

Public service and the need for innovation through a collaborative approach

Public service broadcasting seems to always be under pressure. Two provocative changes for public service broadcasting have been the introduction of commercial competition and the transition from analogue to digital technology. Upheaval of the monopoly and the coming of commercial broadcasters were followed by the discussion concerning whether public service was adapting to commercial strategies, with the critique against commercialization but also against a static public service. With digital technology the whole issue of a new media environment arose, where the form of public service is discussed but where broadcasting, and especially public service television, seriously is questioned whether it should be one of the survivors in a digital future.

The new media environment therefore has a certain built-in challenge. This time the challenge is to innovate, in the sense of reinventing the public service-remit in an unknown field: to think moving images instead of “TV”. This is a very special time in history for television, where it is questioned as an important media, in the context of being a “dinosaur” that is soon going to be extinct. The challenge is to rethink how public service can be relevant in a digital society, based on how it is possible to act in the public interest. To apply public service values in a new media environment means rethinking television, scheduling, programme-making, genre, audience, journalism, financial model, and so on and so forth.

Earlier challenges have been met within the public service companies re-organising, by changing to digital technology and by educating new leaders. The surrounding environment has been something “outside” the company; something that one has related to in strategic analyses of “what the others do”. This I mean has a lot to do with the independence criterion that has been extremely important for public service, something to claim in relation to especially government, but also in relation to everybody and everything except the audience (or the public). Public service dependence has been seen as an ugly word.

There are many reasons for the lack of collaboration in public service. The independence criterion is the main reason. With this as a guideline, collaboration per se becomes dependence

and does not allow any cooperation. To protect one's ideas is another reason. To be unique and alone with a story – the scoop – is important. It is also about the authority to find a story and to make it understandable to the audience. Here we see traditional journalistic principles as the foundation to the independence criteria.

My view is that this misperception of public service in relation to society has delayed the strategy which is now possible to discern in Swedish public service television: to act in cooperation, collaboration with society. In this paper I will deal with this awakening interest of collaboration with universities.

I claim that the new collaborative approach needs to be seen in the following context. Public service broadcasting in Sweden is to be more cost efficient; to make money work in a more efficient way. Collaboration seems to come naturally from downsizing the organization, and more outsourcing will bring along synergy effects. The outsourcing argument is about being able to use the things you need but only when you need it, i.e. not own everything and thereby being able to use things more efficiently. The synergy effect argument is about the value of interaction, cooperation that creates an enhanced combined effect. Put this in the context of the network society, creative economy/creative industries and in the context of the theory of “triple-helix” – then the public service collaborative approach makes sense.

In the network society, as told by Manuel Castells, organizations – hierarchical organizations (dinosaurs) – have to adapt to the new reality of a network world. Value in a network society comes from interrelationships. Networking logic substantially modifies the operation and outcomes in the processes of production, experience, power and culture. It becomes vital to be present in a network and not to be excluded from it.

Collaboration in creative economy/creative industries is about how to create economic growth in taking individual creativity, skill and talent and link it to more industrial actors/dimensions. In creative economy, creativity in an industrial context is seen as a source of power for job creation and growth. An important success factor is partnerships between creative businesses.

The collaborative approach for Swedish Television started with collaboration with Universities. The logic of collaborating with higher education should be seen in the light of the public service value of education and the triple-helix model.

The triple-helix model describes collaboration between certain agents – university-industry-government – and it is increasingly revolving around innovation. The increased importance of knowledge and the role of the university in incubation of technology-based firms has given it a more prominent place in the institutional firmament. The entrepreneurial university takes a proactive stance in putting knowledge to use and in broadening the input into the creation of academic knowledge. Thus it operates according to an interactive rather than a linear model of innovation. As firms raise their technological level, they move closer to an academic model, engaging in higher levels of training and in sharing of knowledge. Government acts as a public entrepreneur and venture capitalist in addition to its traditional regulatory role in setting the rules of the game. Moving beyond product development, innovation then becomes an endogenous process of “taking the role of the other”, encouraging hybridization among the institutional spheres (Etzkowitz, 2003).

