of PSB compared to commercial broadcasters mean that both the incentives and the regulatory limits are different; still, one could ask whether there is scope for more “benign” forms of data mining.

This article situates this development in the context of contemporary social theory and surveillance studies, which posits that such techniques signpost a shift towards new modes of generating social and organizational order (Deleuze, 1995). The advent of so-called “panspectric” modes of prediction (Palmås, 2011a) is dependent upon the technical possibilities of more pervasive techniques of logging, storing, and computing human behaviors digitally. Whether these modes constitute a counterpoint or an intensification of “panoptic” surveillance (Gandy, 1993) is a larger discussion which there is no place for here; our article merely serves to present the possibility for panspectric data mining for PSB actors, by noting some prototypical examples of panspectric practices.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The notion of panspectron was coined by DeLanda (1991), referring mainly to technological developments within signals intelligence during the Second World War and onwards. According to DeLanda it differs from the notion of panopticon (Foucault, 1977) in the nature of its gaze.

Instead of positioning some human bodies around a central sensor, a multiplicity of sensors is deployed around all bodies: its antenna farms, spy satellites and cable-traffic intercepts feed into its computers all the information that can be gathered. This is then processed through a series of “filters” or key-word watch lists. The Panspectron does not merely select certain bodies and certain (visual) data about them. Rather, it compiles information about all at the same time, using computers to select the segments of data relevant to its surveillance tasks (DeLanda, 1991, p. 206).

Following Foucault's (1977) discussion on how technological architectures can join with discourses and knowledge, thus forming social "diagrams" (Deleuze, 1999), one may state that there is such a thing as a "panspectric diagram" (Palmås, 2011a). This involves, on the one hand, the Panspectron-type apparatus sketched above by DeLanda but, on the other, also "a set of knowledge and perspectives on the nature of human nature" (Palmås, 2011a, p. 339).

While having a military origin, this panspectric diagram is at its most visible within the world of business. Corporations like Wal-Mart are developing advanced capabilities to predict future patterns of consumption, using it to streamline its logistics. The panspectric corporation par excellence is Google, whose mission statement tells us that the company wants to know what you will want to do tomorrow. On the Internet, an abundance of traces (Latour, 2007) are left for platform owners to pore over, creating entirely different conditions for audience measurement — potentially causing a desirability to predict audiences by means of data mining and real-time surveillance. The development of an increasingly ad-driven Web, with tethered, walled-garden platforms that de-anonymize the user, arguably entails an accumulation of panspectric practices.

The panspectric diagram is related to recent developments within the management of research and development. The modern corporation was founded upon the existence of internal R&D facilities. Indeed, as Noble (1977) points out, the rise of the corporate R&D laboratory (such as Bell Telephone Laboratories) was as influential as the emergence of salaried managers for the rise of the modern corporation (cf. Chandler, 1977). However, in recent years, this innovation model has been superseded by a new innovation paradigm, led by concepts such as "open innovation" (Chesbrough, 2003) and "user innovation" (von Hippel, 2005). In both of these cases, innovation is something that emerges outside the confines of the innovating organization — the challenge for the organization is, instead, to capture this extra-organizational creativity. Thrift (2006) dubs this development "the reinvention of invention."

The most recent development within this trend is the "agile" approach to management of actors like Google, Microsoft and Amazon, and the focus on "lean start-up" (Ries, 2011) of new ventures. Here, techniques such as "multivariate testing" and "iteration" are used to innovate, through learning more about users. As Thrift (2006, p. 295) states, commodities are cast as "processes of variation and difference that can allow for the unforeseen activities in which they may become involved or, used for which, may then act as clues to further incarnations." User behaviors are thus mined for new effects and new associations.

HYPOTHESIS

We posit that PSB is increasingly caught in a tension between conventional (largely deductive, potentially paternalist) prediction of the audience and new (largely

inductive, potentially panspectric) prediction of the audience. While panspectro-cism could allow for a more efficient operation (more interactive, better responding to audiences), the nature of PSB begs the questions whether efficacy should be maximized — and, in that case, how. Historically, PSB sees different objectives and approaches within the organization; the aim to maximize audiences is in no way uniform. At the same time, the model (very typical for Scandinavia) where PSBs are supposed to enjoy popularity both wide (universality, giving public legitimacy) and deep (catering for specific interests) makes for possible confusion and ambivalence regarding the PSB remit. For example, PSB actors use the same instruments for audience measurement as commercial competitors, but for vastly different purposes. PSB would address audiences as citizens, not consumers; the long-term goal is legitimacy rather than profit. At the same time, if all competitors begin using panspectric techniques, will PSB fall by the wayside if it refuses to engage in data-mining practices?

