

The Legitimacy of Public Service Broadcasting in the 21st Century

The Case of Scandinavia

Håkon Larsen

Abstract

The present paper examines the debate on the future of public service broadcasting (PSB) in Norway and Sweden in the 2000s. I have analysed the discourses on PSB that dominate the public debate in the two countries, the cultural policy related to PSB, as well as the legitimizing rhetoric of the Norwegian public service broadcaster *Norsk rikskringkasting* (NRK) and that of the Swedish public service broadcaster *Sveriges Television* (SVT). Theoretically, the analysis draws on normative theories on the role of PSB in promoting democracy, culture and a well-functioning public sphere, as well as theories on democracy and the public sphere per se.

Keywords: public service broadcasting, Norway, Sweden, digitalization, globalization, legitimation

Introduction

Public service broadcasters have been one of the most important cultural institutions in Scandinavia in the second half of the 20th century. They have played an important role in creating, maintaining and communicating important values in society, and in creating and maintaining a national culture. The broadcasters have informed, educated and entertained the public. Furthermore, they have provided the audience with a common set of references; the nation has gathered around programmes and events broadcasted on radio and TV, and the broadcasting institutions have played a key role in the national public sphere. Due to the processes of economic and cultural globalization, and the digitalization of the broadcast media, broadcasters are facing serious challenges to their legitimacy as publicly funded media institutions (Lowe & Hujanen 2003; Lowe & Jauert 2005; Lowe & Bardoel 2007; Lowe & Steemers 2011; Carlsson 2013).

Digitalization is a great challenge to PSB institutions, in that one of the original and most powerful arguments for PSB, namely the scarcity argument, has been weakened. When the PSB institutions were founded, they had the privilege of being the only broadcaster in the analogue terrestrial network. As the network is now digitalized, it no longer has limited space. Thus, a number of channels can be distributed through the network. As a consequence, the PSBs have to be legitimized by different means (Lund, Nord & Roppen 2009).

Digitalization also leads to greater fragmentation of the audience, as the technology allows for content to be consumed on a number of platforms, whenever it suits the consumer (on-demand media consumption). Because PSB institutions were meant to provide the audience with a common set of references and to promote national culture, this media development makes a new set of arguments necessary as regards the maintenance of a publicly funded national media institution. This is also called for due to the ongoing processes of economic and cultural globalization. With an increasing transnational media market, and with the national culture of the Western nation states playing a less significant role in the face of the globalized culture industry, the legitimacy of PSB is being challenged.

In the present article, I investigate the arguments employed in legitimizing the continued importance of public service broadcasting (PSB) in Scandinavia, in the face of these challenges. I have chosen to study this region of Europe because PSB has played an important role in the Scandinavian social democratic project of the 20th century. The Scandinavian countries have many common features regarding their social democratic welfare states (Esping-Andersen 1990) and media systems (Hallin & Mancini 2004). They are thus well suited for a comparative analysis with a “most similar systems design” (Przeworski & Teune 1970). Of the Scandinavian countries, I have chosen to compare Norway and Sweden, as these countries have more in common with each other than either of them has with Denmark (Sejersted 2005), and a two-nation study “[...] enables the researcher to investigate a much larger number of contextual or micro variables than is feasible in large-scale multinational studies” (Hantrais 1999: 99). I analyse the legitimizing discourses as they are employed in cultural policy, by the Norwegian public service broadcaster *Norsk rikskringkasting* (NRK) and the Swedish public service broadcaster *Sveriges Television* (SVT), and in the public debate on PSB. The main research question is: What characterizes the discourses on the future of PSB in Norway and Sweden, as they appear in cultural policy, the public debate, and the PSB institutions NRK and SVT during the 2000s, and what can this tell us about the successful elements used in legitimating PSB in the 21st century?

Analyses of the different data sources have been published elsewhere (Larsen 2008, 2010, 2011a, 2011b). In the present article, I draw all the studies together and reflect on what the findings, seen as a whole, can tell us about how PSB can be legitimized in the 21st century. The empirical study was centred on the time period between 2000 and 2007, with a special emphasis on the years 2005, 2006 and 2007. However, I did go as far back as the year 2000 in some cases.

After a short presentation of the main analytical concepts applied in the analysis, and the data analysed, I give a short presentation of the PSB institutions under scrutiny, their history and organizational structure. Thereafter, I turn to my analysis of the national debates and present the major findings from my study of the debate on the future of PSB in the public and political spheres in Norway and Sweden, and how this has affected the legitimizing rhetoric of the PSB institutions themselves.