Public service and the need for innovation through a collaborative approach appear as a certain strategic collaboration where the dimension of economic efficiency exists side by side with a creative innovative hope.

Public service and the decision to collaborate with universities

Why then choose to collaborate with universities? The answer goes back to the enlightenment ideal in public service, where emancipation through education is important. Public service is supposed to provide access to information and knowledge through quality and diverse content.

In Sweden public service television has returned in different ways to education for the renewal of the enlightenment remit of public service broadcasting. The local programme producing unit of public service broadcasting company Swedish Television South (Sveriges Television Syd) has turned heavily to universities contact in southern Sweden for innovation: to both Malmö University and Lund University. This is in line with Swedish Television’s new strategy for collaboration with society. The collaborative approach has taken many different expressions.

Cooperation between Malmö University, through the School of Arts and Communication (K3) and Swedish Television South started formally January 11th 2006, with a half day seminar at K3. Here K3 and Swedish Television South presented their competences and ideas on collaboration.

At the meeting different groupings were created. But collaboration preceded this meeting, which will be obvious in the next section. Other important aspects on different types of collaboration and further collaboration will also be part of the next section.

Studying from within with Critical and Cultural Theory

I have more or less actively participated in several different projects marked by collaboration between higher education and public service broadcasting companies. I can therefore be said to be a part of the field I am studying. Bourdieu states that the one that studies her own world should make the well known exotic (Bourdieu, 1996).

In studying my own world I am also participating in practical projects connecting to, so to say, 'another world'. The tradition here is to confess oneself to the field of Participatory Action Research (see for example Fals-Borda and Rahman, 1991; Reason and Bradbury, 2001; Sohng, 1996; Whyte, 1991). In this field research has the goal of promoting social change.

Conventionally this is done through developing relationships with communities and working closely with them to address complex problems. The research method is to involve members from the affected communities in all stages of research including research design, implementation, analysis, and dissemination of findings.

Participatory Observation with its roots in anthropology lies closer to my approach. A classic in the field is Whyte's *Street Corner Society* from 1943 (see Whyte, 1993). As a participant that also observes I am physically present in the field as researcher. My goal as being an insider is that it offers a distinct advantage in terms of accessing and understanding the culture, giving a deeper understanding of public service and its collaborative approach directed towards universities. As Labaree (2002) shows, the assumption that insidership provides greater access can be true, but only to a degree. This is something that will be discussed in the cases presented below as illustrations of collaboration.

In a way one could say that my goal is two-fold. Like Participatory Action Research, with this paper I aim to promote social change through discussing and analyzing experiences from public service television turning to collaboration with higher education. But like Participatory Observation, I do not include the people that are involved in collaboration with universities in the research process. My applied participatory approach is more that of insidership in

Participatory Observation, where the goal is to reach deeper understanding of collaboration between public service companies and Universities with greater access to this collaboration.

Making meaning from the material needs more than a naïve perception of insidership as the key to understanding. What is needed is a certain lens, in this paper in form of trying to answer: How is collaboration between public service and higher education constructed? How do public service discourses and policies, and the social context as a whole produce the phenomena of “public service innovation”?

These issues reflect approaches in both critical and cultural theory. By relating knowledge to society, Critical Theory accentuates not only the social but also the political character of rationality, thus honoring the original Marxist foundations of the Frankfurt School. In this lies the critique of the Enlightenment and of instrumental reason. In instrumental reason, Horkheimer and Adorno claim that reason is deprived of its critical possibilities. It is then reduced to technological rationality aiming for prediction, precision and production and its subordination to industry. With instrumental reason there comes a suprasocial, utilitarian kind of knowledge used by a subject emptied of her/ his self-consciousness and also, as Habermas points out, of self-reflection. Is this the case in the constructed collaboration between public service and higher education?