The actual hypothesis itself is too sizeable to answer comprehensively without further empirical investigation. Two such projects are currently under way in Sweden; Jakob Bjur has embarked on a study of how audience measurements are employed in the radio and TV ecologies at large, while Jonas Andersson Schwarz has begun a smaller, more limited study aiming at testing the hypothesis.

In what follows, we provide some background to it. By taking three recent examples we will illustrate how new models for production, dissemination and marketing come into play, all involving a negotiation with current governmental policies and legislation, such as the case of the public value test (Donders & Moe, 2011), where the market impact of new PSB-led services is supposed to be anticipated. While one of these examples can be said to constitute a genuine outside intervention that apprises PSB developers and managers to new ways of performing audience interaction, the other two involve the formal collaboration between Swedish PSB actors and an advertising agency, Forsman & Bodenfors (F&B). These also raise a number of questions relating to the structural hybridization and feasibility of panspectric approaches.

Further, our intervention coincides with the formal report, in September 2012, of the Public Service committee (appointed by the government) assessing the organizational conditions and market impact for Swedish PSB for the coming license period. Ultimately, our observations can provide an optimistic view of the role of public service broadcasting in the new media environment — given that it is envisaged as an *ethos*, or as an *attitude/approach* (Scannell, 2005) that has a role to play in the emerging, increasingly panspectric media landscape.

PUBLIC SERVICE BROADCASTING IN SWEDEN

A crucial factor is that Swedish public service media — Swedish Television (Sveriges Television; SVT), Swedish Radio (Sveriges Radio; SR) and The Swedish Educational

Broadcasting Company (Utbildningsradion; UR) — are not funded by advertising. Potentially, this absence of an explicit motivation to maximize audiences should make for an entirely different, much more citizen-oriented, accountable approach to audience prediction and management than the entirely commercial approach of actors such as Google, Facebook and commercial broadcasters. However, current policies of PSB in Sweden demand that public service remains relevant by continuing to reach vast audiences. It was SVT that launched the popular docu-soap “Expedition Robinson” (the Swedish version of the internationally popular format “Survivor”) in Sweden in 1997, a program that has served as an illustration in the debate on PSB in Sweden ever since. To us, “Expedition Robinson” marks the definitive break with the paternalist era, ushering in a reassessment of the notion of “what the audience wants” (cf. Bolin, 2001). At the same time, Lindén (2011, p. 328) has shown that there are different wills within the organization; it is far from clear to all departments how the broadcaster should cater to audiences. Lindén concludes that the greater latitude granted to SVT to operate also in the commercial media market (with populist, audience-maximizing content), the more susceptible it is to be influenced by commercial market logic. This allows the broadcaster to slip away from its original objectives regarding social responsibility. This tendency is further enhanced when SVT is thought to outsource production in order to stimulate production companies, he argues. At the same time, the post-modern turn allows for the argument that all forms of culture should be catered for by PSB, and that these actors can ensure also allegedly “populist” content to be of higher quality.

This fraught reluctance towards market justification — “neither too narrow, nor too broad” (Nord & Grusell, 2012) — is also central to the recent formal audit (SOU, 2012), that was commissioned by the Swedish Government, in order to determine the future Swedish PSB franchise: The Public Service committee recommends that PSB actors SVT, SR, and UR will deliver their offerings based on their mission and their knowledge of the audience and not on the basis of a perceived competition for market share. Their report will go through consultation and parliamentary vote, and form the basis for the 2014–2020 broadcasting franchise.

The committee had set out to examine a range of issues, mainly pertaining to funding. The Swedish PSB landscape is peculiar, in that it mixes strong technological progressivism with a preference for rather monolithical PSB actors, funded almost exclusively through a license fee. The committee saw it as their main task to question the current license fee system, partially in the light of the Finnish experience (rapid, full-scale digitization of terrestrial TV; mass exodus of license payers; fraught political bargaining regarding the switch to a tax solution), but generally as part of a current trend for European PSB — replacing licensed financing by direct government funding, or as a fee extending to all households. Sweden, whose PSB system has historically been modeled on the British system, was flagged to make this transition as well. In fact, its license has been formally “technology-neutral” since 2007.