Analytical Concepts and Data

The main analytical concept is discourse, and I have based my analysis on Fairclough’s (1995) critical discourse analysis (CDA). He defines discourse as “[...] the language used

in representing a given social practice from a particular point of view” (Fairclough 1995, p. 56). A distinctive feature of CDA is that it treats the relationship between discourses and social practices from a dialectical standpoint, meaning that historical, social and cultural aspects, as well as social theory (social practice) are in a dialectical relationship with the discourses (in the sense that they shape discourses and are shaped by them).¹

Considering that this is an analysis of PSB in Norway and Sweden, I will provide a brief presentation of how this notion has been translated into the national languages. The Norwegian term for PSB is *allmennkringkasting*. According to Sigve Gramstad (1989, 10), the Norwegian term was first used in a proposition on cable television from 1988, where one defines allmennkringkasting as “[...] broadcasting that is under some form of social control, which entails among other things a varied programme offering containing material of interest to many different groups in society” (Ot.prop. nr. 53 (1987-1988): 10).²

Although there is a Swedish term for PSB, *radio och tv i allmänhetens tjänst* (radio and television in the public’s service), it is common to simply use the term ‘public service’ when referring to PSB. In Sweden, ‘public service’ (an English term imported into the Swedish language) is reserved for broadcasting only, and is not used when referring to other public services, like clean water, public education, or public transportation.

The data for the present article consist of newspaper articles, government reports on PSB and overall cultural policy, strategy documents and annual reports of the PSB institutions, and interviews with high-ranking employees in these PSB institutions. I have analysed a total of 283 newspaper articles from the Norwegian newspapers *Aftenposten* and *Dagbladet* and the Swedish newspapers *Svenska Dagbladet* and *Dagens Nyheter*, covering the time period from September 1 2006 to January 31 2007. All the articles contain either the phrase allmennkringkast* (NO) or ‘public service’ (SE).³ A total of 11 government reports on PSB and overall cultural policy have been analysed⁴ as well as 7 institutional documents (strategy documents and annual reports). In addition to studying the documents, I have conducted 9 semi-structured interviews (Kvale & Brinkman 2009) with heads of various divisions at NRK and SVT (for a list of informants, see Larsen 2011b: Appendix 2). The next section contains a brief presentation of the PSB institutions under scrutiny.

Public Service Broadcasting in Norway and Sweden

NRK is the only public service broadcaster in Norway. It delivers content on radio, television, the Internet, mobile phones and tablets. NRK has been a state-owned limited company since 1996, and the state holds all its shares. Between 1988 and 1996 it was a foundation, and prior to that a government-run enterprise. NRK is obliged to follow the Norwegian Law on Broadcasting (LOV-1992-12-04-127), NRKs statutes and the NRK decree (both are stated in the white paper St.meld.nr. 6 (2007-2008)). Because NRK is a limited company it is also under the regulation of the Norwegian Law on Limited Companies (LOV-1997-06-13-44), and especially § 20-4 to 20-7, which cover state-owned limited companies.

In Sweden there are three PSB companies: SVT, *Sveriges Radio* (SR), and *Utbildningsradion* (UR).

For nearly forty years, all Swedish public service broadcasting was organized in a single company. In 1993, however, the group company was dissolved, and radio and television were split into separate companies, SVT for television, and SR for radio. Together with a third company, UR, which produces educational programming carried in windows in SVT and SR channels [...] (Harrie 2009: 188).

The license fee (paid by everyone in possession of a television) in Sweden is collected by *Radiotjänst*. The limited companies SVT, SR and UR are owned by the foundation *Forvaltningsstiftelsen*. The foundation owns and administers all the shares in the three companies (Prop. 2005/06:112: 20). The PSB companies are obliged to follow the Swedish Law on Free Speech (SFS 1991: 1469), the Swedish Radio and TV Law (SFS 1996:844), and (in the time period for this particular investigation) the green paper *Regeringens proposition 2005/06: 112*. In order to make the comparison manageable, I chose to study only one of the Swedish companies: SVT. For methodological reasons I then chose to focus on NRK Television, rather than NRK Radio (although they are not separated in different companies).

Research on PSB

What the content of the term ‘public service’ should be, when applied to broadcasting, has been discussed by scholars at different times marked by changes in the media environment (Gramstad 1989; Søndergaard 1999; Syvertsen 1990, 1999; Collins, Finn, McFayden & Hoskins 2001; Lowe & Hujanen 2003; Born 2005; Lowe & Jauert 2005; Lowe & Bardoel 2007; Lund, Nord & Roppen 2009; Rolland 2010; Moe 2011). Considering that public service broadcasters deliver on-demand content on the Internet and portable devices, as well as to TV viewers with a receiver containing a hard-disc, scholars have argued that the term broadcasting no longer applies to the service that PSB institutions deliver to the public. Instead, they argue for terms like public service communication (Born 2005), public service media (Bardoel & Lowe 2008), digital commons (Murdock 2005), or public service content (Jackubowicz 2007).