Critical Theory does not deal with the individual or the collective as isolated units, but focuses instead on the interactions between individuals and groups. For Horkheimer, as well as for Habermas, the main element of the social process is still rationality and the goal is emancipation. In this paper it becomes vital to ask: does innovation from this collaborative approach promote and or include emancipation?

The triple-helix model can helpfully be analyzed through Gramsci's concept of hegemony. He claims that hegemony is not necessarily brought about by the state alone but through the ‘balance between political society and civil society’, that is, with the help of organizations such as schools (Gramsci, 1975: 204). How can Universities be understood as a hegemonic force in the context of collaboration with public service companies?

The interdisciplinary area of Cultural Studies alerts us the fact that “innovation” is constructed in and through cultural representations. Critical cultural studies makes visible how representations

construct a culture's normative views and how these representations are appropriated to produce subjectivities, identities, and practices. It is concerned with the conceptual questions surrounding the nature of politics and the operation of power, and the possibilities for resistance within a media dominated society.

This presented analytic framework for understanding collaboration between public service companies and Universities means following up on an important aspect for both public service and higher education activities, namely that of consequences. I argue that concrete implications of the studied collaborative approach mean discussing these consequences, and that key issues here are power and resistance. In this context, what happens with universities and with Public Service?

Presented below are illustrations of collaboration dealing with the construction of collaboration.

Illustrations of Collaboration

The collaborative cases involved in this paper are all those that I have come in contact with during my work at K3, since July 2004. As you will see there are many different forms of collaboration between Swedish Television South and universities.

One form of collaboration is conferences. These may differ in both extent and purpose.

One conference is called Moving Images, which started in 2005 as a collaboration between Swedish Television (central, not only regional), Malmö university and Media Mötesplats Malmö. The actor Media Mötesplats Malmö started 2005 as a project financed by the Knowledge Foundation, Malmö City and Region Skåne.

The Knowledge Foundation acts to enhance Sweden's competitiveness by supporting: research at new universities and university colleges; competence development in industry; the promotion of IT in schools, education and health care; the restructuring of industrial research institutes. An important growth area that has been identified is Experience Industries, also called Creative Industries. Eight so called Mötesplatser (meeting places) have been established throughout Sweden. Mötesplatsen should be a node for knowledge exchange and competence development

where at least two businesses meet and develop collaboration between University, trade and industry and local/regional government.

Malmö City is local government and Region Skåne is regional government for the south of Sweden. Both act to develop and coordinate trade and industry in the region. Moving Images therefore seemed as an important event to support. The regional aspect was also important for Swedish Television, where support to Swedish Television South would strengthen the argument that Swedish Television is acting to mirror conditions in the whole country. It may also be described as a way to neutralize the ongoing internal critique of a Swedish Television being a mainly Stockholm-centred organization.

Another interesting reason for Swedish Television's involvement is that the conference could show that the organization can do something good from the government effort on different themes for different years. 2005 it was "The Design Year". 2006 it is "The Multiculture Year". This kind of theme year is arranged by the government, which obligates authorities, institutions and companies within The Ministry of Education, Research and Culture (where public service broadcasting companies are included) to work with the themes. The programme director Leif Jakobsson introduced the conference Moving Images 2005, stating that the background to the event was that it was The Design Year, and that even though TV influences people there is seldom attention placed on how TV influences with its visual expressions. And 2006 Jakobsson explained that Moving Images took place again because of the good response from the year before, and that in "The Multicultural Year", it was important to reflect on television as a cultural force. But the theme for 2006 was not multicultural. It was not even near it. Instead the theme was mobility and design practices. Still it is interesting to note that Jakobsson wanted to link the conference to government efforts.

Jakobsson concluded his introductory speech by stating that Moving Images should happen also next year. But Sweden got a new government this September, and Swedish Television will from November get a new director general. With a new conservative government the year themes will probably stop. And the new director general has been very critical of Jakobsson's hunt for young viewers. Personal involvement and political strategies can therefore mean that it next year will be no Moving Images.