However, the British have not yet chosen to scrap the license fee. Similarly, during the winter of 2012 also the Swedish committee's proposal to make the license obligatory to all households was stalled. Instead, SVT announced in January 2013 that praxis be changed to conform with the re-formulation added to Swedish broadcasting law in 2006: The law requires that *any* equipment that can receive broadcasts would require a license (i.e. also computer devices able to play streamed media). Commercial broadcasters have increasingly begun offering their broadcasts online and it should be added that by February 2013, SVT had begun entirely mirroring their conventional TV channels live through a streaming protocol.

We will not expand on the financial conditions for public service broadcasting in Sweden, but this is our general picture: a decade of slowly decreasing rates of funding; no possibility for PSBs to offset VAT costs when purchasing external productions; an increase in public willingness to pay for commercial TV; rapid switch-off of the analog terrestrial network allowing for set top boxes and hard drive recorders; increased awareness of ability to choose personally catered media content; increased supply of specialist channels (cf. Bjur, 2009; Edin, 2006; Konkurrensverket & Radio- och TV-verket, 2009) alongside a rapid surge in popularity of unregulated, illicitly distributed audiovisual media (file sharing and streaming). These factors mean that Swedish PSB is arguably much more exposed to competition than ten years previously.

An additional hindrance for public service broadcasting to remain competitive is the public value test (PVT), which the PSBs themselves see as alien to the Swedish tradition and ask to abolish (SVT, 2011, p. 69). The committee report (SOU, 2012), on the other hand, supports the PVT. This is in line with the general recommendation from the committee to maintain a clear separation from PSB and the commercial sector, explicitly asking for a continued prohibition of advertising as well as product placement, and more thorough accounting practices for PSB, especially regarding sponsorship. The Swedish PVT was outlined in a directive issued by the Swedish government in December 2010 (following the EC Directive 2009/C 257/01), declaring that an *ex ante* test be introduced, in order to assess the potential market impact of "significant new services" (cf. Wormbs, 2011).

One difference between Swedish public service media and equivalent media in the Nordic region and the UK, is that Sweden has a strict separation between radio (SR), TV (SVT) and educational content (UR). This, we argue, might have a preventive effect on management solutions that seek convergence of content and activities — especially when considering the separate web platforms of these respective companies. Arguably, this structural condition has deterred developments which would aim to fuse radio, moving images and archival/educational practices.

Tellingly, innovation of Swedish audiovisual media has rather been taking place in the realm of user behaviors and habits, despite rather vertical, non-integrated structural entities. Through strong and highly well-functioning, yet structurally separate outlets — SVT Play (and, to a smaller extent, competing outlets like

TV4 Play) for sanctioned, legal web-based TV streaming; Spotify for sanctioned, web-based audio streaming; The Pirate Bay for nonsanctioned, illicit BitTorrent orchestration — new behaviors have rapidly been established, which can hypothetically be expected to overlap and cross-pollinate each other in the everyday, domestic context. According to ex-Program Director Johan Grafström, SVT Play fundamentally changed the way Swedish audiences consume moving images, causing commercial entities to adopt similar services. Further, he argues, the service has also to some extent limited illegal file sharing and can be considered to have stimulated broadband penetration in Sweden; “Previously unknown actors, like Headweb and Vodder, of course see the business opportunities when more and more people learn to watch movies, children’s programs, nonfiction, and drama shows on their computers” (Grafström, 2010).

SVT was one of the pioneering PSB companies to broadcast via web streaming (SVT Play was established in 2006, and began streaming in HD in 2008). Similarly, SR was early to begin with podcasting, and web streaming too. Paradoxically, the analog FM band is still, however, enjoying vast popularity and actual market dominance; digital terrestrial radio transmission has been a failure in Sweden, while terrestrial TV broadcasting was quickly switched over to digital (culminating in October 2007; a very rapid transition by international comparison). In the current committee assessment, there is however a recommendation that a transition to digital FM radio should be made.

