

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 panspectroicism?

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



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 monolithic 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.

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 re-invention 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

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.

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 Voddler, 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 — µTorrent. 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.

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. Bardeel & 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.

- 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). Sosiale 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.
- Syvrtsen, 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.