These discussions appear in one strand of research on PSB, namely the normative tradition, where researchers approach the broadcasters in light of theories of democracy and the public sphere. But research on PSB also has an institutional tradition, where one studies public service broadcasters as (media) institutions, often linked to media policy and/or the particular institution’s history (Moe & Syvertsen 2007). Given that I am concerned with the normative activity of legitimating PSB, it is the first tradition that is of most relevance to the present paper. I am interested in what normative ideals on democracy and the public sphere that influenced the national debates on PSB in the 21st century.

I am convinced that an analysis of the legitimation of PSB requires a coupling of normative theory and empirical research. Besides, I am not alone in arguing from this position. Born (2005, p. 119) has said this about PSB:

From a policy perspective, we need to take political philosophies seriously – to realise that they offer tangible bases on which to construct institutional arrangements; but also to acknowledge that our existing institutions embody political philosophies that themselves deserve scrutiny and updating.

And Jakubowicz states the following:

Let us not be mistaken about what the discussion on PSB is really about. It is not a debate on a specific form of broadcasting, but on values and principles that govern society and social life. It is really an ideological and moral discussion on what kind of society we want to be part of (Jakubowicz 2008, p. 252).

Let us now turn to the results from the study of how NRK and SVT in particular, and PSB in general, have been legitimized in Norway and Sweden during the past decade.

Normative Positions in the Debate on the Future of PSB

The analysis of the public debate on PSB in the period between 2000 and 2007 showed that three discourses, each influenced by a theory of democracy, were present in the debate in both countries: the fellow citizen discourse corresponding to a deliberative model of democracy (Habermas 1962, 1992), the pluralist discourse corresponding to a pluralist model of democracy (Mouffe 1993), and a consumer discourse corresponding to a neo-liberal model of democracy (Nozick 1974; Hayek 1960, 1994). I will now present the discourses in more detail, focusing on the normative grounds of the discourse rather than on the positioning of the actors engaging in the national debates, as the present article is about normative positions on PSB in the 21st century, rather than about the specifics of the national debates in Norway and Sweden.

The fellow citizen discourse is influenced by a deliberative notion of democracy, where Habermas is an important figure. Habermas has not written about PSB himself, but several scholars have argued in favour of applying Habermas' theory to PSB, of whom Nicholas Garnham (1986, 1992, 2003) is the most prominent. He argues that public service broadcasters are important in securing an inclusive and common public sphere in liberal democracies. According to Garnham, PSB institutions are media institutions that possess the potential to ensure a public sphere that is close to the Habermasian ideal. In addition to Garnham, Paddy Scannel (1989, p. 164), also inspired by Habermas, has argued that PSB is important in securing a well-functioning liberal democracy:

In my view equal access for all to a wide and varied range of common informational, entertainment and cultural services, carried on channels that can be received throughout the country, could be thought of as an important citizenship right in mass democratic societies. It is a crucial means – perhaps the only means at present – whereby common knowledge and pleasures in a shared public life are maintained as a social good for the whole population. As such it should be defended against its enemies.

Such a romantic Habermasian notion of PSB's role for democracy and the public sphere can also be applied to cultural policy as such. Peter Duelund (2002, p. 11) writes:

Cultural institutions are not *per se* any guarantee for the free expression and multitude of culture. It must roll in the blood of people as an internalised normative reality. And that is only developed if today's society contains non-colonised spheres for the free communicative actions of individuals parallel to the coffee houses, salons, etc. of the earlier bourgeois society. The securing of these free

spheres constitutes the cultural dimension of cultural policy in which culture is defined sociologically as the values that render the social relations meaningful.

Such a Habermasian or modernist perspective on PSB and cultural policy has been criticized by scholars advocating a postmodern view on media, democracy, and television (Hartley 1999; Jacka 2003). Elizabeth Jacka criticizes Garnham for emphasizing ‘high modern journalism’ (Carey 1993) on behalf of a media offering that focuses on entertainment. Furthermore, she states that PSB is outdated because we now live in a postmodern society. She argues for abandoning the notion of a universalistic and rational public sphere in favour of a pluralistic and postmodern notion of the public sphere and democracy, inspired by Mouffe (2005) and Hartley (1999). She sees no future for publicly funded media.