THE TECHNOLOGICAL CONTEXT

Sweden has been ranked as the world leader in terms of impact and value derived from the web — a lead that is characterized not so much by usage and content (here, the US is world-leading) but in terms of social, political, communicative, and institutional impact (WWWF, 2012, p. 8). The particularly strong popularity of file sharing in Sweden has been documented by Andersson Schwarz (2013). Sweden also has had an extremely progressive development regarding Internet/software startups in the last decade, for a country of such a modest size. The story of The Pirate Bay is widely known, and so is the voice-over-IP application Skype, whose Swedish founder Niklas Zennström founded the file sharing application Kazaa before moving on to audio/video chat software. It is rarely noted that the founders of the commercial music streaming application Spotify honed their programming skills by constructing one of the world’s most popular BitTorrent clients — μ Torrent. In other words, it is not only The Pirate Bay that has promoted “Promethean” (Palmås, 2011b) peer-to-peer technologies that tread the fine line between creative destruction, public utility, and illegal conduct.

The argument could be made (Andersson, 2012) that activities such as file sharing and streaming are to be seen as normative, ubiquitous even, at least among the younger demographic groups. The key transition that the Public Service committee

report emphasized is that web-based streaming should, as also SVT themselves have argued (SVT, 2011, p. 12), be seen as part of the core remit. Streaming is still a marginal practice in terms of viewers, mainly seen as a supplement.

If audiovisual content is seen as the core remit, the mode of distribution is secondary. Marshall (2009) has argued that, despite a plethora of distribution technologies, the point of origin for televisual content is, after all, conventional broadcasting. Its impact and profitability may have been weakened, but conventional television still tends to be the nexus around which redistribution and discursive performances take shape. While audience statistics show that the will to pay has increased among the population in general, younger generations have increasingly begun to watch TV in alternative ways. One example would be the common occurrence of conventional TV programs that are remediated as digital files in file sharing networks. Online-based behaviors transform the broadcast to more of a piecemeal, segmented sharing culture, where users share links in a horizontal, non-hierarchical, network-based manner, furthering already present trends towards individualization (Bjur, 2009), while also placing greater emphasis on data acquisition and small, mobile screens. This has caused commentators to voice concern for the disappearance of collectively shared experience (Edin, 2006, p. 67).

Nevertheless, regular TV audiences are still growing, alongside access to TVs and domestic hard drive recorders. However, a closer look reveals that a gap is widening. In theory, the supply of specialist programming and obscure media formats has benefited from improved digital storage and distribution capacities — yet, the reaction to this among the leading handful of conventional channels is that their programming has become consistently narrower (de Vries, 2011, p. 24), notably so for SVT 1 and SVT 2.

ANALYSIS

Novel establishments requiring unconventional alliances

The outward argument among Swedish public service executives is founded on a technologically progressivist argument that PSB actors should fully embrace the potential of digital platforms. “We want to see PSB where the audience is, regardless of the form of distribution, regardless of platform” SR Director General Cilla Benkö recently declared (Orrenius, 2012). The committee similarly proposes a more active role, where Swedish PSBs should seize the opportunities offered by new technology in terms of increasing audience interactivity, stimulating democratic debate, and actively help citizens take a stand instead of the current remit, of merely “giving information that citizens need to take a stand on social and cultural issues” (Kulturdepartementet, 2009, § 9, our translation). There is also (perhaps as a reaction to the decrease in programming diversity on the leading terrestrial channels SVT 1 and SVT 2) a strong urge expressed by SVT to open up their archive; this has

previously been hampered by current copyright legislation but is now happening, albeit in limited form: Selected parts of the archive will be made available through the SVT website.

However, the structural separation of services and applications means that another problem is posed, when striving to integrate the public service media experience with auxiliary platforms and social networking sites (SNSs). Such appendages to the core remit could indeed be seen as a form of “outsourcing” — note, for example, the custom of launching Facebook pages for different entertainment or current affairs programs; the deliberate dissemination of PSB content on YouTube; and, more recently, Spotify integration (currently in development), where selected parts of the radio schedule are made available for streaming on the Spotify platform. In both of these cases, the panspectric data on the audience usage patterns is harvested by the platform owner, making targeted advertising possible, catered by tracing user preferences for content that originates from PSB.

