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Introduction

According to the Swedish Media Council, TV is still, in 2013, the medium that most children and young people use on an everyday basis in Sweden.1 Already from the start, the Swedish broadcasting media landscape for children has been dominated by public service broadcasting, and the Swedish television broadcasting company (SVT) has aired TV programming for children since 1956 (Rydin, 2000). The company’s position in relation to the child audience is still strong even though the market for television has changed greatly over its good fifty years of transmissions, and SVT reaches more Swedish children than any other TV company also at present (Rydin, 2000; AR, SVT, 2012; MMS, 2012).

In the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC), the media are put forward as an important source of information for children (Barnombudsmannen, 1999; Government Official Report 2001:84). It is therefore important to study the role the media play in children’s everyday lives. Additionally, the TV licence fee, as well as morning paper and phone access, is explicitly included in the national standard for income support, and the presence of a child in a household may also entitle parents to funds for purchasing a TV set (The National Board of Health and Welfare (Socialstyrelsen), 20122). TV is thereby put forward as one of the minimum recreation and information resources one needs to live in Sweden, especially if one is a child. The idea that the TV licence fee should be included in what is regarded to be a reasonable living standard is not new; this has been the case since 1979 (Government Bill, 1979/80:1). In this way, public service TV has been important in the everyday life of Swedish children for quite some time.

---

1 Swedish Media Council’s website (Statens medieråd)
http://www.statensmedierad.se/Kunskap/Tv/, retrieved 130420. This statement is also backed up by reports on young children’s (2- to 9-year-olds), children’s (9- to 12-year-olds) and young people’s (9- to 16-year-olds) usage of different media in Sweden. Medierådet, Ungar och medier, 2008; Småungar och medier, 2010; Ungar och medier, 2010; cf. Findahl, 2012.

2 The National Board of Health and Welfare’s website (Socialstyrelsens hemsida)
However, this is not the full picture. A search for ‘children and TV’ on Google gives almost 1.7 billion hits.\(^3\) Of the ten hits presented on the first page, one is for a public service TV website presenting TV programming for children, one is for an informational site on children’s programming, and yet another presents TV as being good for children. The rest of the hits express concerns about children’s TV viewing habits and its health consequences. A search in Swedish for ‘barn och TV’ (children and TV) gives a similar result in term of topics,\(^4\) and several actors, such as paediatricians, official health sources and journalists, focus on TV as a potential risk for children. The search thereby gives a complex picture of how discourses on children and TV as a risky relation coexist with promotion and production of actual TV programming for children.

The relationship between children and TV in the societal debate can consequently be put forward in rather contradictory ways. Researchers focusing on children’s media culture have criticized the ways in which children and TV are discussed. For example, the child media researcher Máire Messenger Davies stated, already in 1989, that: “People often talk about ‘children and television’ without any clear definition of either children or television” (p.9). Also the child, media and education researchers David Buckingham, Hannah Davies, Ken Jones and Peter Kelley (1999) have addressed this debate, arguing for an initiated discussion about what is actually broadcast for children, rather than using presumptions about children’s TV programming to address differences in ideological views among adults.

These arguments still hold, and there are few studies today looking into what is really going on when it comes to TV and children (cf. Steemers, 2010). Aligning with Davies (1989) and Buckingham et al. (1999), I argue for studying the relationships between children and TV and doing so not only on a policy level, but also by looking into what is broadcast for children.

In a context of parallel discourses on TV as both something positive and something negative for children, certain questions arise: How do the Swedish public service TV company (SVT) and the Swedish educational broadcasting company (UR) handle these coexisting discourses on children and TV? What implications do they have for TV programming for children? What is a child TV audience? The purpose is to analyse strategies of articulation in public service broadcasting policy and of address in TV programmes for children in order to study notions of a child TV audience.

---

\(^3\) Approx. 1,690,000,000. The search was done 20130322.

\(^4\) However, not in number of hits. A Google search on “barn och TV” (Children and TV in Swedish) gave 165 million hits 20130322.
To accomplish this, three concepts must be mapped out to set the scene: public service, child perspective and TV for children. The concept of ‘public service’ has transformed over time. The way this has affected the notion of public service broadcasting and its audience, and how this relates to a child audience will be discussed below. The second concept, a child perspective, is then presented to set the focus on children. And thirdly, the concept of TV for children is established to define a broad approach to TV programming broadcast for a child audience.

Public service broadcasting

Public service broadcasting is a vast media arena and an equally large international research field (e.g., Debrett, 2010; Iosifidis, 2012; Lowe, 2010; Lowe & Bardoel, 2007). As public service broadcasting has dominated programming for children in a Swedish context, the national development of this kind of broadcasting also forms the foundation for the child audience. Broadcasting in Sweden, as well as in most of Western Europe, was built using the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) as a role model (Hadenius, 1998; Lindén, 2011; Nord & Grusell, 2012). Over the years, the differences between the two public service broadcasting systems have grown, and the Swedish system now has much more in common with public service broadcasting in the Nordic countries (Lindén, 2011). For example, the UK public service TV broadcasts started in the 1930s and commercial TV broadcasting in the mid-1950s, while Swedish public service TV had a monopoly on the terrestrial broadcasts from the start in 1956 until 1992 (cf. Björkegren, 2001; Buckingham et al., 1999; Hadenius, Weibull & Wadbring, 2011; Hadenius, 1998; Syvertsen, 1992). The other Nordic countries have largely experienced a transformation of their media markets similar to the Swedish one (Lund, Nord & Roppen, 2009). In other words, public service broadcasting moved from being a state monopoly to an actor on a commercialized TV market rather late, as compared to the BBC. This transformation has also had implications for public service TV for children.

Public service researchers have discussed how public service broadcasting has developed in the Scandinavian countries and argue that the concept of ‘public service’ has changed over time, in regard to the types of broadcast and perhaps foremost whom they service (e.g., Edin, 2000; Lindén, 2011; Nord & Grusell, 2012; Runic & Sandin, 2010; Syvertsen, 1990; Sondergaard, 1995). Trine Syvertsen (1990: 183-185) outlines three phases of development for the ‘public service concept’ in Norwegian broadcasting; the first concerns the public utility (or goods), the second in society’s service and the third in the service of the audi-
ence. The public service broadcasting researcher Anna Edin (2000) defines a similar Swedish transformation of the concept. She sees the notion of ‘public service’ at the start of Swedish radio in the 1920s as “the public goods” (Edin, 2000: 16). The radio waves were then viewed as a limited natural resource, and the service required – to be reached by broadcasts – was comparable to other public services such as the postal and telephone services (Edin, 2000; see also, e.g., Lindén, 2011; Nord & Grusell, 2012; Syvertsen, 1990; Søndergaard, 1995).

A second understanding of the concept appeared when the radio coverage became nationwide and the audience was seen as equivalent to all citizens. In this way, the radio medium worked “in society’s service” to educate and inform the public (Edin, 2000: 16-17; Lindén, 2011:39; see also Nord & Grusell, 2012; Søndergaard, 1995). The third phase of ‘public service’ “in the service of the audience”, stems from the dissolution of the broadcasting monopoly, according to Edin (2000: 17) and Syvertsen (1990: 184-185) (see also: Lindén, 2011; Nord & Grusell, 2012). This phase focuses on servicing an audience viewed as consumers (cf. Engblom & Wormbs, 2007; Syvertsen, 1990; Søndergaard, 1995). In line with this, Syvertsen (1990) claims that it was not until the public service broadcasters started to compete that it became important for them to define what ‘public service’ stood for or should stand for (see also, Edin, 2000; cf. Runcis & Sandin, 2010).

New arenas and new technologies have also changed the premises for broadcasting and this, in turn, has affected the notion of public service (cf. Lund, Nord & Roppen, 2009; Engblom & Wormbs, 2007; Lindén, 2011; Nord, 2012; Nord & Grusell, 2012). For example, the media and communication researchers Lars Nord and Marie Grusell (2012) refer to a Government Official Report from 2008 (2008:64) in which ‘public service’ is defined as “in the service of the public”, and hence the view of whom the public service broadcasters are to serve may have turned again.

These transformations of the public service concept and how they are argued for in media research have implications for a child audience. In the discussion of whom the public service broadcasters are to serve, the category ‘children’ crops up. In presenting the changed views of the public service concept, several of the researchers referred to above have argued that, before the monopoly on the broadcasting market was abolished, the public service broadcasting institution transmitted programming that the public/audience was thought to need rather than regarding what it wanted and that the public service media thereby had a “paternalistic” relationship to its audience (e.g., Ang, 1991: 118; Edin, 2000: 17; Syvertsen, 1990:185, 189; Søndergaard, 1995: 29-30; Søndergaard, 1994: 262-263, 304; see also, Engblom & Wormbs, 2007). This argument concerning public service broadcasting’s paternalism often draws on notions of children in a
metaphorically. Edin (2000: 30), for example, argues that the public service TV institution has treated its audience as “underage children” when she claims that the audience was to be educated, fostered and protected by public service television. This is a metaphor she returns to, for example, when discussing the SVT test card in 1978, containing an image of a little girl holding a doll with a geometrical pattern as background, she states:

Maybe one should see her [the girl in the image] as the symbol of the institution’s view of the audience – nice, sweet and naïve children with their eyes almost too expectantly turned to the screen and at the same time a disturbance of flesh and blood in the middle of the more abstract and rational mission of television that the viewers did not necessarily need to understand the meaning of. Or does the image of the little child and the sleeping doll beg the interpretation that the address to the viewers was calculated to be on a four-year-old’s educational level? (Edin, 2000: 108)

Here, Edin (2000) criticizes the view of the audience, but in doing so she also draws on discursive notions of children as naïve and lacking in competence. Edin (2000) is not alone in this. The audience researcher Ian Ang (1991: 118) argues that the audience “has come of age; [when] she [the audience] can no longer be addressed in a paternalistic manner” by the public service TV institution. It is thereby not until the public service broadcasting institution began engaging in competition that the research community began defining it as viewing its audience as adult. However, the scholarly view that TV considered its audience as children does not apply only to public service broadcasting. The TV researcher John Hartley (1987: 127) describes the whole television industry as a “paedocratic regime”, stating:

The audience is imagined as having childlike qualities and attributes. Television discourse addresses its viewers as children. It is itself characterized by childlike preoccupations and actions. (Hartley, 1987: 127)

He continues:

Why do industry professionals invent the audience in the image of a retarded child, or of an infant in the cradle – with or without a beer – who is just about sharp enough to spot the movement of moustache-twirling villainy? One reason is that audiences are, literally, unknowable. (Hartley, 1987: 129)

---

5 The citation is originally in Swedish and has been translated by the author, as have all statements in the thesis originally in Swedish.
The child metaphor is used to point to how the audience in general is reduced by the TV institution because the industry does not know whom it is addressing, a notion that Hartley (2009) sticks to also in more recent discussions. Thereby, on the one hand Hartley (1987) argues that the TV industry imagines its audience as a child, and on the other he himself re/produces notions of children as something very undesirable. The presented child has no agency and is undeveloped. In this way, Hartley (1987) offends and grossly underestimates both newborn babies and children with disabilities. The sharpness of the wording is something that singles Hartley (1987) out from other researchers. However, as we have seen, using children as a metaphor for the audience to point out its low rank and lack of value is not unique.

A child perspective on public service television

The patronizing metaphoric use of the category ‘children’ in earlier audience research calls for other ways of thinking about a child TV audience. The present study therefore takes a child perspective on the child audience of public service TV. A child perspective is built on the notion that children are important in their own right and not in their capacity as future adults (cf. Halldén, 2003; 2007; James, Jenks & Prout, 1998). Thus, taking a child perspective means putting children at the centre of the research in order to analyse on what terms children are positioned in society and how discursive notions of children are entangled with the adult society’s wishes for and fears about the future (Halldén, 2003; 2007). A child perspective also entails that we not take for granted what the term children stands for, but that we define what it means to be a child and relate it to the context (cf. Alanen, 2011; James & Prout; 1997; Sandin, 2003; Woodhead, 2008). One such contextual aspect is time, and how public service broadcasting has viewed the child audience over the time period studied here, 1980-2007, needs to be analysed also in light of how notions of children have changed in society at large during this period. One of the major changes is Sweden’s ratification of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (UCRC) in 1990. The ratification raised questions about how the best interest of the child should be translated into public policy, and also what is meant by the best interest of the child (Sandin & Halldén, 2003). The focus of the present study is on how the child audience of public service TV in Sweden has been portrayed in policy documents and in TV programming aimed at children. In summary, the analysis will investigate how notions of the child audience are shaped during a period of change in the broadcasting arena between 1980 and 2007.
Studying the child audience in TV programmes for children requires a definition of these programmes. A look at the schedule in the TV guide shows that it is not only what is labelled as children’s programmes that is broadcast for children. Programmes in minority languages, in sign language, educational TV, as well as family programmes also target children. Therefore the concept *TV for children* is established and used in the present thesis to cover the diversity of programming addressing children. The concept will be developed further in the methodology chapter.
Chapter 1
Previous research and theoretical standpoints

Previous research on children and TV
This chapter begins by presenting earlier research linked to the two opposing discourses on children and TV: TV as a risk and TV as an asset for children. A section on previous research on children’s TV programming follows this. Thereafter the theoretical approach is presented, combining a discourse perspective with childhood studies, audience studies, TV studies and visual culture. The chapter ends with presenting the aim and design of the study.

TV and risk
There are two different and strong discourses on children and TV in the public debate, TV as either a risk or an asset for children, which was pointed out in the introduction. These same discourses are also found in the academic research. One research strand views TV as a potential risk for children in terms of health aspects (e.g., Blevins, 2011; Buijzen, Bomhof & Schuurman, 2008; Cox et al., 2012; Dowd, Singer, & Wilson, 2006; Jennings & Wartella, 2007; Jordan, 2007; Murry, 2007; Rich, 2007). Risk in this case is related to children’s television viewing – which is argued to limit children’s physical activity, leading to child obesity – and to television commercials’ potential negative effects on children’s eating habits (e.g., Buijzen, Bomhof & Schuurman, 2008; Cox et al., 2012; Jennings & Wartella, 2007; Jordan, 2007; Rich, 2007). Another related research focus, also looking into risks and health issues, is on violence in TV programming and its effects on children. Here the focus is on the psychological wellbeing of children and the likelihood that watching TV violence causes violent behaviour and/or anxiety in children in real life (e.g., Blevins, 2011; Dowd, Singer, & Wilson, 2006; Murry, 2007; Government Official Report, 2001:84). Moreover, there
is also research on limiting children’s television viewing (e.g., Jason & Fries, 2004; Jordan et al., 2010).

However, the research on TV as a risk for children has also been criticized. The children and media researchers Sonia Livingstone (2007) and Livingstone and Andrea Millwood Hargrave (2006) have studied research on TV as a cause of harm and offence to children. They argue that: “Methodologically, one must accept that much of the research evidence is flawed” (Livingstone & Hargrave 2006: 51). They mean that this strand of research focuses on media as the prime cause of risk, without taking other possible factors in society and/or in children’s lives into consideration (Livingstone, 2007; Livingstone & Hargrave, 2006). They argue, on the basis of their critical research overviews, that there is evidence for some ‘risk’, such as anxiety after watching TV. Still their argument is that research must pay careful attention to the circumstances of the individual watching, and to the context that TV is watched in, to understand the potential dangers that children face as TV viewers (Livingstone, 2007; Livingstone & Hargrave, 2006; for a critical research summery of TV violence and children, see von Feilitzen, 2009).

The fear of what the TV medium could impose on the child audience, however, was debated already from the start of television in Sweden (Rydin 2000). And TV is not the only medium that has been viewed as putting children at risk. For example, popular literature was seen as a threat to generations of young people all over Western Europe in a discussion starting already in the 18th century, and continuing well into the 20th century (Drotner, 1999; cf. Jensen, 2012). Also when commercial film became a mass medium, children were described as needing protection from the new and powerful medium (Drotner, 1999; Janson 2007). Moreover, in the 1920s, the fear was that radio would make children passive (Rydin, 2000). And more recent is the fierce discussion on children and video violence in Sweden in the early 1980s (Drotner, 1999; Janson, 2007). This has been followed by quite a few calls for attention to the dangers facing children on the Internet, in consumption related practices and in the context of computer gaming (cf. Aarsand, 2007; Buckingham, et, al, 1999; Drotner, 1999; Rydin, 2010; Sparrman, 2006). The risk discourse has thus followed the technological development of various media, and children and young people have been the groups used to raise concern in the public debate. These debates have also been called moral panics, defined as heated emotional and moral tensions in regard to ‘new’ media and children (cf. Aarsand 2007; Buckingham et al., 1999; Cohen, 1987; Drotner, 1999; von Feilitzen, 2010; Mitchell, 2005a; Pollack 1999; Sparrman, 2006; 2002).

As we have seen, the risk discourse of children and media occurs both in the general debate and in the research, and the debates stirred up by these reported
risks have been researched as well. The discursive understanding of children, TV and risk also has historical bonds to discourses on children and other media technologies. This is not, however, the only research perspective on children and television; there are also research strands interested in the beneficial aspects of TV technology for children.

TV and assets
In parallel to the risk discourse, TV is also viewed as an important means of information and recreation for children, as pointed out in the introduction. However, in terms of the research, the focus has mainly been on TV’s educational aspects. Educational hopes for new media are as common as the notions of risk presented above, and within this discourse, too, children are used in the arguments (cf. Aarsand 2007; Drotner, 1999; von Feilizen, 2010; Lindgren, 1999; Rydin, 2000). Education is intimately linked to children, and there is a body of research focused on the learning benefits that TV may potentially provide for children (e.g., Akerman et al, 2011; Fisch, 2004; Hilty, 1998; Jennings, Hooker & Linebarger, 2009; Lemish, 2007).

The use of the TV medium for learning practices has been labelled “edutainment”, i.e. when TV programming (or games, films, etc.) aim at teaching children school-related topics in their spare time by entertaining them (Buckingham & Scanlon, 2005; Scanlon & Buckingham, 2002). The idea is thus that the TV medium, which children are assumed to like, can be used for something that children are thought to dislike: education. Edutainment is often linked to commercial settings where educational products can be sold to engaged parents (Buckingham & Scanlon, 2005; Scanlon & Buckingham, 2002).

However, education and TV go back a long way. Educational programmes have been broadcast on Swedish TV from the 1960s (Runcis & Sandin, 2010). TV’s educational aspects have foremost been discussed in regard to the educational branch of Swedish public service broadcasting (UR), and a major research project conducted between 1997 and 2006 investigated the role of educational broadcasting in the Swedish welfare system. Some of these publications have taken up educational aspects of TV (e.g., Lindgren, A., 2006; Linnér, 2005; Runcis & Sandin, 2010; Wallengren, 2005; Wallengren, 2001), but only a few of the studies focus on children and educational TV programmes (e.g., Lindgren, A., 2006; Wallengren, 2001; see also Bolander, 2009). However, the Swedish Public Service Television (SVT) has also had an educational ambition all along. This is pointed out by the children and media researcher Ingegerd Rydin (2000), who has identified teaching ambitions within children’s programmes broadcast by SVT, especially at the start of TV broadcasts and during the 1970s. When
education is linked to television in this way, TV is portrayed as beneficial for the child audience and, in this relation, the TV medium is not perceived as a risk for children (see also Goldfarb, 2002).

There are also other ways of linking TV and education together in relation to children. On the more traditional schooling arena, educating children about the media is thought to balance the dangers that television could have for children (Buckingham, 2000b; Davies, 2010). For instance, Buckingham (2000a; see also Heins, 2007) argues that the media are part of society and of the everyday life of children, and that children should hence not be sheltered from the media but instead learn to handle them as informed and active participants on a mediated cultural arena. He therefore argues for more media education and for children’s need to be media literate (Buckingham, 2000a).

Only a few researchers see television as having positive potentials for children other than educational ones. Buckingham et al. (1999) claim that the very linking of children’s need for leisure and entertainment to TV is considered irresponsible in the societal discourse. Davies (1989; 2010) has been arguing for children’s right to quality television for quite a long time, and she claims that TV does have several positive aspects in regard to children. She maintains that enjoyment of television in children’s everyday lives must be acknowledged (Davies, 1989). She also calls for a more nuanced view of both children and television when claiming that children are more competent viewers than the public debate gives them credit for (Davies, 1989; see also Rönnberg, 1997).