In her theory on democracy, Mouffe (1993; Laclau & Mouffe 1985) is explicitly in opposition to Habermas’s theory. The most important difference between Habermas’s and Mouffe’s theories is that Mouffe does not consider consensus as a goal; she looks at conflict and emotional involvement as a value in itself, and believes that this serves democracy better than an unattainable ideal of consensus and communicative rationality. Accordingly, the public sphere does not need to include everyone in the public conversation. A fragmentation of the public sphere is considered positive. This theory of democracy provides a normative foundation for the pluralist discourse influencing the debate on the future of PSB in Scandinavia. Actors in the debate promoting this position want PSB to represent a market corrective, and typically focus on narrow subject areas, such as culture, documentaries, and foreign news, rather than on broad subject areas like entertainment, and sport. The Public Broadcasting Service (PBS) in the US can be seen as a media institution based on such a normative perspective.

John Keane (1995) is another scholar who has criticized Habermas’s public sphere perspective and Garnham’s linking of it to PSB. For Keane, both Habermas’s and Garnham’s perspectives are best suited to an early stage in modern society. Because we now live in a time when the national is not as important, Habermas’s and Garnham’s notion of the public sphere concerns only one of many public spheres, according to Keane. Furthermore, he believes that it is no longer possible to distinguish between the private and the public.⁵ Keane then launches a theory consisting of three levels: micro-public spheres, in the form of small groups that influence society through creative activity and resistance to dominant opinions; meso-public spheres, which are close to those described by Habermas and Garnham – i.e. national public spheres; and finally macro-public spheres, which are global or transnational public spheres characterized by “media events” (Dayan & Katz 1992) and the Internet as the dominant structure for communication.

The difference between the normative democratic theories that the scholars who defend and criticize PSB’s relevance lean on is that the former can be seen as proponents of a modern and the latter as proponents of a postmodern view on society. Where the defenders of PSB rely on a philosophical tradition in which one considers modernity an unfulfilled project (Habermas 1985), the critics lean on postmodern perspectives in which one rejects the notion that the enlightenment project is both relevant and achievable. The first tradition is inspired by German enlightenment philosophy (Kant 1795 [1784]; Mendelssohn 1997 [1784]), Habermas being its foremost advocate today. The

second tradition leans on French thinkers like Michel Foucault (1966, 1969), and Jean-François Lyotard (1984).

The third democratic perspective that has influenced the empirically observed debate on PSB, in terms of a consumer discourse, is the neo-liberal one, where Robert Nozick (1974) and Friedrich Hayek (1960, 1994) are key figures. The main idea in this school of democratic theory is to minimize the government's influence on social life. According to this line of reasoning, the market is by definition a more democratic institution than the state, and the market is best suited to ensuring the autonomy of the citizens. Opponents of the license-financed PSB can base their arguments on such a stance. As a response to this line of reasoning, the PSB institutions have become increasingly concerned with communicating to the public quantitative measures related to their activities. This involves ratings, the number of unique visits to the website, the numbers from trust indication surveys, and figures on how many awards they have won for their productions. This leads to a paradoxical situation: The license-funded public service broadcasters use this to support the argument that people get value for the money they spend on the license fee, while it also is proof that the media institutions would survive in the market as commercially funded media companies.

Comparative Conclusions from the Debates in Norway and Sweden

In this section, I will present some of the main findings from my study of the debate on PSB in the national public sphere (Larsen 2008), how the PSB institutions of NRK and SVT legitimate their own existence (Larsen 2010), and how the relevance of these institutions from a cultural policy perspective is being argued for in the two countries (Larsen 2011a). Taken together, the findings from these two national cases illustrate how PSB can be legitimized in the 21st century.

During the 2000s, issues related to PSB have been more debated in Sweden than in Norway. Between February 15, 2000 and February 15, 2007, the issue was debated 2.5 times more in the main national newspapers in Swedish than in Norway. During the time period for my study, September 1, 2006 to January 31, 2007, the issue was debated 7.6 times more in the Swedish papers, but this was also a period of extensive debate in Norway, as compared to the number of articles on PSB during other periods in the 2000s. This was a time when PSB was a "hot area generating intense passion or disagreement" (Lamont & Thévenot 2000, p. 271) in both countries, thus making it a particularly interesting time for analysis. During this particular time period, a great deal of criticism was directed at the new Swedish Minister of Culture, representing the center-right coalition government: After being appointed Minister of Culture, she shortened the licence period for the Swedish public service broadcasters from 6 to 3 years, and it was also brought to light that she had not paid the licence fee for the preceding 16 years (as a consequence she had to resign after two weeks). Also, SVT was criticized for abandoning its public service ideals by focusing on reaching specific target groups (young adults) and in doing so prioritizing entertainment over educational programming in its programme offering (Larsen 2008). As a consequence of this criticism, the new CEO of SVT, Eva Hamilton (appointed on December 6, 2007), made a point of stressing that SVT should serve the whole Swedish population, and not put a special emphasis on specific audience segments. When the consumer discourse was made relevant in SVT, the Swedish public

responded by anchoring the role of PSB in the fellow citizen and pluralist discourses, leading to a rejection of the consumer discourse in SVT.