The absence of advertising makes Swedish PSB actors less susceptible to share data over what has been called the “invisible web”: the ad networks and behavioral data providers that form the backdrop for the ad-driven Web. When testing the SVT.se website (September 2012), zero indications of such third-party data sharing were found, while the SR.se website shared browsing data to Google Analytics, ChartBeat, and Nielsen NetRatings SiteCensus.¹

Besides making radio and TV programs available via the Internet, the PSBs provide extra material about the programs, longer versions of interviews, clips, games, and written updates on their web pages. Additionally, they use blogs and chat, alongside participation on SNSs like Facebook and Twitter. Via so-called “embedded media players,” Internet users can download a media player from the PSB website, add it to their own website or blog, and make certain programs or clips accessible for streaming via this player. Effectively, the PSBs have no control over on what pages and in what context these programs or clips are available; even local newspapers are allowed to embed, which makes for an interesting form of cross-media publishing. Since embedding merely links to the PSB websites, the PSBs can determine if and when the program or clip is longer available via the embedded player.²

In 2011, SR embarked on a one-year test where a selection of programs and features are published on online music streaming sites Spotify and Wimp. These services require the listener to have a subscription with either Spotify or Wimp. Another innovative radio application (partially inspired by another Swedish Internet startup, Soundcloud) and developed in collaboration with F&B, is SR Plus — an interactive service (Web, mobile, tablet) where radio shows are visualized on screen,

¹ The websites were tested on 13 September 2012.

² One difference between SVT and SR is that SR makes available entire programs, while SVT only makes available snippets, due to copyright.

allowing listeners to annotate and add photos or videos directly in the programs, in real time, while listening. Users can comment on shows and link to them, including Facebook and Twitter integration for these purposes. However, SR Plus only ran for one month (February 2012), as a test, only allowing for pre-recorded shows, no live shows.

SR Plus exemplifies the “sticky” nature of innovation in the digital sphere, as it involves several dimensions of cross-platform, cross-institutional hybridization:

- It is a nod to pre-existing services like Soundcloud and pre-existing habits among audiences.
- By building a customized service, the inventive, progressive, technology-friendly nature of SR is shown, thus creating awareness and enhancing its brand.
- It involves collaboration with F&B for conceptualization and planning, and digital software agency Society 46 for execution and production.
- It integrates the radio experience with Facebook and Twitter.

Another contemporary example is the campaign “Bli programchef på UR” (“Become a Program Director for UR”), also in collaboration with F&B (August 2012). To mark the opening of their archives (with 7369 different programs), educational broadcaster UR launched a campaign where Internet users were able to adopt a program each, in order to evangelize for this program and make it get as many viewers as possible. This campaign embraces the idea of “viral marketing,” that word-of-mouth dissemination would benefit awareness and credibility, much in the spirit of positive endorsement common on many SNSs such as Facebook. The UR campaign was closely integrated with Facebook and Twitter — even utilizing data-mining algorithms in order to assess what programs would suit you best, as a user, based on your previous “likes” associated with your Facebook profile. The pre-existing categorization of these likes (“sports,” “music,” etc.) was matched with the genre categorization of the UR program database.

A third example was seen in January 2013, when Swedish Web entrepreneur Ted Valentin “hacked” SVT and created the site bestofsvt.se — a site that tracks which SVT programs have been shared the most on Facebook, and lists them in a user-friendly way. The sharing figures were fetched through the Facebook API,³ while the metadata about the programs, including genre tagging, was fetched from SVT (although they did not have a real API at the time). According to Valentin, the service was born out of frustration regarding the navigability on SVT’s own site. SVT welcomed this outside intervention rather enthusiastically; in late January, the SVT developers invited Valentin to come and visit and help them implement a similar function on the actual SVT site. We thus see how openness towards one external actor (allowing programs to be shared on Facebook) begets new innovations by other external actors. This was, however, only possible thanks to Facebook’s

³ Application Programming Interface; a protocol allowing software components to communicate with each other.

infrastructural features; SNSs can be criticized to be caught between the desire to keep data proprietary and the synergies that can be created through open APIs.

Regarding integration with SNSs, in 2010 the Swedish Broadcasting Commission (Granskningsnämnden) criticized two SR radio programs for undue favourable treatment, when radio DJs had urged people to join the Facebook groups of their respective shows.⁴ SR responded to the Commission that the programs had not induced favouritism towards commercial interests, since the SR broadcasting license explicitly require them to respond to changing audience habits and extend PSB presence on those platforms where the audience is found. SNSs are, for SR (Granskningsnämnden, 2010), both platforms for audience interaction (informing listeners and getting feedback from them) as well as a marketing vector. Another feature is that SNSs are widely used by editorial staff as a tool for research and intelligence, keeping up with current affairs. The initiative to start Facebook pages is largely ad hoc; it comes from editors themselves, as part of a decentralized management strategy.