Consequently, the benefits of TV are primarily focused on the educational potential that the medium can have for children. Researchers of children and media seldom question the educational aims and learning connected to TV for children, or that learning is essentially good (cf. Graff, 2001; Säljö, 2000). And only a few researchers have investigated what is actually taught on TV (e.g., Lindgren, A. 2006; Rydin, 2000; Wallengren, 2001). Neither is the discussion of the relationship between children and television developed beyond the rather simple dichotomy of risk and asset (for exceptions see, e.g., Davies, 1989; Buckingham, 2000a; see also Cook, 2004; Sparrman, 2009; Sparrman & Aarsand, 2009). These are gaps in the previous research that will be addressed in the present study.

TV programming for children
The research on TV programmes for children is diverse in terms of methodology, research questions and research material. There is a limited body of quantitative research on children’s programmes. These have taken a macro-perspective on, for example, representations of social categories, beauty ideals or aggression
in programming (e.g., Callister, Robinson & Clark, 2007; Coyne & Whitehead, 2008; Northrup & Lien, 2010; Robinson & Anderson, 2006). There are also qualitative studies of children’s TV programming. Most of these studies have quite a narrow focus on programming. There are, for example, studies of children’s news, where this genre is investigated in relation to its young audience and the focus is on citizenship, democracy and informational aspects (e.g., Buckingham, 2000b; Matthews, 2007; Rönnberg, 2010; Rönnberg, 2008b). Other programme studies have focused on specific programmes like Teletubbies or Sesame Street, for example, looking into issues like narrative, space and how notions of childhood come forward in the programmes (e.g., Bignell, 2005; Buckingham, 1998; 2002b; Lury, 2005; Morrow, 2006; Rönnberg, 2008a). That there are some studies of educational TV programmes for children has already been mentioned, but both Sesame Street and to some extent even Teletubbies can be viewed as educational (e.g., Bolander, 2009; Buckingham, 2002b; Lindgren, A., 2006; Morrow, 2006; Wallengren, 2001). When it comes to TV programme studies looking at historical time periods, these are rare. Someone who has researched older material is David Oswell (2002) in his study of the start of children’s TV programming on the BBC. Eva Bakøy (1999) has studied the Norwegian public service children’s TV in the 1960s and 1970s. Altogether, only a handful of programme studies apply a longer-term perspective on TV programmes for children (e.g., Rydin, 2000; Forsman, 2000; Lindgren, A., 2006; Rönnberg, 2010).

Studying TV programming content is problematic, as access to programme material is often difficult, something that several of the studies referred to above have established (e.g., Bakøy, 1999; Rydin, 2000; Forsman, 2000; Lindgren, A., 2006; Oswell, 2002). Generally, in an international perspective, very little TV programming from the early days of broadcasting has been saved at all (cf. Spigel, 2005). Moreover, programming from more recent times can be quite difficult to gain access to depending, for example, on copyright and archiving principles (cf. Byers & VanderBurgh, 2010; Caldwell, 1995). As a result, research on TV programming often consists of a limited programme material, relying on saved clips, researchers recording or buying programmes on their own and sometimes simply consulting manuscripts.

The studies applying longer time perspectives on broadcasts for children are foremost from the Swedish context (e.g., Lindgren, A., 2006; Rydin, 2000; Forsman, 2000; Rönnberg, 2010). One explanation for this is that all pro-
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6 See also, Carter (2007) on children’s news websites.
7 See also Janson (2007) on children’s films.
programmes broadcast from Sweden since the middle of 1978 have been saved in a public archive (The National Library of Sweden). This makes it possible for researchers to gain access to literally every programme that has been broadcast on the Swedish terrestrial net since that time. However, even if this archive is a treasure, few researchers have used it to study programming for children, and those who have, have not studied a broad range of programming. Rather, they have focused on programmes produced by the public service companies and/or on specific programme series, even if the time periods studied have been long (e.g., Lindgren, A., 2006; Rydin, 2000; Forsman, 2000; Rönnberg, 2010; 2008a). In fact, the media researchers Anna Edin and Per Westerlund (2008) argue that the core of Swedish television, i.e. programming content, is still largely un-researched (for a similar international claim see, e.g., Corner; 1999).

Previous research on TV programming for children has paved the way for the present study by highlighting the importance of studying the actual TV programming for children. However, based on this research overview, one sees gaps when it comes to studying programmes for children in a longer time perspective and when it comes to studying the whole rage of different kinds of programmes broadcast for children. This study will therefore attempt to fill these gaps.

Theoretical standpoints

The present study is diverse in terms of its theoretical standpoints. What will follow in this section is a discussion of the study’s discursive approach and how the theoretical concepts of children, audience, configuration, TV and visuality are defined and combined.

A discursive approach

There is a common overall discursive approach used in the present study that links all parts of the study together. Several of the researchers that have inspired me theoretically when I discuss the concepts of audience, TV and visual culture have also drawn on discursive perspectives (e.g., Allen, 1992; Ang, 1991; Edin, 2000; Hartley, 1987; Rose, 2001; Wetherell & Potter, 1992). When studying policy and TV programming, my focus is on how the audience is produced in these materials. I view all the categorizations used in this study, such as children and audience, as being produced discursively. In line with this approach, and as I will go on to argue, I also see television as a cultural phenomenon, as produced, context dependent, contested and changeable.
My understanding of discourse draws on the visual culture researcher Gillan Rose’s (2001) Foucault-inspired definition:

Discourse has a quite specific meaning. It refers to groups of statements which structure the way a thing is thought, and the way we act on the basis of that thinking. In other words, discourse is a particular knowledge about the world which shapes how the world is understood and how things are done in it. (Rose, 2001: 136)

This gives a basis for an understanding of the public service broadcasting institution and the child audience as being produced discursively in programming and policy, through statements, visual framing, talk and content. What can be practiced in terms of programming, how the institution can act and how children can interact with TV are in this way formed discursively. However, the discursive understanding of the child audience is also contested and revised. Studying the discursive practices of TV programming for children highlights notions of children as an audience. The tools I use for analysing the child audience will be presented in detail in the methodology chapter. But first I will turn to a discussion of the category ‘children’.

Children as constructions

‘Children’ is not a stable category, which is why it is important to define what is meant by the concept (see also Davies, 1989: 9). My concept of ‘children’ draws upon childhood sociology. Childhood sociology takes a social constructionist approach to the study of children (e.g., Halldén, 2007; 2009; James & James, 2004; 2008; James, Jenks & Prout, 1998; James & Prout, 1997; Jenks, 1996; Lee, 2001; Prout, 2005). This means that what a child ‘is’ within childhood sociology is determined by context, i.e. by gender, class, ethnicity, age, etc. (cf. Alanen, 2011; James & Prout; 1997; Woodhead, 2008: 17). The implications of being defined as a child have also changed over time (e.g., Aries, 1982; Hendrick, 1997; Sandin, 1986; Zelizer, 1994). In a Swedish context, what it means to be a child has evolved greatly also during the past hundred years (e.g., Axelson, 2007; Lind, 2000; Lind; 2006; Qvarsebo, 2006; Sandin, 2003).

‘Children’ must therefore be understood as a relational term, forming a socially constructed category in society. However, this category is upheld by a complex, continuous process of construction and reconstruction in everyday life in society (cf. James & Prout, 1997; Prout, 2005). To be defined as belonging to the category ‘children’ also positions one as living in the life phase of childhood (cf. James & James, 2004; James & James, 2008; James, Jenks & Prout, 1998; Jenks 1996; Eckert, 2001; Samuelsson, 2008). The discursive notions of childhood set
the boundaries for the category ‘children’ and legitimize the control that the adult society exercises over children.

The category ‘children’ is most often seen to oppose and be subordinated to the category ‘adults’ (cf. Jenks, 1996; Lee, 2001). This is a discursively fixed notion of the category ‘children’ that is linked to binary oppositions such as child-adult, competent-incompetent, active-passive, etc. There is, however, resistance to these dichotomous ways of understanding children. For instance, childhood researchers are trying to move away from such dichotomies by studying the practices at stake in children’s lives, thereby making it possible to view the category ‘children’ in more diverse ways (e.g., Buckingham, 2000a; Cook, 2004; Jenks, 1996; Lee, 2001; Prout, 2005; Sparman, 2009; Sparman & Sandin, 2012).

The ways in which children are shown, talked about, and referred to in the empirical material that I study produce notions of a child audience. At the same time these representations also produce notions of the category ‘children’. Both these aspects will be investigated in this study. I will now turn to the understandings of the television audience.

The configured audience

Studying how the child audience is constructed in TV and policy puts a focus on a theoretical strand of audience research, which moves us away from research fields such as media effects research and reception studies. In his book What do pictures want? the visual culture researcher W. J. T. Mitchell (2005a: 207) asks: “How are the media addressing us, who is the ‘us’ they are addressing, and what is the address of media […]?” These questions cannot be answered by media effects research or by reception studies, yet they are crucial to understanding how an audience is constructed and thus the question is: What is an audience?

Richard Maxwell (2000), who has studied how the notion of a generalized audience developed in the 19th century newspaper industry, argues that the audience concept builds on the idea of generalizing people into groups. He stresses that the possibility to visualize a group of diverse people as being linked together by a common denominator is key to understanding how the notion of an audience is formed (see also Corner, 1999).

Forming notions of an audience is crucial to the TV institution in terms of having someone to broadcast to, but the reasons why the audience is crucial have
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8 For introductions to audience research, see, e.g., Gillespie, 2006; Gorton, 2009; Liebes, 2005.
differed. Traditionally, the various branches of television have had quite different broadcasting objectives. The commercial approach has been to sell its estimated audience as a commodity to advertisers, while the public service approach has been to serve the public, and thereby these two branches have also differed in how they view their audiences (Ang 1991; Ellis, 2002). However, the transformation of the media landscape has made the public service institution gradually adjust its notion of audience to the commercial norm, relying on audience measurement to legitimize its existence (cf. Ang: 1991; Edin, 2000; Ellis, 2002; Simpson, 2004).

The notions of audience have been criticized, independent of broadcaster, and the TV researcher John Hartley (1987) sees the whole audience concept as a product of imagination. He writes:

> […] audiences are not just constructs; they are the invisible fictions that are produced institutionally in order for various institutions to take charge of mechanisms of their own survival. Audiences may be imagined empirically, theoretically or politically, but in all cases the product is a fiction that serves the needs of the imagining institution. In no case is the audience ‘real’, or external to its discursive construction. (Hartley, 1987: 125)

Hence, according to Hartley (1987), the audience is an entity that is made up to serve media institutions’ needs (see also Ang, 1991). The audience is in this way imagined to constitute a simplistic but steady shape, in line with what the institutions can make use of when measuring and/or selling it. What the Swedish public service broadcasting institution needs is an audience that is comparable to the commercial one on the Swedish broadcasting arena, if it is to legitimize the payment of a license fee by all households owning a TV set (cf. Edin, 2000; Hadenius, Weibull & Wadbring, 2011). Edin (2000) has studied how public service TV in Sweden addresses its audience. She shows, drawing on Hartley and Ang, how the TV institution’s communicated messages produce discursive understandings of who and/or what the audience is (Edin, 2000).

A few researchers have explored the discursive construction of a child TV audience. One example is Carmen Luke (1990), who analyses how the children/television discourse in academic research transformed from 1950 to 1980. Another is Buckingham et al.’s (1999) study of the history of children’s programming on the BBC, which raises the question of media producers’ constructed notions of the child audience.

There are studies that have focused on the child TV audience in TV programming for children (e.g., Bignell, 2005; Buckingham, 2000b; 2002a; Oswell, 2002). One is David Oswell’s (2002) study of the construction of a British child
TV audience at the start of TV broadcasts. Oswell (2002) argues that, in the UK in the early 1960s, the child television audience was formed into an entity for the first time. He also shows that the youngest child TV audience was already from the start “a recognizable object of concern” and hence formed within a risk discourse (Oswell, 2002: 149). Yet another example is David Buckingham’s (2000b) study of British and American news programmes for young people. Buckingham (2000b: 36) studies the news programmes’ “implicit assumptions about their viewers”. He concludes that the young viewers are constructed as what he calls “citizens-[…] and] news-viewers-in-the-making” (Buckingham, 2000b: 58), as the programmes render a construction of young people who are informed about rather than participating in political society. All broadcasts for children are also almost exclusively produced by adults. Consequently, the ways in which the child TV audience are imagined by the TV institution is a product of adult imagination (Buckingham 2002a).

The science and technology researcher Steve Woolgar (1991) has studied how an imagined user is configured by a product. Woolgar (1991) conducts an ethnographic study of user trials preceding the making of a manual and shows how the user is produced by the company. Woolgar’s (1991) concept of configuration thereby puts the focus on the ongoing production of the discursive understanding of the user. Thus, according to this line of reasoning, to understand how a child TV audience is configured, one must focus on the continuous production of this audience in policy and TV programming. Using the concept of configuration puts the focus on the interplay between the TV institution and the imagined audience.

In this regard, the present study of the imagined configuration of a child TV audience in public service broadcasting draws on Hartley’s (1987) and Ang’s (1991) theorization of the media audience as an imagined construction. This imagined audience construction is transformed via Woolgar’s (1991) concept of configuration, and Edin’s (2000) way of linking the theoretical audience concept (Ang, 1991; Hartley; 1987), to a study of public service media and TV material. The concept of the configuration of an imagined audience in public service TV is also combined with Oswell’s (2002) and Buckingham’s (2000b; 2001; 2002a; see also Bignell, 2005) focus on the child audience as something that is imagined in TV programming. Thus, the approach to theoretically elaborating on the configured child audience in public service TV programmes is established, while the understanding of the TV medium and its visual aspects still need to be developed. However, before moving on, it should be noted that this approach does not entail disinterest in the actual viewers of television. On the contrary, the actual viewers of television have to live with the assumptions that the television institutions make on their behalf (Ang, 1991).
TV as institution and medium

In this section, it is the TV medium and its form that is considered, as well as TV’s modes of address. In addition to this, the point is made that both television and its visual aspects must be understood and analysed discursively.

The public service TV institution

In this study, the TV medium will be approached and investigated as an institution (cf. Ang, 1991; Corner, 1999; Edin, 2000; Hartley, 1987). ‘Institution’ is used here in an abstract and analytical way to discuss the different settings and practices that constitute public service television (Corner, 1999: 12-13). In line with this, viewing public service broadcasting as an institution makes it possible to understand and analyse the two actors that broadcast public service TV in Sweden9 (i.e. their collective of staff, who make, produce, buy and put together the programming and that functions as the brands SVT and UR) as forming one entity (cf. Sturken & Cartwright, 2009). The borders of this institution are established by the laws and legislations that regulate the actions of the public service TV institution on behalf of society (cf. Lindén, 2011; Edin, 2000; Runcis & Sandin, 2010). Even if this institution does not control how its programming is used, it has power over the structure of the TV messages. There is thereby a significant difference in power between the institution behind the TV messages and the viewers, who can only adapt to and, in limited ways, resist this structure (cf. Ang, 1991; Sturken & Cartwright, 2009). But in order to study the institution’s notions of these viewers, what constitutes TV as a medium must also be theorized.

TV and its building blocks – flow, segments, scheduling

In the TV scholar John Ellis (2006) understanding, television is an actor in society and in the world at large. The TV medium is everyday in character, and it has been present in many people’s lives for quite some time (Ellis 2002; Ellis, 2006; see also Gorton, 2012). This medium’s main production is its programming.

TV has been described as a constant flow of programmes, as built up by programme segments, as well as determined by scheduling. The practice of describing TV as a constant flow of programmes was introduced by Raymond Williams (1990) as early as 1974, and this description still tends to be used as a point of reference in TV studies (e.g., Corner, 1999; Edin 2000; Ellis, 1992; 2002; 2006; Gorton, 2012). The notion of TV as a flow has, however, been debated. Ellis
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9 The Swedish Public Service TV Company (SVT) and the Swedish Educational Broadcasting Company (UR).
(1992), for example, criticizes the concept and argues for the use of segments, as the shorter genre-specific building blocks of television programming (cf. Corner, 1999; see also Ellis, 2006). But the notion of segments as well has been criticized. TV scholar John Corner (1999), for example, sees segments as a dated and too static notion for depicting the multitude of ways in which television programming can be built up.

Scheduling is the way in which TV programmes are placed together to form an entity of programme parts, i.e. of segments (Corner, 1999; Edin, 2000; Ellis 1992; 2002; Lindén, 2011). The TV institution uses scheduling to target viewers and to set the TV agenda, thereby the schedule itself becomes an arena where the imagined audience can be traced (cf. Edin, 2008; Ellis, 2002).

I find that the concepts of flow, segments and scheduling are useful for understanding different aspects of television. The aspects of segments and scheduling allow us to view television programming as something structured and planned beforehand by the TV institution (cf. Corner, 1999; Edin, 2000; 2008; Ellis, 2006). Whereas viewing television output as a flow allows us to see it as a unity and thereby to analyse it as it emerges onto the screen (cf. Corner, 1999; Edin, 2000; Ellis, 2006; Williams 1990). In this way, TV can be seen as being built up by smaller parts as well as by a continuous entity, structured by the scheduling. However, the ways in which TV programming addresses its viewers must also be looked into.

The TV medium and its audience address

If we return to Mitchell’s (2005a: 207) questions – “How are the media addressing us, who is the ‘us’ they are addressing, and what is the address of media […]?” – the modes of address come forward as a crucial part in the configuration of the audience. Address is formed constantly in television to let the audience know whom programmes are targeting. This is done in the TV guide, by trailers, announcers and jingles in the beginning of programmes (cf. Edin, 2000; 2008). It is also continuously done in the programmes, through the sounds, the talk and the visual strategies used (cf. Allen, 1992; Edin, 2000; 2008).

The audial modes of address in TV programmes are speech and sound (cf. Allen, 1992; Corner, 1999; Edin, 2000; Ellis, 1992; Lury, 2005). Different kinds of speech are used to form the programmes and build TV narratives, such as voiceovers commenting on or narrating a story, or people on screen talking directly to the camera/viewer (Allen, 1992; Edin, 2000; Lury, 2005). Ellis (1992) argues that the vital importance of sound for the TV address has to do with how the TV medium expects its viewers to watch the programmes. Even though television can be watched with very careful attention, the medium itself does not expect that from its audience (Ellis, 2002). The potential television viewer is assumed
to be watching TV while at home, and therefore the viewer is presumed to be easily distracted by other attention-grabbing activities in the home environment. Ellis (2006) means that this view of the viewer affects how the medium approaches its audience and how the TV medium uses music, direct speech and other vocal and genre-based effects to draw the viewer’s attention (back) to the screen. His point is that the way in which we are expected to watch TV differs from how we are expected to watch a film at the cinema. He argues that TV is looked at with a “glance”, which means to look in passing, as compared to the more focused “gaze” of the cinema audience (Ellis, 2006: 17; cf. Mulvey, 1992).

In this way, Ellis (2002) downplays the visual address of TV programming, and the role of TV’s visual aspects has been debated in TV studies (e.g., Caldwell, 1995; Corner 1999). For example, the TV researcher John Thornton Caldwell (1995) argues for placing the visual aspect of television at the forefront of research, and he argues that the television image has been overlooked by television researchers. There are also other researchers who argue for taking a visual culture perspective on media research, thus putting the focus on the visual aspects (e.g., Becker, 1999; Carter & Allan, 2009; Lury, 2005; Mitchell, 2005a). I have therefore turned to the visual culture research field to theorize the visual aspects of TV. To take a visual culture perspective on TV means, in Mitchell’s (2005b: 264-265) words, to put “the visual” at the centre of the analytic spotlight rather than treating it as a foundational concept that can be taken for granted. However, Mitchell (2005b) also claims that all media are mixed media and hence, focusing on the visual must not downplay other forms of address used by the TV medium (cf. Rose, 2001; Sandywell & Heywood, 2012; Shohat & Stam, 2002; Sturken & Cartwright, 2009).