In both countries, the need to secure a national culture, a vibrant democracy and an inclusive public sphere was emphasized in the white papers on PSB and overall cultural policy. But there were also differences, in that the Norwegians focused on PSB as a tool for achieving cultural policy goals, while the Swedes emphasized why the idea of PSB is important in itself (Larsen 2011a). The cultural policy related to PSB is more instrumental in Norway. Basing legitimacy on the idea of PSB, as the Swedes tend to do, is in line with the rest of Europe: "The attention focused on the mission of public service broadcasters is greater than ever before, both at the level of European and national regulators, and at the level of the public broadcasting institutions themselves" (Bardoel & d'Haenens 2008, p. 342-343).

Moreover, the analysis of the institutions legitimizing rhetoric showed that SVT leant on the traditional PSB rhetoric, focusing on its democratic role and its dedication to enlightening and serving the public in arguing for its continued importance, while NRK focused more on its role in sustaining the Norwegian language and NRK's adaptation to the processes of digitalization and convergence (Larsen 2010). SVT's legitimacy was challenged during the period under scrutiny, with, among other things, a petition protesting its strategy to reach young audiences. As a result, SVT needed to legitimize itself in terms of its mission as a public service broadcaster, drawing on the fellow citizen discourse. According to Hamilton:

SVT differs from the commercial channels not because it focuses upon narrow subject areas in its programmes, [...] but in that it offers programmes within all genres and has productions of higher quality than its competitors' production. NRK's CEO Hans Tore Bjerkaas also stressed the importance of high quality as a key factor for the survival of NRK, relating quality to the use of the Norwegian language: 'NRK's simple way to see the future is that we are a quality deliverer of Norwegian-based, Norwegian-language content, on all platforms in the future' (Larsen 2010, p. 271).

That the Swedish CEO argues that SVT delivers content of higher quality than its competitors in all respects, and the Norwegian CEO stresses that NRK is the only quality deliverer in the Norwegian language, can be interpreted in light of the fact that Norway's population is only half the size of Sweden's, as well as that Norway has two written languages: Norwegian Bokmål and Norwegian Nynorsk. Norwegian is a small language, and NRK is one of the few places in Norway where Norwegian Nynorsk is practiced orally, because the language was constructed as a written language based on a collection of dialects, as an alternative to Norwegian Bokmål, which was developed from Danish. NRK is thus an important tool in maintaining the Norwegian language.

Digitalization was the aspect of the changing media landscape that received most attention in relation to legitimizing the continued importance of PSB in Norway. In Sweden on the other hand, the focus was rather on economic globalization, especially concentration of ownership in the media industry and the homogenizing effects this has on media content: SVT was actively positioning itself in opposition to commercial actors and the levelling effect of cultural globalization.

Neo-liberal ideas have had an impact on the debate in both countries, but its influence has generated more criticism in Sweden than in Norway (Larsen 2008). When faced with the influence of the consumer discourse, the Swedish public mobilized the pluralist and the fellow citizen discourses in defence of the idea of PSB.

The debate in Sweden was influenced by the fellow citizen discourse to a higher degree than was the debate in Norway (Larsen 2008). An important element in the fellow citizen discourse is the role of PSB in educating the citizens. When talking to leaders in the PSB institutions, I was told that the ideal that the institutions should be dedicated to educating citizens and securing a common public sphere did not have to be abandoned due to digitalization, in that PSB institutions should represent a trustworthy provider of essential information that citizens can seek out when they need to be informed rather than amused (Larsen 2010). This goal has been prolonged, in that the main objective in NRKs strategy document for the period 2012-2017 is to maintain NRK as Norway's most important source for new knowledge and common experiences (NRK 2012). It is thus argued that the enlightenment project is not outdated because of digitalization and on-demand media consumption. Public broadcasters should rather be considered a central digital common (Murdock 2005) in today's media landscape.