My involvement in Moving Images 2005 was as a spectator. 2006 my role was a day devoted to the future of media production” (see below) I was responsible for the students making a conference documentation film using mobile phones. I also participated in the conference as part of the concluding debate. The mobile phone test was a suggestion from K3:s member in the conference committee.

Another conference collaboration is The Media Day in Malmö (Mediedagen). It was arranged February 2nd 2006 by Swedish Radio Malmö, Swedish Television South and Malmö university (through K3). It was a day devoted to the future of media productions. The reason for organizing the day was that both Swedish Radio Malmö and Swedish Television South are in an outsourcing phase, with more and more plans to make programs on contract. According to the invitation ”This day can contribute to a more functioning and viable media business in Malmö and the Öresund Region” (author’s translation). The goal is to make one area in Malmö, The Western Harbour, to the region’s new media centre (see for example Malmö university news letter: http://www.mah.se/templates/ExternalNews_34382.aspx).

While Moving Images was centrally established within Swedish Television, but took place in Malmö with all the regional hopes that comes with that – The Media Day was a regional project where the goal was to get media business people to hop aboard the hope of ”development possibilities in The Western Harbour”. The day was themed around the staging of a region and a certain place as a creative centre, where the closeness exists between university and trade and industry – with support from local and regional government. Representations from Malmö City and Region Skåne were speakers during the day. The Media Day started with the head of Swedish Television South talking about excitement, nervousness and many hopes because of a place ”where we need each other” (author’s translation). The Head of Department at K3 talked about creating a meeting place and the search to be “more active in reality” (author’s translation). I was attending The Media Day as spectator, like the media professionals. I also participated in a workshop during the day, where we all got to discuss issues, problems, possibilities in small groups. My group included the Head of Swedish Television South.

Collaboration has also come around in different forms. New Millenium, New Media (NM2) is a collaborative research project which addresses the future of media productions. 13 partners from 8 European countries are involved in the project in different roles, developing new media genres using all of the facilities of modern broadband communication and interactive terminals. K3 is

responsible for developing MyNews and SportMyWay. It is a digital, interactive archive that, using the nm2 system and a graphical interface, makes it possible for engagers via broadband to discover, select and recombine news and sports items and stories according to their individual tastes (<http://www.ist-nm2.org/>). The project has been introduced to Swedish Television, both in Stockholm and in Malmö. Nationally and regionally Swedish Television is interested in participating in applying the system in real life. But it seems like Swedish Television South in Malmö will be more of a driving force in the collaboration than Stockholm. It seems clear that the reason is to strengthen itself in the competition with other regions: that Malmö is the place for new development. I have had an advising role in the project.

There also exists collaborations in education in the co-developing of the course Experimental TV-production. During the meeting January 11th I was appointed as convener of the group on development of the new course "Experimental TV-production": The group consisted of two people from Swedish Television South: head of image respectively head of content staff. They were involved and attended every meeting. The ones from K3 quickly disappeared. Two senior lecturers in literature science felt it was to periphery to their activity: not able to do it just for fun, had to be some use of it, and they couldn't see it. The head of the department did not either show. But one K3 member showed much interest. He is a professor in Interaction design. Not unimportant, he was the K3 member in the Moving Images committee. He has a lot of experience collaborating with Swedish Television, and what it can give. One experience from the development was that Swedish Television very much wanted to be knowledge-providers. At K3 we saw possibilities to get students to the course. One student attending the course today is from Swedish Television South. One lecturer from Swedish Television South has been invited and there has been a study trip to Swedish Television South.