In this way, audial and visual modes of TV address are important to investigate in a search for the configured TV audience, but address is also done continuously in the TV programming content. TV content is built on narrative structure, courses of events, main threads, characters, artefacts, etc., and is what the programming is all about. In this regard, content is important for the TV medium (Ellis, 2007: Lotz, 2007). The TV programming content does not just happen to be there. It is produced for and targeted at different audiences (cf. Lotz, 2007). Broadcast content is not only important for the TV institution, but also for the regulators and for media audiences (cf. Gorton, 2012; see also further discussion in the policy chapter). In this way, how the content is put forward says something about the producing institution’s notions of the audience, and in the present study the TV content, too, is analysed as a mode of address.
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The study therefore investigates TV content, TV talk and TV’s visual aspects as addressing the TV audience and thereby discursively configuring an imagined audience. But the discursive aspects of TV and visuality also need to be addressed in more detail.

**TV, visuality and discourse**

Within the visual culture research field, there has been an ongoing discussion of the relation between text and image, and Mitchell (2005a), for example, argues:

> Pictures want equal rights with language, not to be turned into language. They want neither to be leveled into a ‘history of images’ nor elevated into a ‘history of art,’ but to be seen as complex individuals occupying multiple subject positions and identities. (Mitchell 2005a: 47)

Drawing on Mitchell’s ideas on pictures, they are not to be reduced to text. This is a view that differs from TV studies practices, which often read visual mediations as texts in a discursive perspective (e.g., Allen, 1992; Edin, 2000; Fairclough, 1995). Viewing mediated images as texts for analytical reasons has been criticized for downplaying the role of the visual in, for example, TV (e.g., Caldwell 1995). The theoretical concept of discourse draws on a linguistic tradition, and whether images can be analysed from a discursive perspective without reducing them to text can therefore be discussed (Mitchell, 1994; Caldwell 1995; Rose, 2001). Rose (2001) aligns with Mitchell’s (1994; 2005) claim that images must be analysed in their own right. But she also argues for approaching images from a discursive perspective and means that the concept of discourse is useful when analysing “how images construct specific views of the social world” (Rose, 2001: 140). However, Rose (2001) also views pictures as almost always interlinked with texts and oral communication, and contends that it therefore becomes irrelevant to try to separate them. She argues for analysing them together, while also being careful to recognize their specificities (Rose, 2001). Drawing on Rose (2001), I use a discursive perspective on TV images when studying how the imagined audience is visualized and thereby configured in the programming.

In this way, television is viewed here as an institution, producing programming built on flow, segments and scheduling, and approaching its audience through several modes of address. The analysis of TV address in the present study pays careful attention to the different visual aspects, as well as to the verbal address and the address of the TV content. This goes hand in hand with seeing TV as using a complex mix of visual and audial modes, as important in people’s everyday life and as something that needs to be studied using a critical interdisciplinary theoretical approach – an approach that has been called for by the research community (cf. Gorton, 2012; Mitchell, 2005b; Sandywell & Heywood, 2012).
This is done to study how the public service television institution imagines a child TV audience.

The aim of the study

The aim of the study is to explore how the Swedish public service TV institution imagines a child audience in a societal context where TV is thought to constitute both risks and assets for children. As shown, it has been argued in public service research that before the abolishment of the broadcasting monopoly, the adult TV audience was treated as an incompetent child by the public service institution and that this audience was not treated as having ‘come of age’ until the broadcasting market was commercialized. In this way, the idea of the child has been used as a diminishing metaphor for the public service audience at large, which raises the question of how the child TV audience has been viewed more specifically. This study therefore investigates how the imagined child audience is configured before (1980), during (1992) and after (2007) the abolishment of the Swedish public service monopoly. How can the public service child TV audience be imagined when such complex views of the audience and of children are at work? The analysis focuses on how the child audience is configured through different ways of articulating children in broadcasting policy texts and addressing children in public service TV programmes.

The questions at stake are:

When, where and in what ways is the imagined child audience configured in the policy documents and the actual TV programmes?

Can discourses on risk and assets be traced in the configuration of the child audience? And do notions about the child audience change over time?

In what ways is the imagined child audience configured through visibility, content and verbal address in the TV programmes? And do these targeting strategies change over time?

What does the configuration of the imagined child audience tell us more specifically about the notions of TV and children, and more generally about children as a category?

Studying how the imagined child audience is configured in TV for children allows us to understand how adult society imagines both children as a TV audience and children as a category in the societal discourse. In this way, a study of public service TV can tell us, and also question ideas about, what it means to be a child in a mediated society.
The design of the study

To address the aim of the study, the thesis is divided into seven chapters.

In Chapter 1, relevant previous research has been presented and the theoretical standpoints have been put forward and discussed.

Chapter 2 reflects on how the research material has been selected. The three different time periods, 1980, 1992 and 2007, are discussed in light of the transformation of the Swedish media arena. The empirical material is presented and the procedures used in selecting the research material are explained and discussed in detail. Finally, the analytical tools used when analysing the material are introduced.

This is followed by four empirical chapters.

Chapter 3 focuses on how the child audience is configured in policy documents regulating the public service broadcasts in Sweden. The articulation of children, as a category within the population and as an audience in these documents, is analysed to understand what discourses on children are produced and reproduced in broadcasting policy.

Chapter 4 analyses how the content of TV for children addresses the child audience. Nature constitutes a content theme in TV for children and the analysis thus focuses on animals, outdoor life and environmental issues. This is done to analyse how the nature content configures a child TV audience.

In Chapter 5, the verbal address of TV for children is analysed. The analysed example is a specific pedagogical voice that pretends to talk directly with the audience. The chapter studies how the pretend face-to-face pedagogical voice configures an imagined child audience.

In Chapter 6, the visual address of TV for children is analysed. The analysed example focuses on how viewers are visualized in TV programmes by inviting them to be interactive. In this way, the programming provides a means for viewers to become visible and participate on TV. This chapter studies how the imagined child TV audience is configured through visual address.

Finally, Chapter 7 concludes how the imagined child audiences are configured by TV for children and what these configurations can tell us about the role of the category ‘children’ and how this positions child TV viewers in society.
Chapter 2
Methodology

Introduction

This chapter focuses on the methodological decisions that have formed the research material and the tools used for analysing it. It contains detailed descriptions of the selection process and what constitutes the research material in this study. The chapter starts by defining the concept of TV for children, followed by an overview of the research material, before looking at the selection process and ending in a discussion of the tools used in the analysis.

To grasp the whole spectrum of TV transmissions for a child audience, I argue, as already stated in the introductory chapter, that TV for children, as opposed to children’s television, better expresses the complexity of the broadcasts for this audience. Earlier Swedish research has mainly focused on what SVT (Swedish Television Broadcasting Company), SR (Swedish Radio) or UR (Swedish Educational Broadcasting Company) has labelled children’s programmes, young people’s programmes or educational programmes, respectively (e.g., Rydin, 2000; Forsman, 2000; Lindgren, A., 2006). Moreover, these studies have limited their selection of programming from the start by, for example, focusing on domestically produced programming (e.g., Forsman, 2000; Lindgren, A., 2006; Rydin, 2000), on specific topics and/or programmes (e.g., Forsman, 2000; Lindgren, A., 2006; Rönnberg, 2012) and on specific genres (e.g., Rönnberg et al., 2008b; 2010). The concept TV for children enables an investigation of what programmes are actually broadcast for children on Swedish public service TV, by SVT and UR. This focus thereby broadens our understanding of broadcasts for a child audience and allows us to study the whole spectrum of programming broadcast for this audience. What the concept TV for children constitutes and what it brings in terms of research material will be developed throughout this chapter.

The empirical research material on which the present study is based consists of TV policy documents and TV programming for children from the years 1980,
1992 and 2007. These years represent different phases in the transformation of the Swedish media landscape, and will be discussed further below. The policy documents form the legislative boundaries for TV broadcasts. To understand the process of configuring a child TV audience, three types of documents are studied:


Second, The Broadcasting Contracts or Licenses that regulate SVT’s and UR’s right to broadcast have been selected. It is the broadcasting contracts and licenses valid for SVT and for UR, respectively, in 1980, 1992 and 2007 that are studied here.

Third, The Annual Reports from 1980, 1992 and 2007 – in which SVT and UR report back to the state on their activities – have been selected for analysis.

The policy material is analysed in Chapter 3, with a focus on how the legal framework handles the child audience and thereby restricts how this audience must and/or must not be regarded by the programme companies. The analysis of the annual reports makes it possible to study how the legal boundaries are negotiated, interpreted and handled by the programme companies in regard to the child audience.

The policy material is thus important for understanding the configuration of the child audience on an overall level, but the largest empirical material for this study is the actual TV programming. Broadcasts for children during 42 days in the two main public service TV channels, SVT1 and SVT2, have been selected from 1980, 1992 and 2007:

11 The public service broadcasting companies refer to these laws and broadcasting contracts/licences as their control documents. (SVT website: http://www.svt.se/omsvt/fakta/public-service/, retrieved 20130425; UR website: http://www.ur.se/Webbar/Om-UR/Foretagsfakta/Publikationer-och-dokument retrieved 20120425; see also Lindén, 2011)
12 In 1997, the broadcasting contracts changed names and were called broadcasting licences (Edin, 2000; Lindén, 2011).
13 The channels have had different names, and reconstructions of the channels have been carried out over the years. I call the channels SVT1 and SVT2 throughout this study, even though those names are only used in 2007 and not in 1980 (TV1 and TV2) or in 1992 (Channel 1 (Kanal 1) and TV2). This is done to make distinguishing between the two channels easier.
Table 1: The total number of TV for children programmes in the study, the number of UR and SVT programmes and the total number of hours of programming in the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1992</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UR broadcasts</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVT broadcasts</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programmes in total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours in total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On these two channels, 491 TV programmes for children were broadcast, 120 from 1980, 141 from 1992 and 230 from 2007. The number of programmes thus increases over time, but not in terms of broadcast hours, in fact TV for children amounts to about 60 hours of broadcast TV for each studied year in SVT1 and in SVT2. However, in 2007 there is also a digital channel broadcasting for children, called the Children’s Channel. This channel has not been included in the study. If it had been included, it would have added more than 160 hours of programming broadcast for children in 2007.

Selection

The TV for children concept has methodological consequences, as have the different materials and the choice of years, days and programmes to study. These decisions and choices in the selection process are presented and discussed below.


From the first TV broadcasts in Sweden up until today, the number of channels transmitting has increased, as well as the number of programmes and companies on the Swedish media arena (cf. Engblom & Wormbs, 2007; Hadenius, Weibull & Wadbring 2011; Edin, 2000). These changes have also affected broadcasting for children (cf. Forsman, 2000; Lindgren, A., 2006; Rydin, 2000; Rönnberg, 2012). To study TV for children and broadening the scope of what is considered to be broadcast for children increases considerably the amount of material. This large material had to be limited to make it researchable. Therefore I first chose to limit the scope in terms of time, focusing on transformations of the Swedish
public service TV institution. To identify such points in time, I have relied on other scholars’ analyses of the historical development of the Swedish public service TV institution. A brief overview of changes of the Swedish media arena will follow below to explain the choice of the studied years.

The monopoly years

The Swedish broadcasting arena was built up as a public service monopoly, where the construction of the radio system laid the foundation for TV broadcasts as well. In 1956, the Swedish parliament decided that TV was going to be introduced in Sweden on a larger scale (cf. Hadenius, Weibull & Wadbring 2011; Hadeius, 1998). SVT (The Swedish Public Service TV Company) was broadcasting programmes for children already at that point, and still is, while special educational programmes for children have been broadcast on TV at least since the mid-1960s (cf. Rydin, 2000; Wallengren, 2005). The first major change on the Swedish TV arena was when a second TV channel was launched in 1969 (cf. Lindén, 2011; Edin, 2000). This was a political decision taken to create competition within public service television, thereby avoiding demands to abolish the television monopoly (cf. Hadenius, 1998; Björkegren, 2001; Edin, 2000; Lindén, 2011). The decision meant competition on programme quality and geographically representative programme productions to increase the audience’s freedom of choice (cf. Hadenius, 1998; Björkegren, 2001; Edin, 2000; Lindén, 2011). The competition, however, did not concern viewing figures, as that was seen as bordering too closely on commercial competition (Edin, 2000). The two public service TV channels, SVT1 and SVT2, competed up until the mid-1990s (cf. Lindén, 2011; Government Bill, 1995/96:161).

The companies broadcasting on these two public service channels are also of importance for understanding the media landscape in which TV for children exists. The educational programmes have their origin in two separate educational branches, one linked to Swedish Radio and one linked to the state, which both produced educational programmes up to 1978 when one public service educational company, UR (the Swedish Educational Broadcasting Company), started (Lindell, 2005; Lindgren, 2003; Runcis & Sandin, 2010; Wallengren, 2005). The owner structure of the public service broadcasting companies has also changed over the years, but starting in 1978 Swedish Radio (SR) acted as the mother company of SVT, UR and local and national radio (Hadenius, Weibull & Wadbring 2011; Runcis & Sandin, 2010). In 1993, however, SR, SVT and UR became independent companies, though still linked by their public service mission (Hadenius, 1998; Lindén, 2011; Runcis & Sandin, 2010). There have also been differences and changes in financing. Both SR and SVT have had licence fee fi-
nancing from the start (Hadenius, 1998), while UR was financed by the state up to 1985 and after that by the licence fee (Runcis & Sandin, 2011).

The relationship between the public service channels and the public service companies is organized as follows: The public service TV channels are hosted by SVT, but SVT is bound to let UR transmit on its channels. For a viewer, the channels SVT1 and SVT2 are public service channels and the programmes on these two channels are public service programmes that can be aired by either SVT or UR.

However, it is not only the developments in public service broadcasting that must be considered when researching TV for children. Due to a law on compulsory file copies, the National Library of Sweden (KB)\textsuperscript{14} began collecting all broadcast programmes from SVT, SR and UR in July 1978 (Forsman, 2000; Edin, 2000). From then on, everything that has been transmitted from Sweden has been saved and is therefore available for research, something that is unique in an international perspective.\textsuperscript{15} If one decides to do research on TV programmes broadcast after this date, one does not have to adjust one’s analysis to available clips, odd episodes of programme series and written manuscripts, which are often what is left of older productions and what researchers studying TV material broadcast before mid-1978 must limit themselves to (e.g., Edin, 2000; Forsman, 2000; Lindgren, A., 2006; Rydin, 2000; Rönnberg, 2012). As the aim is to study how an imagined child audience is configured by TV for children, the present study starts at a point in time when all TV programmes are available for research.

In late June 1979, SVT and UR received new broadcasting contracts that paved the way for potential change in terms of broadcasting obligations over the course of this year (\textit{BC SVT}, 1980; \textit{BC UR}, 1980). Even if 1980 does not mark a specific transition point in the Swedish public service media landscape, the public service monopoly on TV broadcasts was still strong (cf. Nord & Grusell, 2012), and it is the first year when all TV material is researchable and the public service broadcasters had broadcasting contracts covering the whole year. The study therefore begins with the year 1980.

\textsuperscript{14} Today, the audio and visual collection is incorporated into the Swedish National Library’s collection, but the collection has also been an authority in its own right under several different names. Here it will be referred to as the Nationla Libarary (KB) only.

\textsuperscript{15} According to the archive, their collection is unique in its vastness (8 million hours) and in that all of it is available for research. E-mail correspondence with Ann-Charlotte Gyllner-Noonan, National Library, 20120605.
The fall of the broadcasting monopoly

During the 1980s, new actors entered the Swedish broadcasting market and new technology such as video, satellites and cable made the role of the public service TV broadcasting monopoly more contested than before (Hadenius, 1998). The monopoly role on TV broadcasts was lost for public service broadcasting when TV3 started transmissions in Swedish on New Year’s Eve 1987 (cf. Hadenius, Weibull & Wadbring 2011). From that point onwards, public service was to compete with commercial companies broadcasting from the UK via satellite. This was the start of competition for viewers on the Swedish TV arena (cf. Hadenius, Weibull & Wadbring 2011). It was not until February 1992, however, that competition on terrestrial transmissions was initiated (Hadenius; 1998; Hadenius, Weibull & Wadbring 2011). Thus, 1992 marks a transition point, as TV4 received a broadcasting licence and thereby could start its commercially financed broadcasts on the Swedish terrestrial net (cf. Lindén, 2011; Edin 2000; Hadenius, Weibull & Wadbring, 2011). Therefore, 1992 was chosen as the second year of study due to the major changes taking place on the media arena that year.

Continuous changes in the Swedish broadcasting landscape

During the time period 1993-2007, new legislation and new forms of transmission formed public service broadcasting. In 1996, a new Radio and TV Act (1996:844) was issued and replaced the old Radio Act from 1966 (1966:755). The same year the internal competition between the public service channels ended (cf. Lindén, 2011). In 2002, SVT started a digital channel for children. In order to view this channel (the Children’s Channel (Barnkanalen)) a digital television receiver was needed, something that all Swedish households were expected to have by late 2007 when analogue transmissions were terminated (Hadenius, Weibull & Wadbring 2011). SVT and UR also received new broadcasting licenses in 2007. The media landscape has also transformed in that it now has more channels, new actors and more aired hours (Hadenius, Weibull & Wadbring 2011). For example, three big commercial channels in 2007 – TV3, Channel 5 and TV4 – were all broadcasting programmes for children in Swedish that year. In 2008, all of SVT’s and some of UR’s children’s programmes were moved to the Children’s Channel and thus very few programmes for children have existed on the main channels after 2007. I have chosen 2007 as the final

---

year for my study because *TV for children* moved on into a new phase after that year.

**Limitations in terms of channel selection**

In 1980 only two channels, SVT1 and SVT2, existed. In 1992, these two public service channels were broadcasting for a Swedish TV audience, along with several commercial channels. In 2007, four SVT public service TV channels existed, as well as numerous commercial channels broadcasting in Swedish, owing to the digitalization of the Swedish broadcasting system.

I have chosen to only gather material from the two main public service TV channels, SVT1 and SVT2. First, this decision limits the amount of TV material that otherwise would be too vast for this project. Second, the only programmes for children broadcast by public service TV and available to all viewers up to late autumn 2007 were those broadcast on the two main analogue channels. The digitalization of the Swedish broadcasting system was an ongoing process that took several years. It was finalized in late 2007, and it was only then that all Swedish households were expected to view the digital channels.\(^{18}\) It is also on the two main channels SVT1 and SVT2 that the diversity of *TV for children* becomes visible, as all public service companies broadcast programming for children on these channels up to and during 2007.

Thus, programming for children broadcast on the two main channels in 1980, 1992, and 2007 has been studied, as during this 27-year period public service broadcasting has gone from having monopoly on broadcasting, to losing that position and being transformed into one of several actors on the Swedish broadcasting arena.

**Selection of days**

There were plenty of programmes for children aired every day during the years 1980, 1992 and 2007. The research material was therefore limited also in terms of studied days. To get a researchable amount of TV programming, I decided to select 14 days for each year. I wanted the material to span both everyday and holiday programming. School times and holidays play a role in structuring Swedish children’s everyday life as well as in determining the regularities of programme planning for this audience group (cf. Forsman, 2000; Rydin, 2000\(^{19}\)).

---

\(^{18}\) One of the digital channels is the *Children's Channel*. Several of the programmes on the *Children's Channel* in 2007 are reruns of original broadcasts shown on SVT1. The proportion of reruns transmitted on the *Children's Channel* is said to be 90%, which includes reruns from both SVT1 and from the *Children's Channel* itself (*AR*, SVT, 2007).

\(^{19}\) For over all TV scheduling practices see also, Edin (2008) and Lindén (2011).
When selecting days, I chose to study the Easter week as the first 7 days for each year. Easter is a time when all school children in Sweden have Easter holidays. The starting point was set to the Wednesday before Easter weekend, and the Tuesday after Easter ended this part of the selection. The same procedure was used for all three years, but as the Easter dates change from year to year the selected dates varied across the studied years.

To select days with a more everyday character, I chose days in autumn. Swedish schools start again in August after the summer break and there are no holidays until early November. SVT refers to a similar reason for choosing autumn weeks when they are conducting viewer research (AR, SVT 2006; see also Lindén, 2011; Edin, 2008). As I wanted to avoid special themes and series that would have taken up the entire slot of programmes for children for a specific week, programming was chosen to give a more diverse insight into the broadcasts during the autumn. I therefore selected all weekdays, but from different weeks, starting with the first Monday in September, the Tuesday in the second week of September and so on until reaching a Sunday in October seven weeks later. By selecting days in this manner, the programmes lost their internal relationship, however such relations could be studied in regard to the Easter days. Naturally the method of selecting days affect what programmes were studied, but these days have given me a good sample of what was broadcast during the time period. All together, TV material from 42 days has been studied.