Facebook and Google are in one way seen as marginal enough not to constitute a threat — as Moe (2008) argues, they remain parenthetical to the core remit — yet, paradoxically, they are universal enough to be seen as ubiquitous in the online realm. The marginal nature of Web presence is seen in the ad hoc approach that program editors appear to have regarding images and sound clips (extraneous material). There appears to be a normative requirement to be present on Facebook, but what one actually does there, as an institutional actor, becomes secondary. One could ask what would happen if this action was more closely related to the core remit — either by changing mission statements that make Web interaction more central than it is today, or by a deepened media convergence which would make audio and video integration more of a regular feature within the Facebook infrastructure. This is a question that directly relates to our overarching strategic question in this article, in that the overarching policy in such scenarios would have to address panspectric dimensions.

What is the nature of public service?

Panspectric techniques might become increasingly necessary also in order to maintain a core-periphery model (Edin, 2006, p. 65) in an increasingly fragmenting media landscape. By, for example, identifying viewing patterns in this apparent fragmentation, and by establishing innovative solutions that serve to “tie” divergent practices to a unifying, common denominator, unity can be maintained. The UR “Programchef” campaign utilizes such an approach, for the underlying purpose of branding. The “Programchef” site creates a unifying brand for the seemingly

⁴ This case was analyzed by Willén (2010; supervised by Christian Christensen), and has also been addressed by Storsul (2011).

divergent content made available by UR, and simultaneously acts to demonstrate this very diversity, while also maintaining an appearance of technological competence and contemporaneity.

Given the expansion of activities beyond traditional broadcasting — and the seemingly increasing normative demands that PSB companies thus be integrating their services with other actors (e.g. the case of SR Plus) — are we witnessing a policy transformation into a media-neutral public service concept? Moe (2010, p. 1) asks this question, which justifies a further, even deeper question: What is PSB, in the rapidly digitized media environment that it finds itself within today? This might sound like an odd phrasing, but we deliberately read Moe's arguments in this way, as public service broadcasting increasingly has to grapple with existential — ontological — questions. What PSB is or understands itself to be is a quality that is relationally defined; it very much exists in the capacity of how it is relationally integrated, how well it interacts with and fits within a contemporary media landscape.

Moe refers to Born & Prosser (2001, p. 671) for a more technology-neutral definition of public services as enhancing, developing and serving social, political and cultural citizenship and doing so by providing universality and quality of services and output. Still, all European PSBs have a deep historical heritage and specific national and supranational conditions that shape this alleged neutrality, he adds. Bardoel & Lowe (2008) have recommended a re-conceptualization of PSB as Public Service Media, but Moe notes that this might focus too closely on the media-centric aspect of PSB. Alternatively, he notes, one could focus on content, as does Jakubowicz (2008, pp. 35ff), in order to account for the increasing prevalence of pull-based, on-demand modes of transmission and cross-publishing. Elsewhere, Jakubowicz (2003, p. 149) has prompted the question of the accountability of public service broadcasting and how it should be interpreted and measured, observing two radically different views of PSB in the literature: a paternal system or a response to demands of individual consumers.

Given these divergent views, perhaps it is more instructive to devise public service broadcasting as a shared attitude and approach, as Moe (2010, p. 12) points out, by recourse to Scannell (2005), before his proposition of a communicative commons as a defining feature for PSB.

CONCLUSIONS

We began with a hypothesis that requires further empirical testing. We will end by noting that none of the three examples that we have chosen involve panspectric monitoring at the “back end;” there is no central database that crunches the audience data generated through these services. Yet, they all employ prototypical forms of panspectricism in that they help shape our view of audience affections as something that can be tracked, measured, and tapped in entirely novel ways. This is different from traditional audience metering, in that services such as these do not rely

on selected panels acting as representatives of the overall audience. They apply to the entire audience, in real time. There is, in this sense, a 1:1 relationship between a Facebook “like” and the personal affect. This is deeply problematic, in our view, as it leads to an inherent risk of confusing the expression for the actual sentiment.