Another collaboration project is developing an interactive children's show. It started as a way of finding programme suggestions for children from Swedish Television South during the meeting January 11th. The organization wanted to collaborate with the university in order to get a solid scientific ground, where the university could assist with research and new approaches to TV production. I applied and was contacted by the helper in the project. He was the one I met three times, not the idea maker and decision-maker, who was the head of children and youth. One reason for this is probably the fact that he lived in Stockholm and was only sporadically in Malmö, where his post was. The project was not very prioritized, it was going to be pitched and eventually produced. Everybody had a lot to do, and the only time the decision-maker could be

present, the meeting had to be cancelled because no one from Malmö university, except me, could attend. I therefore sent a report on research on play and learning. The decision-maker was thrilled, and said "This is exactly what I want!" (author's translation from email. After this I have not been contacted by neither helper nor decision-maker. I suppose that I have fulfilled my role to assist with scientific knowledge. Maybe it is also so that they do not want me get more insight in the progress, because of the fact that I told them that I am was writing this article. Interestingly enough, collaboration in developing children's programming may continue. This time it is initiated by a teacher and researcher at K3 that is trying to create a collaboration around play and learning between K3, the teacher training department at Malmö university, a toy company (that just moved to Western Harbour) and Swedish Television.

These illustrations of collaborations between PSB and universities all involve Malmö university and K3. but Swedish Television South has also started up collaborations with another university, just 20 kilometres away: Lund University. The collaborative approach here is different than in relation to Malmö university. While Swedish Television South at Malmö university arranged The Media Day with a production perspective, the collaboration with Lund University started with what is called "The Public Service Academy" (Public service-akademin). The first time this was arranged was March 22nd 2006 at Lund University. The goal was to create a forum where issues on democracy and media could be discussed from a publicist and researcher perspective (see Swedish press release <http://www.lu.se/o.o.i.s/4393>). The principal of Lund University introduced the day with stating that the collaboration was founded on the belief that big actors should be able to stimulate each other, and that what unites them is the belief is critical analysis. The head of Swedish Television South continued with that it was good to make new contacts to be stronger in the challenging competition, and that one wanted answers on how to reach young viewers and that one wanted new co-workers. I attended both events. It is obvious that the Swedish Television's view on Malmö university is that it is suited to create a meeting place for creativity and innovation. Lund University on the other hand is supposed to stand for the handing over of knowledge (and new co-workers).

There are also examples of collaborations where Swedish Television South is invited to the plan for Future Technologies, arranged by Media Mötesplats Malmö is collaborating with Malmö university and a company consortium of about 200 companies are involved (including Swedish Television South). The plan is in the process of finding funding. I am one of the many researchers hoping on to become involved in interesting projects in the future.

Swedish Television South was also invited to the event Film for Future Technologies, arranged by Media Mötesplats Malmö and Diginet Øresund, its “Sweden in collaboration with Denmark” correspondence in developing the experience industry in the Øresund Region. The event was a seminar focussed on bringing together agents in film and new technology in the Øresund Region. During the seminar the head of Swedish Television South was invited to speak about future plans. I attended the seminar and was surprised of how it was staged to be a meeting place, and not a forum. There was no discussion, only presentations on visions – more or less characterized by the speakers’ wishful thinkings of their own role in the future.

All in all the collaborative approach exists in different forms, and definitely in different forms of involvement. What is apparent is a strong mutual force trying to build a strong region for media development, where Swedish Television South is important and willing to support this. The question of what kinds of innovation that this brings along remains. Issues of emancipation, operations of power, and the possibilities for resistance within a media dominated society are also crucial. This I will discuss in the following sections on what happens with universities, public service and innovation.

What happens with universities?

Collaboration between public service and higher education seems to be constructed mainly through traditional knowledge exchange forums: conferences. This is marked by a rationality aiming for prediction, precision and production. The question is if this is a sign of subordination to industry? Conferences for the scientific community are also aiming for prediction and precision, what differs is focus on the production aspect. Here it is possible to claim that universities are used as legitimating a certain form of knowledge and knowing.