Selection of programmes – searching for and doing TV for children

Categorizing TV programmes for a child audience is not a straightforward task (cf. Buckingham et al., 1999). As I had set out to research TV for children, programmes targeting and addressing children had to be identified. However, the target groups of TV programming are not clearly labelled anywhere, and thus what counts as targeting a child had to be determined before TV for children itself could be defined. In this process, a set of clues indicating that a programme targets children was identified. These clues were age categories, child categories, school categories, time slots and programmes described in a way that made it seem likely that they could address children. Clues were found in sources like TV guides, the National Library archive text, the public service companies’ websites, annual reports, and in earlier research.

TV for children - clues in TV guides and the National Library archive database

In order to view archived TV programmes from the Swedish National Library (KB), each programme has to be specified by title, time and date of broadcast.
Therefore, the programmes targeting children had to be identified and ordered from the archive before they could be viewed to determine whether they did indeed address children. To find the programmes I followed the same strategy as the National Library and used the TV guide magazine, Röster i Radio-TV in 1980, 1992 as a guide to the archive. In 2007 Röster i Radio-TV had ceased to exist, and I did as the National Library and used the TV guide in the commercial tabloid newspaper Aftonbladet instead.

However, these publications are not identical. The 1980 weekly TV guide contains richer programme information, for example short descriptions of programmes, the producing department, year of production and sometimes target group, than the 1992 guide does. In 1992, many new channels were broadcasting and the TV guide had been adapted to this situation, not leaving as much space for additional information. In 2007, the programme information provided is limited compared to both the two other guides. These differences have not affected the usefulness of the schedules published in the TV guides for getting an overview of the broadcasts when selecting programmes, even if the additional information they provided in 1980 had to be searched for elsewhere, especially for 2007.

The National Library archive database also provides information on the programming, but the amount of information differs depending on the year in which the programme was aired. There is less information for the programmes from 1980 than for those from 1992 and 2007. In 2007, there is an information heading called “TV guide text”, which could be compared to the TV guide texts that were published in Röster i Radio-TV magazine in 1980 and 1992. In 2007, the archive text also reveals what code SVT has assigned to the program (e.g., “children”, “news”, “film”, “entertainment”). Thereby the TV guides and the archive text can be argued to complement each other to some extent. For UR programmes, however, the archive text in 2007 is much more limited.

Still, in neither the TV guides nor the archive text was there any definite categorization of TV programming targeting children, and the category ‘children’ was therefore not easy to define in the sources linked to the TV material (e.g., TV guide, KB’s database; see also AR, SVT, 2007). For example, overall age categories for the programming were scarce, especially for SVT (cf. Rydin, 2000; 2008).

---

20 Other researchers have also used TV guides to identify TV programming for research purposes (e.g., Buckingham et al., 1999; Edin, 2000; 2008; Rydin, 2000; Rönberg, 2012).

21 Röster i Radio-TV was published by the public service broadcasting institution between 1934 and 1992 (cf. Hadeius, 1998). Aftonbladet is an independent social democratic commercial tabloid and has no connection to public service broadcasting.
This created uncertainty as to where foremost SVT drew the line between programmes for children and programmes for young people and/or youth, and whether and how these groups differed. I therefore decided to take a broad view of what could be considered TV targeting children. Taking the UN Convention on the Rights of The Child as a point of reference, everyone between the ages of 0-18 is a child (Barnombudsmannen, 1999). I therefore used markings referring to categorizations including people up to 18 years of age as a sign for a programme possibly addressing children. This meant that all programmes with stated target groups of people younger than 18 years of age were ordered from the archive. In this way, stated age categorizations were used as clues to programmes targeting children.

One clue that included people age 0-18 was written statements in the guides or the database referring to child categorizations. For example, programmes described as children’s programmes, educational programmes for children and programmes in minority languages for children were ordered from the archive. All other categorizations used that could target people up to 18 years of age were also included, such as all educational programmes referring to school categories including people younger than 18 years of age as a target group as well as all programmes said to target youth, young people and family, as these categories could include people younger than 18 years of age.

Yet another clue used in finding programmes for children were certain time slots. When studying the schedule, it became clear that programming for children was more likely to be aired during the daytime, afternoon and early evening than late at night. The programme information for programmes scheduled during these times was therefore examined carefully for each selected year to identify programmes. For example, in the morning slots, educational programmes were often scheduled during weekdays, while children’s programmes and/or family programmes with content for children were often scheduled dur-

---

22 Ragna Wallmark – just retiring form her position as head of UR’s children’s department and having also worked at SVT’s children’s department for many years – described how the departments worked with age target groups for programmes but that these were not communicated to the viewers (telephone conversation with Ragna Wallmark 20120611). Margareta Cronholm, who worked at the SVT audience research department, also agrees that it is difficult to get an overview of specific target groups that the programme company has for its younger audiences (e-mail correspondence).

23 Like preschool (up to 7-year-olds, up to 6-year-olds in 2007 (förskola)), primary school (7- to 9-year-olds, 6- to 9-year-olds in 2007, school year 0-3 (lägstadiet)), middle school (10- to 12-year-olds, school year 4-6 (mellanstadiet)), secondary school, school year 7-9 (13- to 15-year-olds (högstadiet)) and upper secondary school, called upper secondary school year 1-3 (16- to 18-year-olds (gymnasiet)).

24 Until about 20.00.
ing the morning slots on weekends. Several children’s programmes were aired in the afternoon slots, and during early evening, especially on weekends, family programmes were scheduled. Programmes for young people and youth showed no fixed place in the schedule and therefore had to be looked for in all time slots. It could also be seen in the scheduling that programmes targeting children were often broadcast in relation to each other (cf. Buckingham et al., 1999). Therefore the information on programmes scheduled close to other programmes targeting children was examined.

Yet another clue was identified. It refers to programmes with informational texts that made it seem likely that the programme could be addressing children. This concerned, for example, programme information that presented children as main characters, programme titles that seemed child related, or any kind of child connection that could be addressing children. Programmes described in this way were also ordered from the archive so that I could watch them and determine whether they targeted children.

These clues – age categories, child categories, school categories, time slots and programmes described in ways that they could address children – were used to order programmes from the archive. As will be discussed below, the selection procedure was an ongoing process, and other sources than the TV guide and the KB database information also provided insights into what was broadcast for children.

**Children’s programmes**

I began ordering programmes by identifying the children’s programmes in the TV guide for each year. In 1980, however, no programme had a children’s programme label. To find the children’s programmes, information in the TV guide was studied, and titles like “When Maja was frightened” and “The happy sausage” (Röster i Radio-TV, 1980 (39): 52) seemed to indicate that Half past four (Halvfem) was the children’s programme in SVT1. Moreover, previous research made it clear that this was the case (Rydin, 2000). This programme was broadcast on weekdays at 16.30. For SVT2 in 1980, the TV guide states “from

---

25 The National Library (KB) has saved all programmes broadcast since mid-1978, but in the material from 1980 the programmes are often only saved once, and often when they were first broadcast. This means that, if the programme is a rerun, the announcers and the things happening before and after the programme might not always be from the day I selected. To this, the things occurring before and after the programmes in 1980 are sometimes saved in full, sometimes partially and occasionally not at all. This is not the case for the material from 1992 and 2007. Here everything that is broadcast is saved.

26 On Good Friday and Easter Monday there were no Half past four programmes, and during the autumn the broadcasts did not start until the 17th of September.
the Children’s department” for some programmes. These programmes started at 17.30 and were broadcast on all selected days but one.\textsuperscript{27}

In 1992, there is a “Children’s programmes” heading in the TV guide for the programmes starting at 18.15 on SVT1 all days except Sundays. However, the heading only framed the first programme, and thus the subsequent programmes in the guide had to be investigated further to determine whether they were children’s programmes. The programme information and titles helped in this search, where for example titles like “Dusk stories” (Skymningssagor), which were said to include a fairy-tale, were seen as child-related clues (Röster i Radio-TV, 1992, (39): 52).

In 2007, the two shows Bolibompa and Bobster (both nonsense names) are SVT’s programmes for children. There is no children’s programme heading in the TV guide, but programme titles, information on the programmes and SVT’s own documents make it clear that these shows are the children’s programmes for both younger and older children (AR, SVT, 2007). Bolibompa started at 18.00 in SVT1 on all selected days, and Bobster at 19.00, just after Bolibompa on weekdays. These shows differ somewhat, in that Bobster has a slightly older target group than Bolibompa.\textsuperscript{28} This is not stated in the TV guide, but it can be traced in the database texts as programmes broadcast within the Bolibompa show are categorized with the code “children”, while the programmes within the Bobster show have codes that refer to their genres, like “news” and “entertainment”, and not to target group. Both the shows, however, are also broadcast in the digital Children’s Channel at times, which also signals that they target children.

\textbf{Youth and young people’s programmes}

Because I had decided that TV for children was programming targeting groups including people age 0-18, programmes described as for youth and young people\textsuperscript{29} were ordered to see whether they address people in this age category. However, it was not always clear whether there were any programmes for these groups or whether they were just not marked as such in the sources I used. Forsman’s (2000) historical study of young people’s programmes in Swedish television shows that broadcasts for young audiences have not been broadcast

\textsuperscript{27} Not on Good Friday.

\textsuperscript{28} The exact age category that Bolibompa targets is unclear, but an educated guess would be children up to about 9 years of age. Also Bobster’s targeted audience is difficult to define. A likewise educated guess would be 9- to 13-year olds (cf. AR, SVT, 2007).

\textsuperscript{29} The terms youth and young people seem to be used synonymously by several of the actors in the broadcasting arena (see Chapter 3) as well as in the TV guides and the archive text. Both these categories have therefore been taken to signal that they could be targeting children.
regularly and that they are difficult to define. To avoid falling into the trap of starting to analyse what young people may watch, the information on the programmes had to give some clue – in the TV guide, in the archive text, in previous research and/or in the policy documents – that the programme targeted a young audience, for the programmes to be ordered from the archive.

No programmes for young people were broadcast with any regularity during my selected days in 1980. Still, there were programmes for a young audience. One example of a programme for young people that was difficult to trace is called Bålinge country feast (Bålinge byfest). Neither the archive text nor the TV guide presented any information on the programme apart from its name. However, young people from this programme are mentioned in relation to another programme in the TV guide, and it is therefore included in the study. Forsman (2000) also describes it as a programme for young people. However, Forsman’s (2000) definition of youth and young people’s programmes differs from the one used in the present study, as Forsman (2000) defines all music programmes showing pop and/or rock music as young people’s programmes. My definition of TV for children also includes music programmes, but if the programmes focus on viewers older than 18 years of age they are not TV for children just because they are music programmes. Therefore the programme information needed to state that they targeted youth and/or young people in some way in order to be selected, for example the “young people” related to Bålinge country feast or when Popitopp is described as “Young sparkling pop television” in the TV guide in 1992 (Röster i Radio-TV, 1992, (15): 52).

In 1992, several programmes state that they target young people and/or youth and they can be aired in almost all time slots. A programme series for young

---

30 About 19 programmes target young people in 1980, of which most are UR programmes. E.g., The Political Party Quiz (Partifrågan) is a quiz show in which two teams representing two of the political youth leagues compete (SVT, 19800405, 18.30-19.30). The TV Puck (TV-pucken), an ice-hockey tournament for boys, 15 years old or younger (SVT, 19801011, 13.00-17.10; SVT, 19801019, 11.00-15.10), and Five times Britain. In Scotland, a geography programme targeting secondary school and upper secondary school (UR, SVT, 19800408, 13.35-13.55).

31 Bålinge country feast (Bålinge byfest), SVT1, 19801003, 21.40-22.30.

32 This is what the TV-guide said: “1st contact (1-kontakt), SVT1, 19801011, 21.15-21.35. […] To this we wonder what you think of Bålinge country feast. Young people from the programme department meet someone from the TV audience” (Röster i Radio-TV, 1980, (42): 38).

33 Popitopp, SVT1, 19920416, 19.15-20.00.

34 About 32 programmes, both UR and SVT broadcast for this group. E.g., In the ring with Glen Killing (I managen med Glen Killing), SVT1, 19921009, 23.30-00.15; 15 minutes of
people called PM\textsuperscript{35} was broadcast in SVT at 16.30, Wednesdays to Fridays during the autumn of 1992. In the TV guide and in the archive database, only the subheadings of the programme, with names like PM: School Friends\textsuperscript{36} and PM: Betty Boop\textsuperscript{37}, signal that this could be a programme targeting young people, however, it is defined as such also in previous research (e.g., Forsman, 2000).

In 2007, few programmes state that they target youth and/or young people, and the ones that do are mostly educational programmes for upper secondary school.\textsuperscript{38}

**Educational programmes**

Educational UR programmes for children were also present in the schedules for all studied years, and the references to school-related categories made it clear that they addressed children.\textsuperscript{39} These programmes were broadcast mostly as clusters in the mornings and middays on weekdays in SVT1 for all the studied days. In 1980 and 1992, the TV guide presents the target group for these programmes. In 2007, no target group indication is given in the TV guide or in the archive database text for these programmes. To determine the intended audience, I searched the UR website. Relying on the website information, in 2007 UR broadcasts two shows for children: Krokomax\textsuperscript{40} (a nonsense name) on Mondays and Tuesdays and Krokdill\textsuperscript{41} (a nonsense name) on Wednesdays at 17.30 just before the Bollibompa show, but UR also broadcast for children on most weekday mornings and occasionally also on weekends.\textsuperscript{42}

---

\textsuperscript{35} What PM means is not clear. It could refer to its afternoon broadcasting time or it might mean memo.

\textsuperscript{36} PM, 19920923, SVT2, 16.35.

\textsuperscript{37} PM, 19921009, SVT2, 17.10.

\textsuperscript{38} About 23 programmes, most of them UR programmes. E.g., Kaksi/Två (the number two in both Finnish and Swedish), UR, SVT1, 20070404, 9.30-10.00; SVT1, 20070409, 17.00-17.30; Real science, UR, SVT1, 20070911, 17.00-17.25; A Star's Life (Livet som stjärna), a Canadian drama about a 16-year-old pop star SVT2, 20071013, 19.00-19.25.

\textsuperscript{39} There are also educational programmes targeting collage, university and adult students, but these programmes have not been included in the study.

\textsuperscript{40} Krokdill “for kids who are about 6-8 years old” (trailer for the programme), “primary school year 0-3” (web search).

\textsuperscript{41} Krokomax “for kids who are about 9-12 years old” (archive text), “primary school year 4-6” (web search).

\textsuperscript{42} Only three days in the 2007 material lack educational programmes for children all together (Good Friday (6\textsuperscript{th} of April), Easter Eve (7\textsuperscript{th} of April) and the 13\textsuperscript{th} of October (a Saturday).
Programmes in minority languages, sign language and Swedish as a second language

There are also TV programmes for children in minority languages and programmes for children in sign language for all the studied years. In 1980 at 17.00 just after Half past four, Doing Language (Språka) is broadcast in Serbo-Croatian, Turkish or in Finnish, on several occasions on my selected days. That Doing Language is a programme series for children must be traced from the informational texts in the TV guide, where programmes are described for example as containing fairy tails, or from other sources because the fact that they target children is not stated in the guides (e.g., Rydin, 2000; Röster i Radio-TV, 1980 (15)). That programmes are broadcast for children in sign language by both UR and SVT in 1980 is stated in the TV guide.

In 1992, the programme series broadcast for children in minority languages is still named Doing Language (Språka). These programmes are aired at midday on Saturdays in Serbo-Croatian, Greek and Turkish. There are also programmes for children in Finnish. The programmes in minority languages for children are produced mostly by SVT in 1992, and whom they target can be traced from their titles or the informational texts in the TV guide. Programmes in sign language are only broadcast by UR in 1992, and these programmes consist of a drama series, a quiz programme series and a news programme.

---

43 Not on Good Friday 1980, however, when Doing Language is broadcast but not Half past four.
44 E.g., Doing Language in Serbo-Croatian (Språka - på Serbokroatiska), SVT1, 19800403, 17.00-17.15; Doing Language in Finnish (Språka - på finska), SVT1, 19800404, 17.00-17.15; Doing Language in Turkish (Språka - på turkiska), SVT1, 19800408, 17.00-17.15. There was a programme in Greek scheduled but it was replaced by an ice hockey game, 19800408. There is also another programme for children in Finnish (SVT1, 19801011, 10.00-10.10).
45 There are two programmes in sign language in my 1980 material: Signs to each other (Tecken till varandra) 19801003, an UR programme clustered with the children’s programmes in SVT2, and a Half past four programme in sign language 19800408 in SVT1.
46 Doing Language (Språka), SVT1, 19920418, 19921017, 12.30-13.30. This hour is divided up into 20-minute-long programmes for each language.
47 E.g., Story (Juttu), in Finnish, 19920416, SVT1, 17.00-17.20; Hey little ones (Hej små knattar) in both Swedish and Finnish, SVT1, 19920416, 10.00-10.30; Finnish half hour (Finsk halvtimme), in Finnish, UR, SVT1, 19920421, 11.00-11.30.
48 E.g., First Love (Första kärleken), 19920419, SVT1, 16.00-16.20; It happens with hands (Det händer med händer) SVT1, 19920419, 16.20-16.30; 15 minutes of signing - now (Teckenkvarten - NU), SVT1, 19921001, 9.45-10.00
In 2007, there are programmes aired for children in Finnish, Turkish, Arabic, Spanish and Saami. These programmes are broadcast by both SVT and UR and they target different age categories, which can be traced from the archive text, the UR website and/or the TV guide. There is also a UR series for young people with Swedish as their second language and two SVT programme series in sign language, one for older children and one for younger children, this year.

**Programmes that could be addressing children**

Programmes labelled family programmes in the TV guide and/or in the archive text were also ordered from the archive for viewing, because they might address children within the family category.

When searching the TV guides, the archive text, the UR website, the companies annual reports and previous research, there were some programmes, in addition to the more distinct programme categories discussed thus far, that had clues signalling that they might be *TV for children*. These turned up in more unpredictable ways, for example animated programmes in unusual time slots,

---

49 E.g., *Sweets (Karamelli)*, a “children’s programme in Finnish” according to the archive text and it is subtitled in Swedish, (SVT1, 20070405, 17.00-17.30); *Around in nature – hen bottoms and cow feet – Turkish (Runt i naturen – hönsrumpa och kofötter – turkiska)* is for primary school children according to the UR website. (UR, SVT1, 20070405, 11.00-11.10); *The cat, the mouse, 10 000 – Spanish, (Katten, musen, tiotusen - spanska)*. The programme is in Spanish and labelled “preschool” by the UR website, (UR, SVT1, 20070927, 11.30-11.40).

50 E.g., *Kaksi/Två* (the number 2 in both Finnish and Swedish) is for young people according to the UR website; the programmes are mostly in Finnish and occasionally in Swedish (UR, SVT1, 20070404, 9.30-10.00); *Around in nature – hen bottoms and cow feet – Arabic (Runt i naturen – hönsrumpa och kofötter – arabiska)*, is for primary school children according to the UR website. It is not subtitled (UR, SVT1, 20070405, 11.10-11.20); *Una Junna*, is a children’s programme in Saami according to the TV guide and subtitled in Swedish (SVT1, 20071021, 9.00-9.15).

51 Selection – Swedish as a second language – Script and acting, (UR-val – Svenska som andra språk – Manus och skådespelare) (UR, SVT1, 20070919,11.00-11.15); Selection – Swedish as second language – writing and inspiration (UR-val – svenska som andra språk, Skrivande och inspiration) (UR, SVT1, 20071005, 11.00-11.15). These programmes target middle school and secondary school according to the UR website.

52 *Pi* (the mathematical number, I suppose) “for the somewhat older children” (in the archive text) (e.g., SVT1, 20070405, 17.30-17.45); *The Fairy Tale Tree (Sagaträdet)*, labelled “children” in the archive text (e.g., SVT1, 20070405, 17.45-18.00).