While we could be accused for asking questions that are somewhat premature in this article, we are interested in the contemporary state of PSB. As the overall analysis of both SR and SVT indicates, the way these corporations see themselves is still largely defined by the core remit of each respective actor; in the case of SR, audio broadcasting, and in the case of SVT, audiovisual broadcasting. The dissemination versus dialogue debate has a deep history in European media policy debates, and there is still cause to underscore the norm of “spreading information to all” (Moe, 2008, p. 15); a duty to support citizenship universally, with quality services that can be transferred to new means or forms of communication (Moe, 2010, p. 12), but also — as we argue here — by letting these values inform also policies in terms of data retention policies (third-part extensions of applications and user data thus generated) as well as outsourcing and “lean” development practices (collaborative/hybrid applications such as *bestofsvt.se*, but also activities such as beta testing, versioning, and multivariate testing). Experimenting with services such as these is a gamble in that it forces stakeholders to begin questioning the PSB remit. What appears to be fundamental is the efficacy dimension inherent to this remit, especially if PSB is expected to cater for minority interests. Could data mining, for example, be utilized to detect unexpected needs among heterogeneous audiences? This question might lie outside of the horizon for what is currently debatable, but given further intensification of the tendencies observed above, such a question might become urgent.

It should be noted that paternalism as well as panspectroicism are extremes that exert a magnetic pull but should be resisted — not necessarily out of efficacy, but if nothing else, for reasons of civic accountability. If the paternalist ethos of old went through a long and excruciating transformation towards a more democratically accountable remit, would it not be possible to argue for a similar, mounting challenge here — democratizing the panspectric logic inherent to the supply/demand-oriented management policy that guides much of what is regarded as innovative media management and platform politics today. Instead of innovating in order to maximize profitability, why not innovate in order to maximize public benefit? This would be a fine starting point for discussions on the future role of public service media in a multiplatform landscape — where PSB is arguably merely a subset, a part, of a much larger category, but arguably the most important part.

REFERENCES

- Andersson, J. (2012). The quiet agglomeration of data: How piracy is made mundane. *International Journal of Communication*, 6. Piracy Cultures Special Section, pp. 585–605.

- Andersson Schwarz, J. (2013). *Online File Sharing: Innovations in Media Consumption*. London and New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bardoel, J., Lowe, G.F. (2008). From public service broadcasting to public service media: The core challenge. In: Lowe, G.F., Bardoel, J. (eds). *From Public Service Broadcasting to Public Service Media — RIPE@2007*. Göteborg: Nordicom.
- Bjur, J. (2009). *Transforming audiences — Patterns of individualization in television viewing*. Doctoral thesis. JMG: University of Gothenburg.
- Bolin, G. (2001). Bingolotto: Produkter, varor, värden i kommersiell TV. *Nordicom Information*, 23 (3–4), pp. 15–32.
- Born, G., Prosser, T. (2001). Culture and consumerism: Citizenship, public service broadcasting and the BBC's fair trading obligations. *The Modern Law Review*, 64 (5), pp. 657–687.
- Chandler, A.D. Jr. (1977). *The Visible Hand: The Managerial Revolution in American Business*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University.
- Chesbrough, H. (2003). *Open Innovation: The New Imperative for Creating and Profiting from Technology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business Press.
- DeLanda, M. (1991). *War in the Age of Intelligent Machines*. New York, NY: Zone.
- Deleuze, G. (1995). Postscript on control societies. In: Deleuze, G. *Negotiations: 1972–1990*. Trans. Martin Joughin. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Deleuze, G. (1999). *Foucault*. Trans., ed. S. Hand. London and New York, NY: Continuum.
- de Vries, T. (ed) (2011). *Medieutveckling 2011*. Yearly report, Myndigheten för radio och tv (Sweden Broadcasting Authority).
- Donders, K., Moe, H. (eds) (2011). *Exporting the Public Value Test. The Regulation of Public Broadcasters' New Media Services Across Europe*. Göteborg: Nordicom.
- Edin, A. (2006). Times have changed: On the relationship between Swedish public service television and the viewing public. *Nordicom Review*, 27 (2), pp. 61–72.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Trans. A. Sheridan. New York, NY: Knopf Doubleday.
- Gandy, O.H. Jr. (1993). *The Panoptic Sort: A Political Economy of Personal Information*. New York, NY: Westview Press.
- Grafström, J. (2010). En prövning av public service-tjänster får inte böja sig för marknadskrafter. *Medievärlden*, April 28.
- Granskningsnämnden (2010). *Beslut 2010-09-06 Dnr: 10/00018 och 21 (360 och 536/10)*. Stockholm: Granskningsnämnden för radio och TV.
- Hall, S. (1980). Encoding/decoding. In: Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (ed). *Culture, Media, Language: Working Papers in Cultural Studies, 1972–79*. London: Hutchinson.
- Jakubowicz, K. (2003). Bringing public service broadcasting to account. In: Lowe, G.F., Hujanen, T. (eds). *Broadcasting & Convergence: New Articulations of the Public Service Remit*. Göteborg: Nordicom.
- Jakubowicz, K. (2008). Public service broadcasting in the 21st century. What chance for a new beginning? In: Lowe, G.F., Bardoel, J. (eds). *From Public Service Broadcasting to Public Service Media — RIPE@2007*. Göteborg: Nordicom.
- Konkurrensverket & Radio- och TV-verket (2009). *Från TV till rörlig bild*. Report, December 2009. Konkurrensverkets rapportserie 2009:6.
- Kulturdepartementet (2009). *Regeringsbeslut 86: Sändningstillstånd för Sveriges Television AB*. Dec 17. Ku2009/2313/MFI and (partially) Ku2009/2147/RS.
- Latour, B. (2007). Beware, your imagination leaves digital traces. *Times Higher Literary Supplement*, 6 Apr. Online edition.
- Lindén, J. (2011). *TV-ledning i konkurrens. En studie av Sveriges Televisions publicistiska ledning 1997–2000*. Doctoral dissertation, JMK, Stockholm University.