Furthermore, in both countries, public service broadcasters portray themselves as small players in the global media arena. They use the same rhetoric as the national commercial public service broadcasters, TV2 in Norway and TV4 in Sweden, used when they engaged in competition with NRK and SVT in the early 1990s.⁶ In the 1990s, TV2 and TV4 argued that the audience would benefit from a national commercial media actor that could counterweight the offering from the license-funded public service broadcasters. But engaging in the competition was difficult, they argued, because the public service broadcasters were so dominant in the market and had a privileged position. Today, it is the public service broadcasters who portray themselves as challenging the big multinational media companies in the globalized (national) media market, by offering the audience an important corrective to the global commercial offering. In Sweden, it is argued that SVT provides a service that is qualitatively better than the commercial offering. In Norway, on the other hand, the focus is more on NRK being the only media company that is actively working to preserve Norwegian language and culture.

Legitimizing PSB in the 21st Century

This article asked what characterized the discourses on the future of PSB in Norway and Sweden, as they appear in cultural policy, the public debate, and in institutional legitimation during the 2000s. The analysis has shown that there are three discourses influencing the national debates to various degrees: a fellow citizen discourse, a pluralist discourse, and a neo-liberal discourse, each influenced by a normative perspective on democracy and the public sphere. The paper also asked what the national cases of Norway and Sweden can tell us about successful elements in the legitimation of PSB in the 21st century. The study has shown that the legitimizing rhetoric surrounding PSB can be adapted to an age of digitalization and globalization, and that we as citizens can influence the future of PSB by protesting when we perceive that broadcasters are moving in the wrong direction. A publicly funded broadcasting institution can survive in a digital media environment provided it is capable of adapting both its practice and

legitimizing rhetoric to a new environment. Although there are national differences in how this is done, the key to accomplishing it is maintaining a focus on the quality of the content, regardless of the platform on which it is distributed. As long as the PSB institutions are perceived as trustworthy deliverers of high quality content, we have not come to the end of public service media.

Notes

1. This notion of social practice differs from the way the term is used by other scholars, as well as from the common-sense usage of the term, in that Fairclough uses it to contextualize discourses, rather than applying it to describe human action.
2. It was not until the NRK faced competition from commercial broadcasters that a need to define the content of NRK's mission resulted in the launch of a new word. Until the launch of *allmennkringkasting*, PSB in Norway was simply called *kringkasting*, which is the Norwegian equivalent to broadcasting. This had been in use in official documents since 1924 (Dahl 1999: 33).
3. The articles are retrieved through searches in the online newspaper archives Retriever.no and Retirever.se. * indicates that all endings of the term are included in the search, and ‘ ’ indicates that the words must appear after one another.
4. The reports are either *Storingsmelding* (St.meld.), *Riksdagsproposition* (Prop.) or *Statens offentliga utredningar* (SOU). The Norwegian St.meld. is a document that the government presents for the parliament, containing a broad orientation to a specific policy area. The Swedish Prop. is a proposed change of law that the government presents for the parliament, but the Prop. usually also contain a broad orientation to the policy field, similar to the Norwegian St.meld. The Swedish SOU is a report delivered to the government by an independent committee, commissioned to evaluate existing and recommend future policies in a specific policy area.
5. Peter Dahlgren (2006) has also argued that a contemporary perspective on the public sphere should include the private to a greater extent than these modernist perspectives do.
6. They were labelled commercial public service broadcaster as they were commercially funded, but given access to the analogue terrestrial network alongside the public service broadcasters in return for fulfilling some cultural policy obligations laid down by the government. TV4 has been a commercial broadcaster since 2007 (Lund, Nord & Roppen 2009). TV2 is still defined as a public service broadcaster, with a licence from the government running until December 31, 2015. The most important cultural policy obligations stated in the licence are: The programme offering should be broad and varied, and TV2 must be located in Bergen, which is the second largest city in Norway (NRK is located in the capital, Oslo). TV2 must have daily news broadcasts produced in-house, weekly Norwegian language programmes for children, and regularly aired Norwegian language programmes for young people. 50% of the programme offering should be in Norwegian, and both Norwegian languages should be present in the total programme offering. The licence is available here: http://www.regjeringen.no/upload/KUD/Medier/TV2-avtalen_underskrevet_av_Hildrum_og_Huitfeldt_03des2010.pdf