53 E.g., *The Muppet Show (Muppeterna)* is described as a “family show” (familjeföreställning) in the TV guide, (SVT1, 19800404, 18.55-19.20); *Open Sunday (Söndagsöppet)* is for the “entire family” according to the TV guide, (SVT1, 19920419, 17.30-18.00, 18.15-20.00); *Video evening with Luuk (Videokväll med Luuk)* is “family entertainment” the TV guide states, (SVT1, 20071005, 14.00-15.00).

54 E.g., *The Flintstones (Familjen Flinta)* SVT1, 19800403, 19.30-20.00; Betty Boop, SVT2, 19800909, 20.50-21.00.
taries with a title and/or a description pointing out children as a possible audience. Or it could be a drama where the information in the TV guide stated that the content concerned children in some way. To be selected, the programme needed to be written about in the TV guides, the archive texts, previous research, programme websites and policy texts in such a way that made it seem likely that it was intended for children up to 18 years of age. If it seemed likely that a programme might target children, it was ordered from the archive for viewing.

In this way, all programmes were ordered from the archive that were mentioned in the TV guides, the archive text, the UR website, the companies annual reports and previous research in connection with clues signalling that the programmes might target children. By tracing programmes in this way, I assembled a large number of different programmes targeting different groups of children within the age span on 0-18 and broadcast by both public service companies. However, any programmes that were not described in any of the sources in ways that signalled that they targeted people younger than 18 years of age are not part of the research material. But ordering the programmes was only the first step in selecting TV programmes for children. All the ordered programmes had to be watched to determine whether they did in fact address children.

Watching TV for children

I watched all the ordered programmes to decide whether they addressed children and thus whether or not they should be included in the study. Most of them did, but if a programme, for example, only addressed adults and talked about children for an adult audience, it was excluded.

The selection procedure continued as an ongoing process of searching programme information and watching the programmes. For instance, while I watched a programme, the announcers and/or the programme hosts could remark on the target group for adjacent programmes. If this happened, I ordered those programmes, and watched them to see if they addressed children.

The programmes labelled children’s programmes, stated to be “for children”, produced by the SVT Children’s department, belonging to series of programmes for children, or targeting children as expressed by school stages or age, for ex-

---

55 E.g., Born with TV (Född med TV), SVT1, 19800404, 20.00-21.00; In everyday life dreams are born (I vardagen föds drömmen) SVT1, 19920416, 16.35-16.45; Why democracy: Vote for me! (Varför demokrati: Rösta på mig!), SVT1, 20071013, 13.00-14.00.

56 E.g., Francesca, SVT1, 19801003, 18.10-19.00; The Flea (Loppan), SVT1, 19920418, 14.00-15.40; Falling gracefully (Falla vackert), SVT, 20070406, 13.20-15.00.
ample, almost always had an explicit child address. This became obvious in the way the content, the talk and the visual aspects of the programmes were presented. Only four of these programmes did not have such an address.\(^{57}\) I chose to include these four programmes anyway, as they were said to target children and these programmes then had to be viewed in light of the explicitly mentioned target group.

Another programme in regard to which the complexity of targeting a child audience can be discussed is called *Sex with Viktor (Sex med Viktor).*\(^{58}\) The programme was not marked in any particular way as targeting children in the TV guide, but it appears in the policy material where it is stated to target “older teenagers and young adults” (*AR, SVT 2007: 58*). In the archive text it is, however, coded: “children”. The programme features young people, and issues related to sex and relationships are its focus. The programme host is in his mid-twenties and he is talking with young people about sex-related issues. It is broadcast at 21.00 and rerun at 00.35. The programmes address young people and are therefore part of the research material. What this programme accentuates is how wide and diverse the category ‘children’ is in terms of television, as a programme can be labelled “children,” said to target older teenagers and young adults, and feature as well as address young people. This programme thereby shows that 0-18 years of age is not an extraordinary age span to work with as concerns *TV for children* and that researching it requires a multifaceted methodological approach.

The family programmes selected were also watched in search for signs of child address. In 1980, several of the ordered programmes were included in the research material because they addressed children. For example, *The Muppet Show (Mupparna)*\(^{59}\) was included because of the child address created by the broadcasting time and that it stars talking puppets, *Saturday Sweets (Lördags-

\(^{57}\) *Following the steps of gold diggers (I guldgrävarnas fotspår),* about the gold rush in the Klondike, where history is told without making it child centred in any way, but where the programme is “from the Children’s department”, (*SVT2, 1980040218.00-18.30*); *Tubs (Tunnelbanor),* a short documentary about tubes not doing anything to explicitly address children, however, the announcer introduces the programme in a child centred way, (*SVT2, 19800405, 18.50-19.00)*; Also two language programmes lack a specific child address, as it is the level of language that is the prime content used for educational purposes and hence these two documentaries address children as language learners. *Weekday in Moscow (Vardag i Moskva),* UR, *SVT1, 199201009, 09.15-09.30; Des femmes et des camions,* UR, *SVT1, 19921009, 12.10-12.30.*

\(^{58}\) *Sex with Viktor (Sex med Viktor),* SVT1, 20070919, 21.00-21.30; 20071022, SVT1, 0.35 - 1.05.

\(^{59}\) *The Muppet Show (Mupparna),* SVT1, 19800404, 18.55-19.20.
addresses children in that there is a competition involving children only, and Circus - a noble art (Circus – skön konst) addresses children by virtue of its time slot and that the circus is a cultural event for children (cf. Berger, 1982; deCordova, 1994).

Several of the ordered family programmes from 1992 addressed children by the fact that children had a central role in these programmes. For example, the quiz show The Main Thread (Röda tråden) stars only young people as contestants. In Open Sunday (Söndagsöppet), 7-9 and Good Morning, Sweden (Go’morron Sverige) children are addressed by specific parts of the programmes and they are contestants in competitions. In Cosby the children in the portrayed family are significant characters in the drama, and in the episode included in the present study the two youngest girls are the main characters.

The programmes referred to as family programmes in the TV guide in 2007, however, only addressed adults and therefore no family programme from 2007 is included in the research material.

Reflections on the selection process

The process of ordering and selecting programmes in this way may seem complicated, but if I had done it differently there would have been consequences for the research material. For example, an archive search for ‘children’ would only have given me programmes for which the word children was written in the information text. Far from all programmes for children had the word children stated in the archive text, while many other programmes not targeting children did. If I had only focussed on the children’s programmes, the broadcasts for children would have looked very sparse. To begin with, such a focus would have excluded all educational programmes, youth programmes, family programmes, pro-

60 Saturday Sweets (Lördagsgodis), SVT1, 19800405, 20.00-21.00.
61 Circus - a noble art (Circus – skön konst), SVT2, 19800407, 18.20-19.30.
62 The Main Thread (Röda tråden), SVT1, 19920416, 21.45-22.10; 19920907, 17.25-17.50; 19921001, 22.00-22.25.
63 Open Sunday (Söndagsöppet), SVT1, 19920419, 17.30-18.00, 18.15-20.00; 19921025, 17.30-18.00, 19.15-20.00.
64 7-9, SVT1, 19921017, 19.00-21.00.
65 Good Morning, Sweden (Go’morron Sverige) SVT2, 19921017, 8.00-10.00.
66 Cosby SVT2, 19920419, 20.00-20.25.
67 That’s how it should sound (Så ska det låta), SVT1, 20070406, 20.00-21.00; Video evening with Luuk (Videokväll med Luuk), SVT1, 20071005, 14.00-15.00; Babben & co, SVT1, 20071021, 13.55-14.55.
programmes for children belonging to minorities, and programmes for children with disabilities. Moreover, it would also have excluded programmes addressing children but not aired within the usual time slot for children’s programmes, as well as programmes not clearly stating that they were children’s programmes. The way I chose to select programmes has given a much broader insight of what has been shown for children on public service television, and the research material selected using this process reflects this. However, by selecting research material in this manner I may have missed programmes that target children if the sources I have used (the TV-guide, the archive text, the broadcasting companies’ annual reports and websites, previous research, and comments and announcements in relation to other programmes for children) have not given any keys to suggest that children were the targeted audience.

I watched all ordered programmes from beginning to end. This means I watched more programmes than are included in the research material, as some were disqualified from the study based on their lack of child address. Also the way in which I watched the programme material matters for what has been defined as TV for children. I watched the programmes using an inspectional gaze, rather than the glance of casual TV watching (cf. Ellis, 2006). I have done so in order to study how these programmes address their viewers and what this address says about what the viewers are imagined to be. This differs from how these programmes set out to address their audience, but I do not place myself in the position of a potential child viewer. Rather it is from an adult position that I, drawing on a child perspective (cf. Halldén, 2003), put the addressed child audience at the centre of my research focus.

In this way I went about studying the scheduling, the programmes and the segments of TV for children to identify the TV flow intended for a child audience. When investigating the details of the TV schedule and the TV programming, there is a TV flow for children, but not a flow that continues endlessly like for the adult audience (cf. William, 1990). Children are an audience that are expected to watch TV only when they are addressed. They are not encouraged to keep watching for long periods of time like the rest of the TV audience.

Information was gathered on all programmes’ day of broadcast, time of broadcast, length and production year and whether the programmes had been broadcast previously, when such information exists. In the TV guide and the archive text this information is rarely stated, and the credits of specific programmes

---

68 I have watched more than 40 additional hours of TV broadcasts that have not been selected for analysis including some of the commercial channel TV4 broadcasts for children from 1992 and some programmes from SVT’s digital Children’s Channel from 2007.
and/or programme parts are often cut or not shown at all, making the original of
the images and/or clips difficult to trace. This, however, changes over the years
and more credits are shown in 2007 than in 1980. But a clear picture of the or-
gins of the programmes is not easy to get (see also Forsman, 2000). What is
sometimes stated in both the TV guide and in the archive text is whether a pro-
gramme has been aired on the public service channels previously, and in that
case when. Many of the programmes in the research material are reruns. It is
common that programmes are rerun close to the main broadcast, but also that
programmes for children are rerun over the years, which means that some pro-
grammes for children shown are quite old. A good example of this is classical
cartoons, like Betty Boop and Mickey Mouse, which were produced during the
1930s and 1940s but aired during all three of the studied years.

In my definition, with the limitations that I have already put forward, TV for
children during the 42 days contains 491 programmes, 120 from 1980, 141 from
1992 and 230 from 2007 (see the overview on page 36). Even though the num-
er of programmes increased over time, this cannot be interpreted as indicating
that more TV for children was broadcast in the main channels in 2007 than the
other years, in fact TV for children makes up about 60 hours of broadcast TV in
SVT1 and SVT2 for each year (62 hours 1980, 58 hours 1992 and 59 hours in
2007). In 2007, however, the programmes are shorter and in longer pro-
grammes subheadings are used, which results in many more programme titles in
2007 than for the other two years.

Analytical procedures

As has been discussed in the previous chapter, the study has a discursive ap-
proach. It sets out to investigate how the imagined child audience is configured

69 There are sometimes notes in the TV guide and/or the archive text stating that programmes
have been broadcast previously. In 1980: 41 programmes out of 120, in 1992: 52 out of 141,
and in 2007: 75 out of 230 programmes were marked as reruns. This gives a percentage of
slightly above 30% of rerun programmes for children during the selected dates for all my
studied years (34% in 1980, 37% in 1992 and 32% in 2007). The notes in the archive texts do
not say anything about whether the programmes have been rerun since then.
70 E.g., Betty Boop, I heard, SVT2, 19800909, 20.50-21.00 from 1933; Betty Boop, Snow
White, SVT2, 19920109, 17.10 (within another programme) from 1933; Mickey Mouse, The
Pointer, SVT1, 19920417, 19.00-20.00 (within another programme) from 1939, Mickey
Mouse, A Gentleman’s Gentleman, SVT1, 20070407, 18.00-19.00 (within another pro-
gramme) from 1941.
71 Here the choice to not include the Children’s Channel is crucial, had the Children’s Chan-
nel been included more than 160 hours of broadcast would have been added in 2007.
in a diverse material, and the analytical tools have been chosen in relation to this aim. Discourse analysis is originally a linguistic method (cf. Diaz-Bone, et al., 2007; Potter & Wetherell, 1994; Wetherell & Potter, 1992). The study of policy texts is thereby well suited to this tradition (cf. Diaz-Bone, et al., 2007; e.g., Wetherell & Potter, 1992). However, studying images using discourse analysis, without turning them into text, has been debated (cf. Caldwell, 1995). Rose (2001) nonetheless argues that discourse analysis can be used successfully to analyse visual material. She maintains that images are so tightly connected with texts and verbal statements that the same method can be used to study all these modes of communication as long as their specificities are not neglected in the research (Rose, 2001). Other researchers also argue for using visual materials in discourse analysis (e.g., Diaz-Bone, 2007; Sparrman, 2002), and discourse analysis has previously been used to study TV programming (e.g., Allen, 1992; Edin, 2000; Lindgren, A., 2006; Potter & Wetherell, 1994).

In the analysis, I have focused on the discursive practices (cf. Diaz-Bone, et al., 2007; Wetherell & Potter, 1992) of both the policy text and the TV programming. In other words, I have studied the ways in which things are written, said, re/produced and visualized in the texts and the TV programmes to discover how these materials address issues of children as a TV audience. When researching the policy texts, my focus has been on statements about children and children as a TV audience, how these statements have been articulated and in what kind of contexts these statements occur (cf. Diaz-Bone, et al., 2007; Foucault, 1994; Foucault, 1993; Wetherell & Potter, 1992). When investigating the TV programming, my focus has also been on how things are articulated when spoken about and when written on screen (cf. Potter & Wetherell, 1994; Wetherell & Potter, 1992). But when analysing the TV programming, the visual aspects of TV for children have been central; thus how things are visualized for a child audience has been an issue of special interest (cf. Rose, 2001). The relational aspects between and within both the broadcasting policy texts and the TV programming have been studied in terms of context (cf. Rose, 2001; Wetherell & Potter, 1992), bearing in mind that text and TV programming are different, though interlinked media (cf. Mitchell, 2005a;b; Potter & Wetherell, 1994; Rose, 2001).

To focus more specifically on the continuous productivity of discursive practices (cf. Diaz-Bone, et al., 2007), I have used Woolgar’s (1991) concept of configuration. He argues that targeting a specified audience with a specific product (in Woolgar’s case machine – text and in this case a medium – product) configures both the imagined user and the product itself. In this way, the TV institution’s way of producing TV programming comes to configure its user, i.e. the audience. This production also works in the opposite direction; by configuring the
child audience, the public service institution also configures itself as institution. This means, in turn, that the overall child TV audience that public service TV configures at the same time says something about public service broadcasting. Therefore, using a discursive approach when researching TV for children makes it possible to analyse the expectations and limitations that society sets for the child audience, but also what kind of knowledge and taken-for-granted truths about the category ‘children’ these notions rest on (cf. Janson, 2007; Lindgren, A., 2006; Sparrman, 2002).

As discussed above, defining what constitutes TV for children is an analytical process in itself, and when analysing the material in depth a new process is started. By using some of the methodological advice offered by Rose (2001) on how to approach visual material discursively, I began by “immersing” (Rose, 2001: 158) myself in the material and I watched it over and over again while taking notes. I was also careful about “paying attention to details” (Rose, 2001: 158), studying closely what the programmes contained, what was said in them and what was visualized for a child audience. Finally I proceeded by “identifying themes” (Rose, 2001: 158) that the repeated watching and paying attention to details had made visible. Three themes of specific interest to how TV for children addresses its imagined viewers, and thereby configures a child audience, have emerged from the analysis. The first theme that emerged from the analysis was nature. It turned out that nature as content left few programmes untouched, and therefore the focus of Chapter 4 is on how nature as TV content addresses a child audience. The second theme that emerged through watching the programmes was the pedagogic verbal address used in many programmes, and this theme is therefore explored in detail in Chapter 5. A third theme that emerged regards how child viewers are made visible on screen. In Chapter 4 I examine how viewer-programme interactivity forms a visual address in TV for children. A thorough analysis of the themes and how they are formed will be presented in each chapter.

I will now move on to the analytical chapters of the thesis, where the policy texts and the TV programming will be analysed in terms of how the imagined child audience is configured in this research material.
Chapter 3
The child audience in Swedish TV policy

Introduction

This chapter focuses on the policy that forms the foundation for television on a structural level. In the policy documents, discursive notions of ideology, societal debates, taken-for-granted truths and views on categories, the media, everyday life and society at large are expressed as well as re/produced (cf. James & James, 2004). In this chapter, I will study the legal framework for broadcasting and the TV institution’s annual reports. I will look at how the categories ‘audience’ and ‘children’ are articulated and, as a consequence, how the policy documents produce possibilities for imagining a child TV audience.

Children’s role in media policy and how policy affects this group is under researched and thus in need of more investigation (Jordan, 2011; for studies see, e.g., Heins, 2007; Lisosky, 2001; Oswell, 2008; Simpson, 2004). Brian Simpson (2004) demonstrates the relevance of a such approach in his study of broadcasting regulations in Australia, also drawing on examples from the UK, the US and Canada. Simpson argues that the regulation is an important part of the construction of childhood and he writes:

What this means is that the concept of state regulation of the relationship between children and television is highly problematic. Choices exist with respect to the form of that regulation, and while these choices are shaped by different ideas which exist in society with respect to the nature of childhood and the role of television, the law too becomes part of the process which shapes society’s views about both children and television. (Simpson, 2004: 7)

Simpson (2004) finds that the legal discourse draws upon different notions of children. In broadcasting legislation, children are mostly regarded as innocent and in great need of protection from television content. This legislation focuses
on content that is seen as harmful to and/or unsuitable for children, such as violence, sexuality and consumption (Simpson, 2004). He points to how the descriptions in broadcasting legislation differ from other legal discourse, such as that found in the juvenile justice system and the family court, where children are viewed as competent (Simpson, 2004). Thereby, some legal discourses treat children as being entitled to having their voices heard and responsible for their actions in regard to their age, while others do not. Simpson (2004), therefore, claims that what can be seen as harmful to children depends on how children are viewed (see also Heins 2007). He relates his argument to the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) and to the First Amendment of the US Constitution when criticizing how freedom of speech and information is treated in relation to children in TV regulations (Simpson, 2004). US legislation is also the focal point in Marjorie Heins’ (2007) argument that censorship of children’s broadcasting can be viewed as a breach of the First Amendment. 72 Both Simpson (2004) and Heins (2007) argue that children, in their opinion, have a much greater need for information than for protection from information. 73

To study law and policy is in this way crucial to understanding how childhood is discursively performed in society (James & James, 2004). Moreover, policy is an area where children are seldom let in to have a say (Davies & Machin, 2000). This makes policy an arena where boundaries for the category ‘children’ are established, but where children themselves have limited possibilities to have an influence.

Policy documents, like laws and regulations, articulate the legal boundaries for institutions. The ways in which these boundaries are interpreted and negotiated on the institutional level are articulated in other policy documents, such as annual reports. This chapter looks into policy for Swedish broadcasting media both in terms of legislation and in terms of the TV institution’s annual reports.

Policy in this study refers to:

- Legal Acts
- Broadcasting contracts and licences
- Annual reports

The legal framework that all television and radio companies have to follow when broadcasting from Sweden is primarily set out in The Radio Act and The

72 Heins (2005) also studies some European legislation.
73 See also Carter & Davies (2005) regarding how children’s need of information is handled in the news.
Radio and TV Act, issued by the Swedish parliament. Broadcasting contracts and broadcasting licences outline the general obligations and the rights to broadcast for the Swedish Public Service Television Company, SVT, and The Swedish Educational Broadcasting Company, UR. They draw on The Radio Act and The Radio and TV Act, respectively, and are outlined by the Swedish government. The broadcasting companies’ annual reports primarily aim at demonstrating how SVT and UR have fulfilled their obligations to the state. The present study focuses on three specific points in time, and the policy material is thereby selected for the years 1980, 1992 and 2007. These policy texts are described in more detail in the sections in which they are analysed.

The focus of the analysis is on how the child audience is configured in TV programming aimed at children. In this chapter, it is the boundaries for TV programming that are in focus. Therefore my research interest lies in how the child audience is articulated in relation to programming in these policy texts. Questions that have guided the analysis are: Is there such a thing as a child audience defined in TV policy? If so what characteristics is this category ascribed, and how is it related to notions of the audience more generally and to programming? Can discourses of risk and assets concerning children and TV be traced in the documents? Does the discursive notion of children and TV change over the three decades, 1980-2007? And what does the analysis tell us about the configuration of an imagined child audience and its characteristics?