- Marshall, D. (2009). Screens: Televisions dispersed “broadcast”. In: Turner, G., Tay, J. (eds). *Television Studies after TV: Understanding Television in the Post-Broadcast Era*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Moe, H. (2008). *Public Broadcasters, the Internet, and Democracy: Comparing Policy and Exploring Public Service Media Online*. Doctoral thesis, University of Bergen.
- Moe, H. (2010). Defining public service beyond broadcasting: The legitimacy of different approaches. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 17 (1), iFirst Article, pp. 1–17.
- Noble, D. (1977). *America by Design: Science, Technology and the Rise of Corporate Capitalism*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Nord, L., Grusell, M. (2012). *Inte för smalt, inte för brett: Spelet om framtidens public service*. Göteborg: Nordicom.
- Orrenius, A. (2012). *Hon vill rädda public service*. Riksdag & Departement, Sept 10.
- Palmås, K. (2011a). Predicting what you’ll do tomorrow: Panspectric surveillance and the contemporary corporation. *Surveillance & Society*, 8 (3), pp. 338–354.
- Palmås, K. (2011b). *Prometheus eller Narcissus? — Entreprenören som samhällsomvälvare*. Gothenburg: Korpen Koloni.
- Ries, E. (2011). *The Lean Startup*. New York, NY: Crown Publishing Group.
- Scannell, P. (2005). The meaning of broadcasting in the digital era. In: Lowe, G.F., Jauert, P. (eds). *Cultural Dilemmas in Public Service Broadcasting — RIPE@2005*. Göteborg: Nordicom.
- SOU (2012). *Betänkande av Public service-kommittén: Nya villkor för public service*. Statens offentliga utredningar 59. Stockholm: Fritzes.
- Storsul, T. (2011). Sociale medier — nye muligheter for allmennkringkasterne. *Nordicom-Information*, 33 (1–2), pp. 69–73.
- SVT (2011). *Om alla. För alla*. Official report to Ministry of Culture, Spring 2011.
- Syvtersen, T. (1999). The many uses of the “public service” concept. *Nordicom Review*, 20 (1), pp. 5–12.
- Thrift, N. (2006). Re-inventing invention: New tendencies in capitalist commodification. *Economy and Society*, 35 (2), pp. 279–306.
- von Hippel, E. (2005). *Democratizing Innovation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Willén, N. (2010). “Vi blir som en liten ambassadör i Facebooklandet”: En uppsats om Sveriges Radios närvaro på Facebook. C-uppsats i medie- och kommunikationsvetenskap. Uppsala University, Department of Informatics and Media.
- Williams, R. (1968). *Communications*. London: Penguin Books.
- Wormbs, N. (2011). Swedish pre-screening of new services. Treading lightly. In: Donders, K., Moe, H. (eds). *Exporting the Public Value Test*. Gothenburg: Nordicom.
- WWWF (2012). *Web Index 2012: Key Findings*. Report, World Wide Web Foundation. September 5.