This can be seen negatively, that with the global knowledge economy and related national innovation policies the university as an institution is losing its traditional characteristics (Etzkowitz et al., 2000; Gibbons et al., 1994; Marginson and Considine, 2000; Slaughter and Leslie, 1997). The new collaborative approach of universities can be interpreted as a turn to higher education as the market adapting university, what Blackmore and Sachs (2001) call the intrusion of an academic capitalism. This means that the link makes education useful, packaged, and saleable at the market. Consumer friendliness becomes crucial. This view is also called New Public Management, where universities are marketing client services that have production, not

learning, in the centre (Prichard, 2000). Lyotard (1984) announces the end of the university along with the end of the nation-state, where knowledge has lost its emancipatory role.

It can also be understood more positively in the emergence of the so-called entrepreneurial university (Etzkowitz, 2003a, 2003b; Marginson & Considine, 2000; Smilor et al., 1993). The School of Arts and Communication at Malmö University is marked by what Michael Gibbons in *The New Production of Knowledge* calls »mode 2« within western society knowledge production. In »mode 1«, problems are solved and formulated within the academic sphere and its social context. In »mode 2« problems are formulated and solved in applied contexts. A consequence is a higher degree of not only interdisciplinarity and heterogeneity in a research environment, but also new alliances and contracts between trade and industry and the research community, and between the new research environments and the society at whole. The transitions and borders between »mode 1« and »mode 2« are floating – and can be negative in causing controversies concerning how research work should be conducted, organized, inspected and valued (Gibbons 1994).

Are universities then a hegemonic force in the context of collaboration with public service companies, or does this collaboration bring the possibility for universities to establish new intellectual spaces marked by interdisciplinarity and heterogeneity?

According to Feldman (2001) economically weaker groups can exploit higher learning centres as a basis for accumulating power. So let us say that public service is an economically weaker group that uses collaboration with universities for accumulating power. Then we need to discuss how this power is used. If public service is strengthened in this collaboration without universities being forced to have production, not learning and research, in the centre – then it seems like universities and public service is making a common cause where “the knowledge” is used for “good purposes”.

As a principle it sounds fine. In practice what we can see in the illustrative cases above is that in order to build a strong region for media development, a production focus is necessary for Malmö University. For Lund University it is possible to act more learning and research, in the centre. But with Lund’s more “independent” role it misses out on the interdisciplinarity and the heterogeneity that comes from the production perspective. The key here is that Malmö University not only collaborates for conferences with Swedish Television, like Lund University

does. In Malmö the production perspective, which problems that exist and how they are solved and formulated, lies within the academic sphere where collaboration means more input – not the search for making education saleable at the market. For Malmö the innovativeness comes from openness to the production perspective, but not being subordinated to it. Being the entrepreneurial university does not mean taking a proactive stance in knowledge-making, not only putting knowledge to use. This is what Etzkowitz (2003) mean in moving beyond product development, where innovation becomes an endogenous process of “taking the role of the other”.

What happens with public service?

In this section I could make a list of success factors for the innovation strategy of collaboration where the renewal of the enlightenment remit of PSB, can be discerned. But this would be devoting to a form of academic capitalism, aiming at descriptive knowledge or at success-oriented expression or intervention. Therefore I will discuss the general value for public service to collaborate and the link to innovation.

The collaborative road that public service has taken is linked to innovation. As Morgan (1997) has pointed out, during the last two decades, innovation is to be understood “in the broad sense to include product, process and organizational innovation in the firm as well as social and institutional innovation at the level of an industry, region and nation” (Morgan, 1997:492). Being a strong force for making The Western Harbour in Malmö a media centre, Swedish Television is making a statement for collaboration and innovation. This shows what Storper and Scott (1995) argue that other aspects are assuming increasing significance in the production of knowledge for innovation. These are aspects such as the informal contacts and the flows of tacit knowledge. The innovation process is a constructed through a continuous and interactive learning course (Lawson and Lorenz, 1999). Supporting The Western Harbour is in this sense supporting an innovation dynamic which “is a localised, and not a placeless process” (Asheim and Isaksen, 1997:299).