In this chapter, I will first analyse the legal acts. Thereafter follows an analysis of the contracts and licences, and finally the annual reports are studied.

The law and the audience

The Radio Act (1966:755) was the law in force in 1980 and in 1992. It was originally issued in 1966. In 1996, The Radio and Television Act (1996:844) replaced The Radio Act. The legal texts can be amended when so decided by the parliament, and I have analysed the laws and their amendments for the different years under study. To distinguish between them, I call the respective acts in

---

74 Broadcasting is also regulated by, for example, The Fundamental Law on Freedom of Expression (Yttrandefrihetsgrundlagen, 1991:1469), which regulates freedom of expression on a constitutional level. This law will not be analysed, however, as the focus here is specifically on broadcasting.

75 Preceding Government Bills sometimes influence the laws and the regulatory framework and I have also used these to interpret some of the more factual comments in the policy documents.

The absent audience

The RA 1980 stresses that the right to broadcast “shall be practised impartially and objectively. Thereto it shall be taken into consideration that extensive freedom of speech and information is to prevail in broadcasting”.

There are few references to programming in this text, but it is pointed out that programming must “claim the democratic polity values and the principle of all humans’ equal value and of each individual’s freedom and dignity”. This wording is also present in 1992 and 2007. Children are not mentioned at all in the 1980 document. In fact this text lacks an audience position altogether. Instead “the public” is mentioned. If “the public” is the receiver of a radio and/or TV transmission, the transmission is defined as a broadcast. The public, in this way, becomes the defining principle for broadcasts. It is, thereby, the public that the legislator is considering and it is the civic rights of all humans that must not be violated by broadcasts. This wide and somewhat imprecise notion of whom the broadcasts were transmitted for in 1980, however, was something that would change over time in the laws.

Children and commercialism

In 1992, a change took place on the Swedish media arena. The public service monopoly on terrestrial broadcasts ceased to exist and the law was adjusted to these new circumstances. The RA 1992 therefore, for the first time, regulated not only the public service broadcasting companies but also the commercially financed programme company TV4. The paragraph banning advertisements altogether was removed from the Act, while others were included stating conditions

76 In 2010, a new Radio and Television Act (2010:696) replaced The Radio and Television Act (1996:844). As this law was issued after 2007 it will not be analysed here.

77 (RA 1980: 6§; RA 1992: 6§; see also R&TA 2007, Ch. 3 & 6 1§). In 2007, impartially, freedom of speech and information are aims that the legal text refers to the broadcasting license to regulate. Thereby they are present in the law but must only be practiced if the broadcasting licence for the individual broadcasting company states it too, which the licences for both UR and SVT do. Objectivity, however, is not mentioned in The R&TA 2007. All quotations from the empirical material are originally in Swedish and have been translated by the author.

78 RA 1980:6 §.

79 RA 1992: 6§; R&TA 2007, Ch. 3 & 6 1§.

80 RA 1980: 1§; also in RA 1992: 1§; and R&TA 2007: 1§.
for broadcasting commercials. With the addition of these new paragraphs, children appeared in the text.\textsuperscript{81} The 1992 law makes clear that TV advertising “must not aim at capturing the attention of children under the age of 12”,\textsuperscript{82} The category ‘children’ is the only group added to the text as compared to The RA 1980. It is, however, not all children who are mentioned in this new wording. Rather, the wording concerns only those under 12 years of age.

The government bill that preceded the change in the law made clear that “younger children” needed special regulations, as they “have not yet learnt to clearly separate advertising programming from other TV programming”.\textsuperscript{83} The understanding of “younger children” in the government bill originates from the Council of Legislation. The law proposal was referred to the Council of Legislation for consideration and the council demanded a concretization of the term “younger children”. The council’s understanding of the intention of the wording “younger children” in the proposal was that “the regulation should affect adverts and programmes that mainly target children who have not yet reached puberty”.\textsuperscript{84} Based on this argument the council argued for a 12-year age limit to be included in the Act, and this limit was subsequently included.

Other types of Swedish legislation use 12 years as a boundary for when a child must be consulted in legal matters that concern her or him (Government Official Report, 1996:11; Schiratzki, 2011:135). It is thus consideration of children’s agency that age limits of this kind are most often intended to address. However, this is not the case in The RA 1992 (and R&TA 2007). Instead, via the government bill, it is the incompetence of children up to 12 years of age that is in focus. These children are said to be less able to distinguish programme content from advertisements, and it is their bodily development that is referred to as the basis for this claim. No other support is provided for either the notion that children under 12 years of age have difficulties distinguishing programming from advertisements or the notion that reaching puberty affects this type of media literacy. What is significant in this text is that young children are singled out and distinguished from all other audience groups in regard to broadcast advertising, making them a special audience in need of protection (cf. Buckingham, et al., 1999; Davies, Buckingham & Kelly, 1999).

In the same paragraph it is also stated that “people or characters that play a prominent role in television programmes mainly targeting children under the age

\textsuperscript{81} RA 1992: 8-15§.
\textsuperscript{82} RA 1992: 11§; also in R&TA 2007: Ch.7, 4§.
\textsuperscript{83} Government Bill 1990/91:149, p. 121.
\textsuperscript{84} Government Bill 1990/91:149, p. 121.
of 12\textsuperscript{85} may not appear in commercials. This restriction does not only regard programming for children. News anchors, journalist and other people important for news programmes are also not allowed to take part in advertisements.\textsuperscript{86} The fact that people connected with other kinds of programmes are not mentioned indicates the special status of programmes for children and news. News is a TV genre intimately connected to aims of objectivity and impartiality, which can be seen in the government bill preceding that change of the law (e.g., \textit{Government Bill 1990/91:149}; see also Hadenius, Weibull & Wadbring, 2011). If people recognized from news broadcasts were associated with commercial messages, there is a risk that the objectivity and seriousness of the news genre would be compromised. The same claim cannot be made for people and/or figures starring in children’s programmes. They are often fictive characters, thereby limiting their objectivity claims from the start. Rather, when the legislation prohibits TV characters that are well-known for children from spreading consumption messages, this draws on notions of children as being unable to understand the differences between different media formats and thus as being lured into consumption by familiar characters (\textit{Government Bill 1990/91:149}; see also Sparrman, 2009).

In 1992, advertisements were not allowed to interrupt programmes.\textsuperscript{87} In 2007, they could do so under certain circumstances and with some exceptions. There are only two types of programmes in 2007 that may not under any circumstances be interrupted by commercials: programmes for children up to 12 years of age and church services.\textsuperscript{88} The basis for these restrictions draws on EU TV legislation as well as Swedish legislation, which can be read in a government bill.\textsuperscript{89} In the \textit{TV Directive}, it is only church services that may not be interrupted by advertisements under any circumstances.\textsuperscript{90} In the Swedish legislation programmes for children are added to this group.\textsuperscript{91} Why church services are to be protected is not discussed, but the legislation makes clear that these types of programmes are not to be associated with commercial activities. Programmes for children are in this

\textsuperscript{85} RA 1992: 11§; R\&TA 2007: Ch.7, 4§.
\textsuperscript{86} RA 1992: 9; R\&TA 2007: Ch.7, 3§.
\textsuperscript{87} RA 1992: 15§.
\textsuperscript{88} R\&TA 2007: Ch.7, 7b§.
\textsuperscript{89} \textit{Government Bill} 2001/02:82, p. 14.
\textsuperscript{90} The \textit{TV Directive} 89/552/EEG; 97/36/EG: 11.3-11.5.
\textsuperscript{91} In the \textit{TV directive}, other programme categories have a minimum programme length over which they may be interrupted by commercials. Programmes for children are part of this group. The other programme categories mentioned in the \textit{TV directive} also have a minimum programme length stated in the Swedish legislation (\textit{Government Bill 1990/91:149}, pp. 8-10, 14).
respect an protected programme category just as church services are in the Swedish context.

The paragraphs on advertising and children do not stop at this, but further stress that advertising must not occur “immediately before or after a programme or part of a programme that mainly targets children under 12 years”. Such an extension of the protected media territory only applies to programmes for children and thereby only to the child audience. In The RA 1992 and The R&TA 2007, all paragraphs concerning advertisements state that children should not encounter advertising. No other programme category is so well protected and no other group is considered to this extent in the legislation. The legislators as well as the broadcasters are to protect this audience group from messages of consumption on the basis of an age categorization. This categorization is based on a discursive understandings of bodily development thought to reflect children’s actual ability to distinguish between commercial messages and other programming. How the link between age, puberty and media literacy is made, however, remains unexplained in these texts.

Children as consumers

In the paragraphs on advertising, the anti-consumption message in regard to children has been quite firmly stressed, as seen, but when penalties for not adhering to regulations are discussed in The R&TA 2007, the wording is different. The text refers to a breach of regulations as treating “consumers inappropriate-ly”. Consumers are only mentioned here in the text, which must be understood in light of the fact that this paragraph refers to The Marketing Act, which acts on behalf of consumers. What is worth noting is that one of the paragraphs, for which penalties are regulated, aims at protecting children. Therefore the category consumers also includes them. It is, thereby, possible to articulate children as belonging to the group consumers also within this text, where the category children has thus far been put forward as a group that needs protection from consumption altogether.

92 R&TA 2007: Ch.7, 7b§; also in RA 1992: 15§. This is stated in two separate sentences in 1992.
93 R&TA 2007, Ch.10, 7§.
94 R&TA 2007: Ch.10, 7§.
95 R&TA 2007: Ch. 7, 4§.
96 See also Sjöberg (2013) for a thorough analysis of how children are regarded as consumers in Swedish legislation.
Child viewers, violence and pornography

On an overall level, illegal matters regarding freedom of expression, such as child pornography, are regulated in The Fundamental Law on Freedom of Expression (Yttrandefrihetsgrundlagen, 1991:1469). In terms of regulating broadcast content, the broadcasting legislation states that “the particular impact of radio and television” should be taken into consideration in regard to subject matter and time of broadcast. The Swedish Broadcasting Commission is the body that examines this particular impact for “a large public audience, where all ages are represented”. Issues regarding content were not further regulated in the broadcasting legislation before 1996. However, when the new R&TA was instated in 1996, thereby also valid in 2007, it stated that the broadcaster is required to issue warnings before showing, but also during, “programmes with explicit violent depictions of a realistic character or with pornographic images”. All viewers should thereby know beforehand that content of this sort is to be expected. These types of programmes, however, “may not be broadcast at times and in ways that entail a considerable risk that children may be watching the programmes, unless there are extenuating circumstances justifying it”. The wording of the paragraph also reflects an adjustment of Swedish legislation to the EU TV directive. What this wording spells out is the broadcaster’s responsibility to protect children from violent and/or pornographic content altogether.

In this way, it is adjustment to EU regulations that enters this form of content regulation for children into the Act. It can be noted that no age range is given for the category ‘children’. No children are viewed as a suitable audience for these kinds of images. However, what the law does focus on, and what is not referred to the EU directive in the government bill, is that violent and pornographic content may be broadcast when children could be watching if there are special circumstances that warrant it. This must be understood in relation to the demand for freedom of speech and information, and to the democratic values stressed for all broadcasts, as discussed above. News programmes are also given as exam-

As I have demonstrated, no reference to children or broadcasts for children was made until commercial TV was introduced into The RA in 1992. During the era of broadcasting monopoly, there was no need to stress children’s protection from commercial messages as no broadcaster had the right to air such content, but when commercial actors came onto the Swedish broadcasting arena, it is made clear that commercialism is viewed as something that children need to be protected from. When the Swedish legislation is to harmonize with the EU broadcasting legislation, the protection of children from commercial messages is kept stricter than what the EU TV directive stipulates. However, the fact that violence and pornography are emphasized as phenomena that the category ‘children’ needs protection from marks a divergence from prior Swedish practice. The Swedish Broadcasting Commission had previously examined, and is still examining, what could be upsetting and frightening to a large public audience consisting of all ages, but in accordance with the EU TV directive children are specifically referred to as being in need of protection from violence and pornography, from 1996 onwards (Government Bill, 1995/96:160).

In the Swedish context, this time period, 1980-2007, saw an increased interest in children’s rights. This is reflected in a set of new legislation on children and the best interest of the child during the 1980s and 1990s – most notably in relation to ratification of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) in Sweden in 1990 (Barnombudsmannen, 1999; Sandin, 2011; Sandin & Halldén, 2003; Söderlind & Engwall, 2005). In the UNCRC, a view on children as active agents is stressed, and this notion therefore gives rise to legal changes, which are to harmonize with the convention (cf. Sparrman, 2009; Schiratzki, 2003). In the UNCRC, a tension comes to the fore that is based on the duality between the competence of children and their need for protection (Lindgen & Halldén, 2001; Sandin, 2011; Schiratzki, 2003). In the legal texts studied here, however, it is the protection of children that is articulated as being a result of commercial TV broadcasting and an adjustment to EU regulations. Children are in no way put forward as agents in these acts, and it is foremost children’s limitations in terms of bodily development and competence that the legislative measures lean on.

Now, we will turn to the legislative documents that regulate the public service companies specifically and look at how children are regarded in these texts.

---

104 The Swedish Broadcasting Commission website:
http://www.radioochtv.se/Tillsyn/Reglerna/SVT-SR-och-UR/#Mediets%20genomslagskraft
Retrieved 20130207
Programming and categorization in contracts and licenses

Broadcasting contracts and licenses regulate SVT’s and UR’s right to broadcast. They are agreements between the government and the programme companies, and draw on The RA or The R&TA. The agreements are valid for several years. The Ministry of Education and/or the Ministry of Culture outline these documents. In his study of SVT, Johan Lindén (2011) defines these texts as the most important control documents for programme production and what in practice comes to define public service broadcasting. The agreements were contracts up to the mid-1990s and thereafter licences. In this section, the analysis of these texts focuses on whom the broadcasts are to be made for and how the categories of audience and children are articulated in relation to programming. It is the broadcasting contracts (BC) that were valid for the programme companies in 1980, 1992 and the broadcasting licenses (BL) that were valid in 2007, which I will analyse in this section.

Programming for the population

The broadcasting contracts for SVT and UR in 1980 and 1992 follow closely The Radio Act, but have more detailed sections on programming. The contracts make clear that “the programming should provide knowledge and experiences, mediate experience as well as presenting good entertainment” and in regard to “quality, accessibility and diversity, to a reasonable extent see to the varying needs and interests of the country’s population”. The broadcasting contracts for UR in 1980 and 1992 are less extensive than those for SVT, but the framing of the programming is quite similar, as UR is to “through quality, accessibility and diversity to a reasonable extent provide for the different educa-

---

105 The BC that was valid for SVT in 1980 was issued in 1979 and ran until 1986. The BC that was valid in 1992 for SVT was issued in 1986 and ran until 1992. The BL that was valid for SVT in 2007 was issued in 2007 and ran until 2009. The timeframe for UR’s contacts and license are the same as for SVT’s.

106 It was decided in the mid-1990s that licences with stated terms for broadcasting rights were more in line with the Swedish constitution (Government Bill 1995/96: 160; see also Edin, 2000). Funding conditions (Anslagsvillkor) also shape the broadcasting companies’ activities (Lindén, 2011). These documents were instated together with the licences (Government Bill 1995/96: 160). There are, however, no references to programming or audience in the SVT Funding Conditions for SVT 2007 and this document is therefore not analysed.

107 That is also the relation between the broadcasting licences for SVT and UR in 2007 and The Radio and Television Act.

108 BC SVT, 1980: 10§; BC SVT, 1992; §6; see also BL SVT, 2007: 7§. Notable differences in 2007 are that quality has a sentence of its own, that the word "needs" is replaced by "prerequisites", and most notably that entertainment is no longer stated as a goal for SVT.

67
tional needs and interests of the country’s population.” The specific focus on education is what separates UR’s mission from SVT’s. This can also be seen in relation to programming and target groups, as UR is to broadcast programming within “the educational arena” focusing on “preschool and upper secondary school, college and adult education.” Thus, UR has a more limited programming focus than does SVT and a more specific target group – i.e. one focused on learning within the educational system.

SVT’s target group is more diverse and larger, in that it is the entire population of the country. SVT is also to provide a wider range of programming, not limited to education as UR’s programming is. SVT programming is, however, regulated in several sections of the contracts from 1980 and 1992. For example, SVT must “provide the comprehensive information citizens need to be oriented and to take a stand on societal and cultural issues”. Also eight other issues are put forward to form the content of the programming, something that the texts regulating UR lack altogether.

The groups considered in the paragraphs regulating SVT’s programming in 1980 and in 1992 are mainly defined as “the population” or as “the citizens”, and thereby these groups are articulated in these documents as the prime beneficiaries from the broadcasts. The population and the citizens are also divided into other categorizations, as the programme companies should also “particularly consider different groups of disabled individuals” and “linguistic and ethnic minorities”.

The term “audience” is not mentioned in the main paragraphs on programming in any of the contracts, but it appears when the programme companies are to broadcast corrections in the event they have failed to adhere to the terms of

---

109 BC UR, 1980: 10§; BC UR, 1992; §6; see also BL UR, 2007: 9§. Notable differences for UR in 2007 are that quality has a sentence of its own and that the word “needs” is replaced by “prerequisites” just like for SVT.

110 BC UR, 1980: 2-3§; BC UR, 1992; 2§; see also BL UR, 2007: 9§. A notable difference in 2007 is that compulsory school has been added to the list of school-related areas so the text reads ”compulsory and upper secondary school” in 2007.

111 BC SVT, 1980: 11§; BC SVT, 1992; 7§.

112 BC SVT, 1980: 11§; BC SVT, 1992; 7§.


114 BC SVT, 1980: 11§; BC SVT, 1992; 7§, also for UR; BC UR, 1980: 11-12§; BC UR, 1992; 7§.

the contracts in 1980 and in 1992. In 1992, the audience is also mentioned when rules of sponsorship are discussed for SVT.\textsuperscript{116} For SVT in 2007 the audience is only mentioned once, and then it is SVT’s responsibility to make cultural events accessible for the “entire audience”.\textsuperscript{117} Thereby, the audience is not articulated in relation to programming in these texts, and only occasionally so in relation to other legislative aspects.

What is worth noting in the documents valid for SVT in 1992 and for SVT and UR in 2007 is that all programming should “aspire to educate the general public”.\textsuperscript{118} This is not stated in the documents from 1980 for any of the broadcasting companies. This is somewhat surprising, as research on public service broadcasting has pointed to the far-reaching educational intentions that both the state and the broadcasting institution had for the broadcasts (cf. Edin, 2000; Lindén, 2011; see also Nord & Grusell, 2012; Runcis & Sandin, 2010; Rydin, 2000; Søndergaard, 1995). UR is also to adopt a more informal popular educational outlook along with its focus on formal education. To articulate a wide educational mission for both SVT and UR so clearly is a sign of the legislator’s interest in keeping educational ambitions within public service broadcasting (see also Government Bill, 2005/06:112). Thus, the aspiration that broadcasts should educate and inform is not diminished in the view of the legislator when approaching the present.

There are not many significant differences on a general level between the broadcasting licenses in 2007 and the broadcasting contracts in 1980 and 1992 in terms of whom the broadcasts regard. Both the “citizens” and the “population” are still mentioned in the texts in 2007.\textsuperscript{119} The first sentences in the broadcasting licences for both SVT and UR in 2007, however, state that the companies should broadcast “in the service of the public”.\textsuperscript{120} In the previously discussed documents, the broadcasts have not been said to be in anybody’s service, but in the licences valid in 2007 it is made clear from the start that it is the public that should be served by the broadcasting companies. The public is not, however, the only category that is to be served in these texts.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{116} BC SVT, 1992; 10§.
\item \textsuperscript{117} BL SVT, 2007: 10§.
\item \textsuperscript{118} BL SVT, 1992: 6§; BL SVT, 2007: 7§; BL UR, 2007: 9§.
\item \textsuperscript{119} BL SVT, 2007: 1, 7, 9, 13§; BL UR, 2007: 9, 12§.
\item \textsuperscript{120} It is mentioned 3 times in the BL SVT, 2007 and once in BL UR, 2007 (BL SVT 2007; BL UR, 2007).
\end{itemize}
Children as a category

Just as in the Act, the word “children” is not mentioned at all in The BC text from 1980, but in 1992 “children” is present in the text regulating commercial sponsoring. Paragraph 10 in the regulations is changed during 1991, and it goes from banning all commercial actions to allowing sponsoring for SVT under specific circumstances. No programmes such as “news or news commentary or [those] mainly targeting children under the age of 12” may be sponsored. These formulations draw upon The RA 1992 (and R&TA 2007), and as SVT is not allowed to broadcast commercials, only sponsoring needs to be regulated in the broadcasting licence. Consequently, children do not occur until issues of sponsorship are at stake in the documents. It is, therefore, the reference to the consumerist sphere that forms children as a category in these documents as well. However, the category ‘children’ are articulated in other ways too.