References

- Bardoel, J. and d'Haenens, L. (2008) 'Reinventing Public Service Broadcasting in Europe: Prospects, Promises and Problems'. *Media, Culture and Society* 30(3): 337-355.
- Born, G. (2005) 'Digitising Democracy', *The Political Quarterly*, 76 (issue supplement s1): 102-123.
- Carey, J.W. (1993) 'The Mass Media and Democracy: Between the Modern and the Postmodern', *Journal of International Affairs*, 47(1), 1-21.
- Carlsson, U. (ed.) (2013) *Public Service Media from a Nordic Horizon. Politics, Markets, Programming and Users*. Gothenburg: Nordicom.
- Collins, R., Adam, F., McFadyen, S. and Hoskins, C. (2001) 'Public Service Broadcasting Beyond 2000: Is There a Future for Public Service Broadcasting?', *Canadian Journal of Communication* 26(1): 3-15.
- Dahl, H.F. (1999) *Hallo-hallo! Kringkasting i Norge 1920-1940*. Oslo: J. W. Cappelens Forlag.
- Dahlgren, P. (2006) 'Doing Citizenship: The Cultural Origins of Civic Agency in the Public Sphere'. *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 9(3): 267-286.
- Dayan, D. and Katz, E. (1992) *Media Events. The Live Broadcasting of History*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

- Duelund, P. (2002, January) 'On the public Sphere as a Cultural Political Idea, The Nordic Cultural Model as an Example'. Paper presented at the *Second International Conference on Cultural Policy Research*, Wellington.
- Edin, A. (2006) 'Nya förhållanden. Om den svenska public service-televisionens relation till publik och allmänhet'. *Nordicom Information* 28(2): 61-71.
- Esping-Andersen, G. (1990) *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Fairclough, N. (1995) *Media Discourse*. London: Arnold.
- Foucault, M. (1966) *Le mots et les choses: un archéologie des sciences humaines*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Foucault, M. (1969) *L'archéologie du savoir*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Garnham, N. (1986) 'The Media and the Public Sphere', in Golding, P. Murdock, G. and Schlesinger, P. (eds.), *Communicating Politics – Mass Communication and the Political Process*. Leicester: Leicester University Press.
- Garnham, N. (1992) 'The Media and the Public Sphere', in Calhoun, C. (ed.) *Habermas and the public sphere*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Garnham, N. (2003) 'A Response to Elizabeth Jacka's 'Democracy as Defeat''. *Television and New Media* 4(2): 193-200.
- Gramstad, S. (1989) 'Kringkasting i folkets teneste'. Publikasjon nr. 17. Volda: Møre og Romsdal Distrikthøgskole.
- Habermas, J. (1985) 'Modernity – An Incomplete Project', in Foster, H. (ed.) *Postmodern Culture*. London: Pluto Press.
- Habermas, J. (1962) *Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit. Untersuchungen zu einer Kategorie der bürgerlichen Gesellschaft*. Neuwied: Luchterhand Verlag.
- Habermas, J. (1992) *Faktizität und Geltung. Beiträge zur Diskurstheorie des Rechts und des demokratischen Rechtsstaats*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp Verlag.
- Hallin, D.C. and Mancini, P. (2004) *Comparing Media Systems. Three Models of Media and Politics*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Hantrais, L. (1999) 'Contextualization in Cross-National Comparative Research', *International Journal of Social Research Methodology* 2(2): 93-108.
- Harrie, E. (2009) *The Nordic Media Market 2009*. Gothenburg: Nordicom.
- Hartley, J. (1999) *Uses of Television*. London: Routledge.
- Hayek, F.A. (1960) *The Constitution of Liberty*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Hayek, F.A. (1994) *The Road to Serfdom*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Jacka, E. (2003) "'Democracy as Defeat'. The Importance of Arguments for Public Service Broadcasting', *Television & New Media* 4(2): 177-191.
- Jakubowicz, K. (2007) 'Public Service Broadcasting in the 21st Century. What Chance for a new Beginning?', in Lowe, G.F. and Bardeol, J. (eds.) *From Public Service Broadcasting to Public Service Media*. Gothenburg, Nordicom.
- Jakubowicz, K. (2008) 'Hold fast i kerne, og lav så om på (næsten) alt det andet! Redefinering av public service broadcasting for det 21. århundrede', in Mortensen, F. (ed.) *Public service i netværkssamfundet*. Fredriksberg: Forlaget samfundslitteratur.
- Kant, I. (1975[1784]) 'Beantwortung der Frage: Was ist Aufklärung?', in Zehbe, J. (ed.) *Was ist Aufklärung? Aufsätze zur Geschichte und Philosophie*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Keane, J. (1995) 'Structural Transformations of the Public Sphere', *The Communication Review*, 1(1), 1-22.
- Kvale, S., and Brinkmann, S. (2009) *Interviews. Learning the Craft of Qualitative Interviewing*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.
- Laclau, E. and Mouffe, C. (1985) *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy. Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. London: Verso.
- Lamont, M. and Thévenot, L. (2000) *Rethinking Comparative Cultural Sociology: Repertoires of Evaluation in France and the United States*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Larsen, H. (2008) 'I demokratiets tjeneste. Offentlig debatt om allmennkringkasting i Norge og Sverige', *Tidsskrift for samfunnsforskning* 49(3): 313-342.
- Larsen, H. (2010) 'Legitimation Strategies of Public Service Broadcasters: The Divergent Rhetoric in Norway and Sweden', *Media, Culture and Society* 32(2): 267-283.
- Larsen, H. (2011)a 'Public Service Broadcasting as an Object for Cultural Policy in Norway and Sweden. A Policy Tool and an End in Itself', *Nordicom Review* 32(2): 35-47.
- Larsen, H. (2011)b *Legitimering av allmennkringkasting i Norge og Sverige*. Thesis (PhD). University of Oslo: Department of Sociology and Human Geography.
- LOV-1992-12-04-127 Lov om kringkasting. Kultur- og kirke departementet.
- LOV-1997-06-13-44 Lov om aksjeselskaper. Justis- og politidepartementet.