In collaboration with universities, Swedish Television can maybe move closer to an academic model, engaging in higher levels of training and in sharing of knowledge. This might be a process moving beyond product development, where innovation becomes an endogenous process of “taking the role of the other”, encouraging hybridization (Etzkowitz, 2003).

There is one aspect that I deliberately have neglected to discuss, and that is: What kind of innovation are we talking about? I have chosen to almost entirely disregard the issue so far because I mean that it is linked to the question if public service search for innovation through a collaborative approach should be measured.

Do we need another search for more precisely defined goals and performance indicators? Bardoel (2003), Born (2003) and Jakubowitz (2003) warn that too much focus on accountability creates less attention to PSB democratic and cultural remit. But this does not hinder the fact that PSB is forced to prove and justify itself in relation to its competitors and critics. What I mean we should do is that collaboration and innovation are two important aspects in PSB that really could strengthen it in the future. This implies the possibility of really rethinking the public service remit as something “new”.

Several researchers call for a newness in public service. Ala-Fossi (2005) warns PSB of losing its identity and competitive edge, if only reacting and following others. Bardoel, D’Haenens and Peeters (2005) claims that:

Public service broadcasting must also be a driving force, one which creates space for the experimental and a quality of programming the entertainment industry is not inclined to offer. Such experiments should not be too unusual in order not to scare viewers away: public service broadcasting is at its best when it manages to ‘push the envelope’ while meeting well-targeted viewer expectations. (Bardoel, D’Haenens and Peeters, 2005:59)

Ytreberg (2002) discern the ideal type Avant-Garde in public service television. Here there exist an element of experimentation and innovation and with its often provocative approach “provide a supplementary basis of legitimacy to that of mainstream public service programming” (Ytreberg, 2002:770-771), and resonate with the notions of PSBs critical and reforming function.

The question still remains on what kind of newness in public service that comes from innovation through collaboration? The newness in public service wanted from researchers seldom reaches more concrete levels than Ytreberg’s “provocative approach”. I would here like to add that my claim is that PSB should be innovative in all its dimensions: social cohesion, forum, impartial and independent information, programmes for all, pluralism in ideas aimed at mutual understanding

and so on. And this is especially important in a time where viewer expectations are changing because of changing media habits. In this context finding new ways is crucial, for example to be able to reflect contemporary society, and to act from the insight that television is not only television. This implies a lot of things. Technologically moving images will be distributed and also created differently. Journalistic ideals need to be in tune with participatory culture.

What we need is an independence criterion that allows public service to collaborate. There is also a compelling need to discuss and further deepen the understanding of the phenomena of “public service innovation”. Here innovation theory can not follow the enlightenment philosophy of a combination of empiricism and rationalism. There is a problem if innovation in the context of “the enlightenment and the public service remit” is built on reason as the overarching quality. The search for innovation will then be in nature of the enlightened type of rationality. Notions such as experiment, method, measurement, demonstration and evidence which have been linked with the idea of a systematic, quantitative and objective type of knowledge will then play an important role in the conception of what collaboration with higher education can bring. Therefore the ongoing search should be marked by a critical cultural awareness to what collaboration actually means in relation to consequences of independence and the relation synergy effects. Critical reflection is an important tool for demystifying triple-helix and its consequences both for universities and for the public service remit.

References

- Ala-Fossi, M (2005) Culture and quality in broadcast media. Ferrell Lowe and Jauert (ed) *Cultural dilemmas in public service broadcasting*. Nordicom: Göteborg university, Göteborg.
- Asheim, BT and Isaksen, A (1997) ‘Location, Agglomeration and Innovation: Towards Regional Innovation Systems in Norway?’, *European Planning Studies* 5 (3): 299–330.
- Bardoel J (2003) Back to the public? Assessing public broadcasting in the Netherlands, *Javnost/The Public* 10(3), pp81-95.
- Blackmore, J and Sachs, J. (2001). Women Leaders in the Restructured University. Kapitel I Brooks, A. & Mackinnon, A. (red). *Gender and the Restructured University. Changing Management and Culture in Higher Education*. Buckingham: SRHE & Open University Press.
- Born (2003) From reithian ethic to managerial discourse. Accountability and audit at the BBC., *Javnost/The Public* 10(3), pp 63-80.
- Bourdieu, P. (1996). Homo Academicus. Stockholm: Symposion.