Children – an audience for programming

When groups in particular need of programming attention are singled out in 2007, the broadcasting licences do not only identify the two groups “people with disabilities”, and “linguistic and ethnic minorities” as the contracts did in 1980 and 1992, but “children, youth and young people” are also pointed out. In 2007, the broadcasting licenses state that the programme companies “shall offer a wide range of programmes of high quality for and with children and youth". The wording “for and with” children and youth is only used for these groups. The legislation hereby promotes children and youth as groups that should be present in the programming. That programmes of high quality are required for the entire population is stated already in earlier paragraphs, but in paragraph

---

121 Sponsoring in this respect means that an entity other than the programme company (a brand or a company, etc.) can finance a programme and that this is accounted for at the start and/or the end of a programme (cf. R&TA 2007, Ch. 7: §§), which means that the sponsor will have its name mentioned and its logo shown. This differs from advertising in that no products are shown or talked about. The only type of direct sponsoring that SVT can receive is in connection with sports events (BL SVT 2007: 19§). UR is not allowed to broadcast any type of direct sponsoring (BL UR 2007: 18§).

122 (Government decision, appendix 19910711, number 11)

123 BL SVT, 1992: 10§, see also similar formulations in 2007, BL SVT, 2007: 19§.


125 Children, youth and young people are mentioned several times in these paragraphs (BL SVT 2007: 11, 13-14§; BL UR, 2007: 11-12§).

126 BL SVT, 2007: 11§; BL UR, 2007: 11§.

127 BL SVT, 2007: 10§; BL UR, 2007: 9§.
11, it is stressed in both SVT’s and UR’s licences that quality programming must be offered to children and youth in particular. The wording expresses the importance of the programme companies providing programmes for these groups, but it also singles them out from the rest of the population. In this way, children, young people and youth are articulated as being at risk of being forgotten within the population at large, and here it is acknowledged that they have special rights to substantial programming of quality.

In the texts it is also stressed that: “The programmes should communicate, on children’s and young people’s own terms, news and facts together with cultural and aesthetic experiences from different parts of Sweden and the world”. As stated previously, programmes for children and young people have been produced and broadcast essentially from the start of Swedish TV transmissions (cf. Rydin 2000), but licences in 2007 spell out that children and young people are in fact audiences that are entitled to programming adapted to them. In this way, children and youth become TV audiences, but by singling out them, focus is also put on their difference from the rest of the audience.

Children – several audiences?

The category ‘children’ is in fact the most frequently used one in the broadcasting licences in 2007 (18 times). But in these texts, children are not treated as a homogeneous group. This can be seen when linguistic and ethnic minorities and people with disabilities are focused on in the broadcasting licences, where it is stressed that programme companies “should particularly consider” and “particularly prioritize” “children and youth” and “children and young people” within these groups. The categories children, young people and youth thus intersect with other categories, which points to the diversity within the categories children, young people and youth.

However, there also seems to be almost synonymous use of the words youth and young people in the texts, and no actual criteria for distinguishing between any of the categories children, young people and youth can be found in the doc-

---

129 BL SVT, 2007: 11§; BL UR, 2007: 11§.
130 This can be compared with the next most frequently mentioned categories in the texts: “young people” (9 times), “youth” (6 times), “minorities” (6 times) “the public” (5 times) and “citizens” (3 times) (BL SVT, 2007; BL UR, 2007).
131 Children, youth and young people are mentioned several times in these paragraphs (BL SVT 2007: 11, 13§; BL UR, 2007: 11-12§).
132 BL SVT, 2007: 11, 13§; BL UR, 2007: 11, 12§.
uments. The category ‘children’ is also most often linked to the other child-related categories, and “children and youth”\textsuperscript{133} and “children and young people”\textsuperscript{134} seem to be used as entities in the texts. In UR’s case, the reference to schooling\textsuperscript{135} stages gives some hints of a diversified view of the child audience, but there is still no explicit focus on defining these categories in the licences. The only age categorization in these documents is the 12-year age limit for sponsored programmes.\textsuperscript{136} Thus, the links between children, young people and youth, and minority groups and languages in one sense produces a diversified view of the child audience. Nevertheless, because the categories children, young people and youth are used so frequently, often interchangeably, and with few distinguishing features, in many instances in these documents they must also be understood to form one category.

To sum up, the broadcasting contracts and licences articulate a hegemonic anti-consumption discourse in relation to children. Children under the age of 12 are not considered capable of handling matters of consumption in TV, and they are, therefore, in need of protection from the consumption sphere in broadcasting. However, children are also entitled to programming content. In 1980 and 1992, this entitlement concerned all citizens, but in 2007 the broadcasting licences contained articulations that single out children and young people as important audience groups who should have programming made for and with them. These groups now have rights in terms of protection and information. Both these rights are stressed in the UNCRC, and are also highlighted in a government official report\textsuperscript{137} on protecting children from “unsuitable programme content on TV”. The duality in the broadcasting licences in 2007 reflects notions found in the ongoing discussion of children’s more general needs in society at large (cf. Sandin, 2011), and it is worth noting that children in these documents are also entitled to participation in programming production.

Now we will turn to the broadcasting companies’ views on their obligations to the audience and foremost to the child audience.

\textsuperscript{133} Mentioned 3 times each in BL SVT, 2007 and BL UR, 2007.
\textsuperscript{134} Mentioned 5 times in BL SVT, 2007, and 4 times in BL UR, 2007.
\textsuperscript{135} UR covers the whole spectrum from preschool up to adult education (preschool, compulsory and upper secondary school, collage and adult education” (BL UR 2007: 9§).
\textsuperscript{136} BL SVT, 2007: 19§; BL UR, 2007: 18§.
Accounting for the audience in annual reports

The programme companies publish annual reports on their activities. These primarily concern whether the programme companies have lived up to their obligations in regard to the Acts and contracts or licences, and accordingly whether they have fulfilled their respective obligations to the state. The state’s requirements regarding annual reports have shifted over the years and as has what the programme companies have used these reports for. What these reports cover and for whom they are written have therefore varied considerably over the studied years.

The programme companies have been related to each other in different ways over time (e.g., Hadenius, 1998; Hadenius, Weibull & Wadbring, 2011; Runcis & Sandin, 2006), and this also affects how the annual reports have been formed. In 1980 and in 1992, SVT and UR were both subsidiary companies to the parent company Swedish Radio (SR). The annual reports for these years therefore consisted of a combined annual report for the whole of the SR group as well as separate reports for SVT and UR. There are six reports covering the activities of SVT and UR during 1980:

- The UR Annual Report 1980/1981 (AR, UR, 80/81)
- The Swedish Television Annual Report 1980/1981 (AR, SVT, 80/81))

In 1992 there are three reports covering SVT’s and UR’s activities:


In 1980, the SR group split the financial year. There is thus one set of three annual reports covering the latter six months of 1979 and the first six months of 1980, and another set of three reports covering the latter part of 1980 and the first six months of 1981 for the programme companies. The mother company SR’s reports for 1980 are substantial texts that cover all the public service companies’ financial matters as well as other more descriptive texts. Also the UR reports have sections that discuss programming and the audience. The SVT reports, however, primarily account for the financial status of SVT and little more.

In 1992, the financial year is not split for the SR group and the annual reports thus account for the whole year. Still one report covers the whole SR group. In 1992, the relationship between the reports has changed. The SR report only accounts for the financial matters of the SR group, while the UR and SVT reports also account for future goals and some of the actual programming.

---

138 In 1980, the SR group split the financial year. There is thus one set of three annual reports covering the latter six months of 1979 and the first six months of 1980, and another set of three reports covering the latter part of 1980 and the first six months of 1981 for the programme companies. The mother company SR’s reports for 1980 are substantial texts that cover all the public service companies’ financial matters as well as other more descriptive texts. Also the UR reports have sections that discuss programming and the audience. The SVT reports, however, primarily account for the financial status of SVT and little more.

139 In 1992, the financial year is not split for the SR group and the annual reports thus account for the whole year. Still one report covers the whole SR group. In 1992, the relationship between the reports has changed. The SR report only accounts for the financial matters of the SR group, while the UR and SVT reports also account for future goals and some of the actual programming.
In 2007, SVT and UR are separate companies and they publish one annual report each:


The analysis of these reports is guided by questions concerning whom the programming is made for, how the categories audience and children are articulated in these texts and how they are related to programming. First the overall view of the audience will be analysed for the different years, followed by an analysis of the category children.

### The public service broadcasting audience as a political tool

#### 1980

The SVT reports from 1980 strictly focus on the financial accounts for the company, and references to audience and programming are completely absent. Compared to the SR group and UR there is a stark difference. In the reports for the whole SR broadcasting concern, the managing director and others put forward the company’s views on the development of broadcasting media, as well as presenting the financial figures and other statistics.

The category ‘audience’ has not been in focus in the legislation during any of the years, as shown, but it is by no means absent in the SR and UR reports. Rather, it is the audience that the parent company refers to when certain issues are at stake in 1980, such as the level of the licence fee. The SR reports account for all the broadcasting companies, but SVT does not make any major marks in the SR reports either. However, all of the broadcasting companies (also SVT) stress the centrality of creating meeting points with their audiences.

In the SR report from 79/80, there is a whole section called “The audience during the 70s” where statistics on listening and viewing are presented. The “audience” is not the only word used here, but also “the public”, “citizens”, “population”, “households”, “people”, “Swedes” and “everybody” are terms used to...
define who the programmes are broadcast for. In this way, the SR group articulates its audience in large, general terms.

In the sections in the SR reports accounting for UR and in UR’s own reports, a slightly different vocabulary is used when describing whom UR is targeting. Also UR uses the more overall descriptions, but it is the terms “target group”, “users”, “audience” and “receivers” that are used as the more general categorizations of whom the programming is intended for. However, UR describes its audience more often in specific terms, such as “immigrants”, “the disabled” or “adults”. There are thereby different ways of articulating the imagined receivers of the public service broadcasts in 1980. The mother company primarily refers to a general audience spanning the entire population, while UR puts most emphasis on the specific audiences that the programming is aimed at.

Also the public service broadcasting discourse is discussed in relation to whom the broadcasts are made for. The managing director of SR writes that:

A fundamental element of the public service idea, which Swedish Radio is bound to protect and develop, is that the radio and TV offerings must be accessible for everyone and on equal terms.

There is also a whole section called “Radio and TV of the 80s – in the service of the public” which discusses what public service broadcasting should be and become in the upcoming decade. In both the SR reports, issues of competition over viewers, programming and monetary aspects are central. Thus, in the documents no traces can be found of public service companies calmly sitting back in their broadcasting monopoly position. Instead the mother company, SR, is alarmed by the coming competition from video, foreign satellite broadcasts and the increased expenses caused by this expected competition. This issue is highlighted in these documents even if the competition for terrestrial broadcasts will not be a reality for over a decade.
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144 AR, SR, 79/80; see also AR, SR, 80/81.
145 AR, SR, 79/80; AR, UR, 79/80; AR, UR, 80/81.
146 AR, SR, 79/80; AR, UR, 79/80; AR, UR, 80/81.
147 AR, SR, 80/81: 3.
148 AR, SR, 80/81: 3.
149 E.g., AR, SR, 79/80: 3, 13-17; AR, SR, 80/81: 2-20
When the companies present their concerns regarding changing conditions on the media arena, this is done on behalf of their audiences. The SR group, for example, argues that the majority of the population, being radio and TV users, should not have to stand back so that a minority of the population can have the choice of selecting programming of interest from other media formats such as video. By making this claim, the public service company articulates the issue of competition on the media arena as something the state needs to take measures on so as not to weaken the broadcasting companies’ position, ultimately doing so for the sake of the majority of the population. This also shows that even if the public service companies had a monopoly on broadcasts at that time, they were not resting assured and unconcerned about public service or their audience.

What has been argued in earlier research – that the public service companies were uninterested in defining what public service should stand for until commercial competition entered the media arena in the Nordic countries (e.g., Syvertsen, 1990; Edin, 2000) – cannot be found in the texts studied here. Instead one can observe that the broadcasting companies as early as 1980 had ongoing discussion of what public service should mean and for whom public service programmes should be broadcast.

1992

SR’s report in 1992 is foremost a financial report for the SR group, and it is only in a two-page-long introduction that the managing director is able to argue for a strong public service institution in the future. UR’s annual report 1992 is more a declaration of future goals than an annual report. The managing director of UR states that:

We are to become an educational company for the whole of Sweden […]
We shall be present across the whole country and offer knowledge and development for everyone […] everyone living in Sweden shall know that we are working in the public’s service […]

The report does not give many clues as to what has been broadcast during 1992. In 1993 UR is to become an independent public service company and the report
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151 E.g., The SR group; AR, SR, 79/80:3; AR, SR, 80/81:2-3, 5, 7-11, 16-18; and for UR: AR, SR, 79/80:3, 9-10.
152 AR, SR, 80/81: 3, 10-11.
153 This can also be compared to the political discussion of the public service educational broadcasts during the 1960s and 1970s, which has been identified by Maija Runcis and Bengt Sandin (2010).
is used to position UR in this new role, for example by stating that it targets everyone and wants the whole country to be its audience.

The SVT report from 1992 provides a richer text both in comparison to the other two reports from 1992 and to the SVT reports for 1980. It contains information on what SVT has been broadcasting during the year, its future goals, a financial report as well as statistics. In this text, the audience is present in several ways. The presentation starts by stating that SVT is “a company in the service of the public” and that “SVT’s employer is its audience”. The text thereby links the public to the audience and forms a bond between these groups. This link is used to bridge a potential gap between TV viewers and the Swedish population. This is essential, as The BC 1992 describes SVT’s obligation as providing programming not only for actual viewers, but also for the population and citizens as well. At the end of the document, “the audience” and “the viewers” are also accounted for in terms of viewing figures and programme success rates. They are also used to take a political stand in the debate about public service TV as such, and the then managing director of SVT, Sam Nilsson, writes in the report:

Our ambition is to show, through viewers’ appreciation of the programmes and their willingness to pay the TV licence fee, that even during the second half of the 90s we need public television whose centre point is quality.

Here the viewers are to make sure that SVT survives the commercialization of the TV market, which was marked by the start of TV4’s terrestrial broadcasts. Viewers’ appreciation of SVT’s programming and their willingness to pay for it should hopefully ensure that political measures will not be taken to abolish public service media altogether. The relation is, however, the opposite of the one presented in 1980. In 1992 the audience is to help SVT handle the state, while in 1980 the state is supposed to step up for public service broadcasters in the name of the audience. In the 1992 text the audience, which should preferably be as large as the entire public, is of crucial importance in legitimizing public service broadcasting.
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156 6-7§.
The central position of the audience is stressed even more in 2007. UR defines its focus in terms of the profile of UR’s programme selection.\textsuperscript{159} It is here stated that:

\begin{quote}
UR has an educational mission as well as a responsibility to educate the general public. The programmes and range target the viewing and listening audience and users in different areas of learning.
\end{quote}

The audience targeted by UR is thereby those people already listening to, viewing and using UR’s services. UR, however, also states that it aims to reach more teachers and pupils, so attracting more users is a goal as well.\textsuperscript{160} How these target groups relate to the obligation of educating the general public is not touched upon.

SVT, on the contrary, cannot rest assured with the audience it already has. The report focuses on this under the heading “Audience - The audience foremost”,\textsuperscript{162} where ratings and viewer figures are discussed, and points to the importance of the audience for the company. In the preface of the text the managing director of SVT, Eva Hamilton, also discusses this:

\begin{quote}
During 2007, SVT’s family of channels (SVT1, SVT2, SVT24, SVT Children’s Channel and the Knowledge Channel) gathered the largest audience and SVT1 was the next largest Swedish TV channel. But it is not size measured in viewing figures, ratings, that is crucial to whether or not SVT has succeeded in its mission to be the whole of Sweden’s television. It is the reach: how many watch SVT? The answer is: almost everyone. 85 per cent of the Swedish TV audience watches one or several of SVT’s programmes a week.\textsuperscript{163}
\end{quote}

The audience is something that the programme company must fight for through competition. In this text, it is not only viewing figures but also reach that is put forward as indicating the success of the programme company. But parts of the TV audience do not choose SVT, even if SVT still gathers the largest audience 15 years after the first commercial broadcasts on the Swedish terrestrial net. In 2007, the TV audience is one that can choose and one that has chosen SVT so

\begin{itemize}
\item[159] AR, UR, 2007: 5-6.
\item[162] AR, SVT, 2007: 86-93.
\item[163] AR, SVT, 2007: 3.
\end{itemize}
far. In the political argument over public service broadcasting, in 2007 SVT is dependent on reaching as many as possible. The state, however, is no longer referred to – not as the entity to look to for help, like in 1980, or as the one that SVT argues against, like in 1992. In 2007, public service broadcasting is an issue that concerns the public service company and its audience only. This audience needs to consist of almost the entire population to make it public service broadcasting.

The presence of a child audience
In the reports the category ‘children’ is also referred to. In this section the characteristics defining this category, the public service broadcasting companies knowledge about the child audience and how this relates to programming for this category is analysed.

1980
Children and young people do not play any significant roles in the annual reports for the SR group in 1980, but the programming for these groups is reported on in the programming statistics. The picture painted in the UR reports is, however, very different. Here several pages are used to discuss children and education. It is, for example, stated that:

Developmentally speaking, the foundation for children’s communication abilities is laid during the first year of life. During the preschool years, the most intense language development takes place, which presents good opportunities for supporting and stimulating the least fortunate children.

In this way, UR positions itself as knowledgeable about children and their learning abilities as related to social class. UR also positions itself as an agent that can offer its services to provide stimulation and support to children who need it. UR draws on developmental psychology to frame what they can and are doing for young children (cf. James & James, 2008; Lindgren, 2003). “Children” is the category referred to most, by far, in both UR reports. This makes children the prime audience group for UR and it puts children at the centre of the educational
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focus for its broadcasts. Thus, in the reports from 1980, children are primarily recognized as an audience in relation to educational broadcasts.

1992

In the programming statistics in *The AR SR 1992*, the two categories children and young people are separate in the charts for all the broadcasting companies except for UR, where the reporting on programming for children is divided up in reference to stages of schooling (preschool, compulsory school, upper secondary school). *The AR UR 1992* has no special focus on any audience groups, as the programme company is mostly focused on forming its strategies for the future. Only a few programmes are presented and among these is *Day care TV* (Dagis-TV), which is said to want to “entice children into becoming active”\(^{167}\). What is striking is that this report contains many close-up images of children and young people\(^{168}\). These are present as illustrations in the report without any programming-related connection. In this way, children and young people are visually represented as an important audience even though they are not stressed as such in the text.

In *The AR SVT 1992* children and young people are described as one audience group. Under the heading “The child and youth audience at the centre”\(^{169}\) programming for children and young people is accounted for. Only a few programmes are presented under this heading. One of them is the well-known series for children *Björne’s Storehouse* (*Björnes Magasin*).\(^{170}\) Another one is a programme series about young people’s issues and relationships, *The Bun* (*Bullen*).\(^{171}\) These two programmes are put forward as “The backbone of The Department of Children and Young People’s broadcasts”.\(^{172}\) The programmes are also described:

\(^{167}\) *AR*, UR, 1992: 15. Three episodes of this programme are part of the research material (Dagis-TV för barn, UR, SVT1, 19920421, 09.30-09.45; 19921001, 9.30-9.45; 19921017, 9.00-9.15).

\(^{168}\) In *AR*, UR, 1992, 8 children and young people can be seen in the 12 images present. In the SVT report for the same year, 47 images are presented showing only one child and mainly the members SVT’s board.