- Lowe, G.F. and Hujanen, T. (eds.) (2003) *Broadcasting and Convergence: New Articulations of the Public Service Remit*. Gothenburg: Nordicom.
- Lowe, G.F. and Jauert, P. (eds.) (2005) *Cultural Dilemmas in Public Service Broadcasting*. Gothenburg: Nordicom.
- Lowe, G.F. and Bardoel, J. (eds.) (2007) *From Public Service Broadcasting to Public Service Media*. Gothenburg: Nordicom.
- Lowe, G.F. and Steemers, J. (eds.) (2011) *Regaining the Initiative for Public Service Media*. Gothenburg: Nordicom.
- Lund, A.B., Nord, L. and Roppen, J. (2009) *Nye utfordringer for gamle medier. Skandinavisk public service i det 21. århundrede*. Gothenburg: Nordicom.
- Lyotard, J.-F. (1984) *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Mendelssohn, M. (1997 [1784]) 'On the Question: What Does 'to Enlighten' Mean?', in Dahlstrom, D.O. (ed.) *Moses Mendelssohn. Philosophical Writings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Moe, H. (2011) 'Defining Public Service Beyond Broadcasting: The Legitimacy of Different Approaches', *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 17(1): 52-68.
- Moe, H. and Syvertsen, T. (2007) 'Media Institutions as a Research Field: Three Phases of Norwegian Broadcasting Research' *Nordicom Review*, Jubilee Issue: 149-167.
- Mouffe, C. (1993) *The Return of the Political*. London: Verso.
- Murdoch, G. (2005) 'Building the Digital Commons. Public Broadcasting in the Age of the Internet', in Lowe, G.F. and Jauert, P. (eds.) *Cultural Dilemmas in Public Service Broadcasting*. Gothenburg: Nordicom.
- Nozick, R. (1974) *Anarchy, State and Utopia*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- NRK (2012) NRK 2012-2017. Oslo: NRK. <http://www.nrk.no/informasjon/1.7802563>
- Ot.prop. nr. 53 (1987-1988) Lov om kabelsendinger. Kultur- og vitskapsdepartementet.
- Przeworski, A. and Theune, H. (1970) *The Logic of Comparative Social Inquiry*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
- Regeringens proposition 2005/06:112 *Viktigare än någonsin! Radio och TV i allmänhetens tjänst 2007-2012*.
- Rolland, A. (2010) 'Allmennkringkasting til allmenn forvirring. Begrepsanalyse ved inngangen til det digitale bakkenettet', *Nordicom Information*, 32(1): 75-91.
- Sejersted, F. (2005) *Sosialdemokratiets tidsalder. Norge og Sverige I det 20. århundre*. Oslo: Pax Forlag A/S.
- Scannell, P. (1989) 'Public Service Broadcasting and Modern Public Life', *Media, Culture & Society*, 11(2): 135-66.
- SFS (1991: 1469) Ytransdefrihetsgrunden.
- SFS (1996: 844) Radio- og TV-lag. Kulturdepartementet.
- St.meld.nr.6 (2007-2008) NRK-plakaten 'Noe for alle. Alltid'. Det kongelege kultur- og kyrkjedepartement.
- Syvertsen, T. (1990) 'Kringkasting i 1990-åra: Hvem er mest 'public service'?', in Carlsson, U. (Ed.) *Medier Människor Samhälle*. Gothenburg: Nordicom.
- Syvertsen, T. (1999) 'Hva kan 'public service' brukes til?', in Carlsson, U. (Ed.) *Public Service-TV*. Gothenburg: Nordicom.
- Søndergaard, H. (1999) 'Some Reflections on Public Service Broadcasting', *Nordicom Review*, 1: 21-28.