- Etzkowitz, H (2003a) 'Innovation in Innovation: the Triple Helix of University–Industry–Government Relations', *Social Science Information* 42(3): 293–337.
- Etzkowitz, H (2003b) 'Research Groups as "Quasi-firms": the Invention of the Entrepreneurial University', *Research Policy* 32(1): 109–21.
- Etzkowitz, H, Webster A, Gebhardt C and Cantisano Terra BR (2000) 'The Future of the University and the University of the Future: Evolution of Ivory Tower to Entrepreneurial Paradigm', *Research Policy* 29(2): 313–30.
- Fals-Borda, O and Rahman, MA (eds) (1991) *Action and knowledge: Breaking the monopoly with participatory action research*. New York: Intermediate Technology/ Apex.
- Feldman, JM (2001) Towards the Post-University: centres of higher learning and creative spaces as economic development and social change agents. In *Economic and Industrial Democracy*, Sage: London, vol 22 (1).
- Gibbons, M, Limoges C, Nowotny H, Schwartzman S, Scott P and Trow M, (1994) *The New Production of Knowledge: The Dynamics of Science and Research in Contemporary Societies*. London: Sage Publications.
- Jakubowitz (2003) Endgame? Contracts, audits and the future of public service broadcasting. *Javnost/The Public* 10(3), pp 45–61.
- Labaree, RV (2002) 'The risk of 'going observationalist': negotiating the hidden dilemmas of being an insider participant observer. In *Qualitative Research*, Apr 2002; 2: 97 - 122.
- Lawson, C and Lorenz, E (1999) 'Collective Learning, Tacit Knowledge and Regional Innovative Capacity', *Regional Studies* 33 (4): 305–17.
- Liotard, J-F (1984) *The postmodern condition: a report on knowledge*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Marginson, S and Considine M (2000) *The Enterprise University: Power, Governance and Reinvention in Australia* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Maskell, P and Malmberg, A (1999) 'The Competitiveness of Firms and Regions: "Ubiquitification" and the Importance of Localized Learning', *European Urban and Regional Studies* 6 (1): 9–25.
- Morgan, K. (1997) 'The Learning Region: Institutions, Innovation and Regional Renewal', *Regional Studies* 31 (5): 491–503.
- Prichard, C (2000). *Making Managers in Universities and Colleges*. Buckingham: SRHE & Open University Press.
- Putnam, RD (1993) 'The Prosperous Community – Social Capital and Public Life', *The American Prospect* 13: 35–42.

- Reason, P and Bradbury, H (2001) *Handbook of action research: Participative inquiry and practice*. London: Sage.
- Slaughter, S and Leslie LL (1997) *Academic Capitalism: Politics, Policies, and the Entrepreneurial University* Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Smilor, RW., Dietrich GB and Gibson DV (1993) 'The Entrepreneurial University: The Role of Higher Education in Technology Commercialization and Economic Development', *International Social Science Journal* 45(135): 1–11.
- Sohng, S. S. L. (1996). Participatory research and community organizing. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare*, 23(4), 77-97.
- Storper and Scott, 1995 Storper, M. and Scott, A.J. (1995) 'The Wealth of Regions: Market Forces and Policy Imperatives in Local and Global Context', *Futures* 27 (5): 505–26.
- Whyte, WF (1993) [1943] *Street Corner Society: The Social Structure of an Italian Slum*. Chicago : Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Whyte,W (ed) (1991) *Participatory action research* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Ytreberg, E (2002) Ideal types in public service television: paternalists and bureaucrats, charismatics and avant-gardists. In *Media, Culture & Society*, Sage publications: London, vol 24: 759-774.