\(^{170}\) *Björne’s Storehouse* (*Björnes Magasin*) was produced by SVT from 1987-2004 and reruns have been frequent (cf. Rydin 2000). 3 episodes of this programme are part of the research material (Björnes magasin SVT1, 19920907; 19920923; 19921009, 18.15-18.45).

\(^{171}\) *The Bun* (*Bullen*) was produced by SVT from 1987-2000 (cf. Rydin 2000). 2 episodes, of which one is broadcast twice, are part of the research material (Bullen, SVT1, 19920415 19.10-20.00; 19920421, 17.00-17.50; 19921025, 18.45-19.15).

\(^{172}\) *AR*, SVT, 1992: 9.
Björne’s Storehouse is an institution in Sweden and a good example of public service diversity. In the show there is room for play, fairy tales, tricks, make believe figures, music, poetry as well as curiosity about reality – the essence of child culture. Björne shows that quality and diversity are attractive for the audience, also in competition with less demanding programmes aired at the same time.\textsuperscript{173}

Here, this show is put forward as representing the core of child culture, in terms of the content the programme is said to stand for: play, fairy tales, tricks, etc. Culture for children is thereby something very different from adult culture in that it is primarily focused on make believe. Moreover, children are supposed to be curious about reality. In this text children do not seem to be a target group focusing on real-life issues. However, the audience of this programme also has agency. It is, via its viewing, also legitimizing SVT’s position in regard to other actors on the media market. Thus, the child audience may live in fantasyland when choosing programming, but in doing so it is indeed forming the reality for SVT.

When The Bun (Bullen) is described, the text states that:

‘Dear The Bun. I have a problem…’ The Bun is a programme in which the audience puts great trust. It targets viewers in the early puberty years, 11-15 years, a time when the hormones are just beginning to flow, but it is obviously also interesting for an adult audience.\textsuperscript{174}

This programme is placed far from the land of make believe when it is described as being trusted by its audience. The programme audience is partly framed by its bodily development. It has a fixed age that should also refer to hormone levels and puberty, on the one hand, but the programme is also put forward as being “obviously” interesting for an adult audience, on the other. What the hormone levels look like in the adult audience is not stated, nor is a fixed age given for adults who might be interested in watching the programme. This can be seen as an example of how an audience of children and young people can be described in comparison to an adult one. The young audience for this programme is, however, active not only in terms of bodily development, but it also actively sends letters to the programme. It is just such a letter that the first sentence in the quotation refers to, and this kind of interactivity constitutes a considerable part of the programme content. The letters contain questions and problems that the viewers want the programme to take up, answer and solve for them. In this way,

\textsuperscript{173} AR, SVT, 1992: 9.
\textsuperscript{174} AR, SVT, 1992: 9.
The Bun audience trusts the programme with its problems and the audience makes the programme possible by filling it with content.

A third programme presented in the section on children and young people’s programming is a series called Robinson. Robinson, a factual series for the curious, eager-to-learn, Robinson age, 7-11 years, when one has just learnt how to read but before puberty begins. Using knowledge about this age group’s weakness for fiction, the series puts a fictionalized frame around factual elements.

Robinson, a factual series for the curious, eager-to-learn, Robinson age, 7-11 years, when one has just learnt how to read but before puberty begins. Using knowledge about this age group’s weakness for fiction, the series puts a fictionalized frame around factual elements.

Also in this short description the targeted audience of the programme is defined by its development together with its ability to read. The audience is portrayed as being curious and wanting to learn, and these characteristics are bound to the specific age group of 7- to 11-year-olds. The programme company states that its knowledge about this age group has informed the programme. The audience is described as having a soft spot for fiction that is linked to age. These children are not presented as agents, but more as being controlled by the programme company in terms of how they receive factual programme content: They are served facts in a fictional frame because they will then watch the programme. It is the programme company’s knowledge about this audience that makes it possible to produce a programme tailored to the audience’s preferences. Here, SVT presents itself as being well attuned to the young audience and to producing programming in accordance with what makes this audience watch TV.

However, when SVT states its goal of getting 50% of all viewing time and reaching more people than the other channels do all together, it turns out that: “These goals are not always fully reached for the younger age groups.” Viewers are, as stated previously, the targets of the newly established competition situation, and therefore it is troublesome that SVT does not reach children and young people to the extent that the programme company would like to.

In the statistics section of the AR SVT 1992, children and young people form a category of their own. In these charts, children and young people are the only audience-based categories, all other categories being based instead on programme genre, except for the category "special groups". This indicates that it is important for the company to reflect on children and young people when re-

---

175 2 episodes of this programme are part of the research material. Robinson, SVT1, 19920915, 19.00-19.30; 19921017, 16.00-16.30
178 Special groups here include “lingual minorities and the disabled” (AR, SVT, 1992: 50-52).
porting back to the state, but also that children and young people are not regarded as special groups.

In the AR SVT 1992, children are described as having cultures of their own and young people as being bound by their bodily development and by their preference for the fiction genre, but these groups also choose to watch channels other than SVT’s. Consequently, children and young people are different from adults in 1992, but they are not considered part of the groups that have special rights, rather they are defined as something in between, as groups with interests that SVT occasionally finds it difficult to satisfy.

2007

In 2007, UR still accounts for its young audiences in relation to the schooling arena. The focus in the texts regarding preschool and compulsory and upper secondary school is on learning and on inspiring children and young people to learn. This is done by providing programming that can fill the educational needs set for children by teachers and society at large. UR also stresses that it is giving “children a voice in the media”, that it is striving for “a high degree of child participation in the programmes” and thus, to produce programmes “not only for children but also with children”, which connects well to the wording in the broadcasting licence. In this way, the young UR audience is defined by its role in the schooling system and can consequently be seen as institutionalized (cf. Halldén, 2009; Säljö, 2000) at the same time as it is supposed to be activated and given a voice by the programme company.

The method of reporting used in the annual report that accounts for SVT in 2007 is described as new. What is new is that programmes targeting children and young people are now accounted for by genre, and reported on together with other programmes. This means, for example, that all news programmes are reported on in one section, including news programmes produced for children and young people. This report, however, also accounts for “Programme selections for special groups”. Three pages under this heading report on program-
ming for children and young people. SVT’s report for 2007 thus frames children and young people’s programming as part of the main audience’s, but children and young people constitute a special audience group as well.

In none of the reports from 2007 are children and young audiences described and defined in the elaborate and somewhat condescending manner seen in The AR, SVT 1992. In 2007 children and young people are audiences that the programme companies are working hard to reach, and it is this work that the texts focus on. The audiences are therefore presented more in terms of what has been broadcast for them, and their participation in programming, than in terms of their bodily development levels and/or notions about their comprehension of media messages.

Within the text on children and young people, there is a short section called: “The programme selection for teenagers and young adults.” However, the programme company seems to have difficulties in defining this part of the audience, as words like “young people”, “youth”, “older children”, “younger teenagers” and “older teenagers” are also used in this section. To add to this, SVT writes that: “Experience shows that young people’s programmes rarely reach a young audience. On the contrary, young people take to programmes of all categories if the time slot and the address are correct.” The report also states that 9- to 19-year-olds are “the group that the company has most difficulties reaching with its traditional TV channels.” Here, the report must be read in relation to the broadcasting licence that stated: “SVT should especially develop programming for older children and young people”. The programme company must acknowledge that this category or categories are difficult both to define and to reach, and SVT accounts for a group that it should have prioritized but in relation to which its obligation has not been met.

Children, age and categorization

When discussing characteristics that categorize children, age is a crucial aspect (cf. James & James, 2004). Children and age categories have also been discussed in regard to Swedish policy (e.g., Government Official Report, 1996:11; 185 They are referred to in different ways: as "children and youth" and as "children and young people" (The AR, SVT, 2007: 9, 11).

186 AR, SVT, 2007: 58.
189 BL SVT, 2007: 11§.
Schiratzki, 2011; Söderlind & Engwall, 2005). In the annual reports studied here, age emerges in a multitude of ways when the categories children, young people and youth are described.

It is not altogether clear whether there is a notion that draws on age in the reports for 1980 in terms of defining children and young people as categories. SVT mentions none, but the SR group does make a few remarks on age. In the statistics section, for example, viewing figures for 79/80 are measured for the audience aged 9-79 years.\(^{190}\) A comparison with the early 1970s is made, but viewing figures then used the age range 15-79. It can thereby be noted that, by 1980, children 9-14 years of age have become an audience interesting enough to measure in terms of its viewing.

As shown, some of the SVT programmes for children and young people were accounted for using age categorizations, among other things in 1992. In the report, few other age categorizations are used, however, age is an audience-defining principle given that the viewing statistics cover 3-99 year olds in the population.\(^{191}\) Thus more children are present in the statistics here than in the previous reports.

UR defines its target groups according to their place in the school system. Therefore, the reports for all three years under study primarily refer to the target group children in terms of school year and schooling stages. This makes age categories implicit. The category ‘children’ is omnipresent in the UR texts for all the studied years, both in the language per se and in visual images, when such representations exist. This means that all of the texts dealing with educational broadcasts are built on notions of the category children and of age in relation to education. In the UR report from 2007, the youngest children are left out when viewing figures are measured, as the age span considered is 9-99 years of age.\(^{192}\)

In the SVT text from 2007, age categories are used on several occasions to define the intended audience, but the categorizations overlap and are often difficult to interpret. One example is when the programming target group for statistical coding purposes is put forward and the programmes for children and young people are then divided into three subgroups: “small children (ca. age 3-6), younger schoolchildren (ca. age 7-11) [and] older schoolchildren (ca. age 12-14)”.\(^{193}\) However, when the programmes for children are discussed under the heading special groups, other categories are used:

\(^{191}\) AR, SVT, 1992, 20, 24, 53; also in AR, SVT, 2007: 86.
\(^{192}\) AR, UR, 2007: 29.
\(^{193}\) AR, SVT, 2007: 11.
In its planning, SVT works with three age categories within the age span of 0-13 years: small children, medium-sized children and bigger children/young teenagers.\textsuperscript{194}

These age ranges are thereby not the same as those used when coding the programming statistically. The categories also refer to different categorizations, not only drawing on age. In the first set of categories, two of three have a relation to the schooling system while the first refers to body size. The second set of categories is more related to size than to age (in Swedish as well), even though they are used as definitions of age in the document. The frequent use of different age categories makes clear that age is a central matter in the categorization of children. Here different wordings and ages are used to differentiate children into several audiences. Even if they overlap, the text shows that SVT defines children as belonging to much more diverse groups than the legislation does. Also a variety of age categories are present in the report that can be understood as referring to and/or including young people and/or youth.\textsuperscript{195} Here one of the most significant is 9- to 19-year-olds, as this is the audience group that SVT finds it difficult to reach.\textsuperscript{196}

In the 2007 document, children and young people are no longer a target group, but diverse groups in relation to age and the words used to characterize them. Some of them are also part of the group that the programme company has difficulties obliging, as they tend to choose other programme providers. This constructs children and young people as competent media users who know that they can choose not to watch SVT’s programming. But it also positions them as difficult consumers whom SVT cannot count on in the competition over viewing figures.

**Children in broadcasting policy**

The policy level establishes the boundaries for the programme companies, and it is therefore crucial to how programming can configure the child audience (cf. Heins, 2007; James & James, 2004; Simpson, 2004). Also the way in which the programme companies articulate their views on children as a category gives insights into the discourses on children and TV on which the imagined child audience is based. In this chapter, the categories children and audience have been

\textsuperscript{194} AR, SVT, 2007:56.

\textsuperscript{195} E.g., AR, SVT, 2007: 86.

\textsuperscript{196} AR, SVT, 2007: 88.
studied in relation to programming in the policy texts. As shown in the policy
texts, there has not always been an explicit audience for the broadcasts, and the
child category, too, has been articulated in diverse ways on the different levels
of broadcasting policy.

The relation between children and TV in these documents thereby draws on dif-
ferent discursive notions. The category children can be viewed as similar to,
included in, or even the same as the general categorizations of the audience, on the
one hand, or as different from the audience altogether, on the other.

Children are included in the audience at large:

- In the laws and broadcasting contracts from 1980 and 1992, which state
  that the public, population, and citizens are entitled to TV content that
  lives up to civic democratic values and human rights.
- In *The R&TA* 2007, which states that the general audience can also be
  seen as consumers.
- In *The AR SVT* 2007, which accounts for programming in terms of gen-
  res for all other audience groups.
- When the broadcasting companies, in their annual reports, portray chil-
  dren as several audience groups and thus portray children as an audi-
  ence category that is just as diversified and complex as all other audi-
  ence categories. This is especially the case in 2007.
- When seen as a political tool in public service broadcasting debates, due
to their ability to choose programming.

Children are singled out as different:

- In laws and broadcasting contracts in 1992 and 2007, wherein children
  are put forward as being at risk for potential harm and in need of protec-
  tion from commercial messages, violence and pornography.
- In *The AR SVT* 2007, which describes children as having special needs
  in almost all the legal documents from 1992 and 2007, and when chil-
  dren’s programming is reported on under the heading “special groups”.
- In almost all the legal documents from 1992 and 2007, wherein con-
  sumption is regulated.
- In SVT’s annual report from 1992, which defines child and youth audi-
  ence’s TV programming preferences according to their developmental
  status.
- When portrayed as being dependent on developmental psychological
  stages in relation to educational programming in 1980.
- When defined in terms of age, independent of whether they are to be
  protected from content or to have broadcasts scheduled for them.
• When positioned as institutionalized and linked to education in all texts concerning educational public service broadcasts.
• When portrayed as an incompetent TV audience, unable to distinguish advertisements from TV programming if they are younger than 12 years of age.
• When portrayed as competent in relation to TV because of their ability to choose TV programming based on their own interests, even if these interests are not always covered by public service broadcasts.

In this way, the different notions of children and TV intersect, but they also change over time and are dependent on context. For the legislator, children are foremost a category at risk that needs protection from TV content from 1992 and onwards. From 2007, however, children are entitled to programming and the legislator articulates this quite resolutely (children being the most mentioned category in the broadcasting licences in 2007). Here a transformation can be seen to take place, whereby children are transformed from a non-category to an at-risk audience category, understood to be both in need of protection and entitled to programming.

The broadcasting companies do not present children as a category at risk. For them children belong to one or several audience groups. UR’s obligation is and has been to provide children with programming, and children have therefore always been an audience for educational broadcasts. This audience, however, is more linked to terms such as users or pupils and divided up into several audience groups in relation to schooling stages. For UR, children are to be educated and child audiences are therefore defined in terms of their position in the school system.

The children are not noticed by SVT in 1980, but in 1992 they are seen as one audience. SVT seems to know this audience well, both regarding what constitutes its interests and abilities, and regarding how to produce programming for it. However, the programme company does not fully succeed in reaching it. In 2007, the child audience is much more multifaceted and divided up into several audience groups. Here the young child audience is reached with ease, but the slightly older child audience is not (9-19 years). These audiences are put forward as containing active agents whom SVT is doing its best to provide programming for, even if they are not all reached by the programme company.

In an international comparison, there is stark difference at the level of the legislative boundaries established for the Swedish public service broadcasts. What is explicitly articulated as harmful to and/or unsuitable for children in Swedish broadcasting legislation are commercial messages, explicit, realistic violence and pornography only. As shown, the documents preceding The R&TA 2007
suggest that the wording on violence and pornography reflects an adjustment to EU’s view on children as possibly being harmed by this type of content. But in the Swedish regulation, there is a disclaimer that makes it possible to broadcast violence and pornography even when children might be watching, if such a broadcast is in the interest of freedom of speech and information.

In the Swedish context, the only area where the legislation finds no possible circumstances for broadcasting to a child audience, and where a stricter restriction is used than the EU TV Directive stipulates, is advertising and commercial messages. Consequently, advertising can in no respect be seen as having such great informational value that there could be a reason for showing it anyway. This is something that stands in stark contrast to the legislation studied by Simpson (2004), for example, where sexuality constitutes a much greater threat to childhood innocence than consumption does. The Swedish legislation thus takes a very different stand on consumption than does other national legislation (e.g., Australian, British, Canadian and American) (cf. Heins, 2007; Lisosky, 2001; Simpson, 2004). Accordingly, what is seen as harmful to children varies greatly with cultural context (cf. Livingstone & Hargrave 2006).

Instead of trying to pinpoint children in the broadcasting discourse, it may be more rewarding to acknowledge that broadcasting policy in Sweden shows a diverse and often contradictory view of what constitutes children as a category, a child TV audience and how the legislator and programme companies interpret ‘the best interest of the child’ (cf. Lindgren, C., 2006; Sandin & Halldén 2003). This ambiguity may not be a bad thing, but it is important to note that even though Swedish legislation is viewed as being progressive in terms of children’s rights (cf. Fass & Grossberg, 2012), the actors on the Swedish broadcasting arena do not articulate a fixed discourse on what constitutes a child or on what constitutes the best interest of children. This opens up for imagining the child audience in different ways.

Children are affected by how they, as a category, are presented in the policy texts, as these are used in producing TV programmes for them. Accordingly, the Swedish broadcasting legislation, which is sometimes seen as one of the most protective broadcasting regimes in the world (e.g., Geary, et al., 1999), uses these very diverse notions of children to regulate broadcasting for them, but not always in a restrictive way. The ways the child TV audience has been imagined over the studied years have changed, both in terms of the legislative demands and how the audience has been viewed. It is a complex imagined child audience that the programming companies are to serve, and what this service boils down to will be revealed in the next chapters, which focus on the address of the programming in terms of visual aspects, content and talk.
Chapter 4
The content of nature in TV for children

Introduction

This chapter focuses on how content configures a child audience. The programme content is the core of television (cf. Ellis, 2007; Edin & Westerlund, 2008; Lotz, 2007). When a programme is described in the TV guide and in trailers, it is the content that is central. The content does not just happen to be there, it is produced and targeted to different audiences (cf. Lotz, 2007). What TV programmes for children contain therefore expresses something about the imagined child audience. However, within television studies content as a theoretical concept has not been a primary focus in qualitative research, but rather it is the form of television that has been at the centre of attention (e.g., Caldwell, 1995; Corner, 1999; Lotz, 2007; Lurry, 2005). As a result, programme content is to a quite large extent under researched (Edin & Westerlund, 2008). In this chapter, therefore, the spotlight is put on programme content. Here, content is defined as the topic around which the programme is built up. It can be characterized by the course of events, main threads, characters, artefacts and/or scenery in the programmes, i.e. content is what the programme is all about. Content is investigated in terms of how it addresses a child audience, here referred to as child address, and thereby how an imagined child audience can be configured by programme content.

As TV programme content is such a wide concept, it has been limited for the research purposes of the study. This chapter therefore focuses on a specific TV programme content, namely nature. When studying the TV programming material, nature content cropped up basically everywhere. It spanned all genres, leaving few programmes untouched.

197 However, in quantitative communication research, content analysis is a frequently used research method (e.g., Krippendorff & Bock, 2009)
To investigate the content of nature in TV for children further, nature needs to be defined. When looking into nature as a concept, it soon becomes clear that nature lacks a readymade definition. The question is also how natural nature can be said to be (cf. Allan, Adam & Carter, 1999; Cronon, 1995; Green, 1992; Halldén, 2011; Haraway, 1991; 1992; Macnaghten & Urry: 1998). William Cronon (1995: 25) has studied the idea of wilderness and argues that: “nature” is not nearly so natural as it seems. Instead, it is a profoundly human construction”. In arguing this, Cronon (1995) also questions the omnipresent and naturalized nature-culture dichotomy in Western culture (see also Andersson, 2009; Macnaghten & Urry, 1998; Taylor, 2011). The notion that nature should be seen as opposing culture has also been questioned by others (e.g., Haraway, 1991; Ganetz, 2004; 2012; Macnaghten & Urry, 1998; Prout, 2005; Taylor, 2011). Nature can instead be understood as consisting of multitudes of “contested natures” that depend on the social practices forming them (Macnaghten & Urry: 1998: 1-2). In this respect, nature cannot be defined in itself, because it is socially embedded and what is seen as nature depends on how it is, for example, discursively ordered, spaced and timed (Macnaghten & Urry: 1998; see also Green, 1992). Given that this chapter sets out to study nature content in TV for children, nature is not natural in any way but is instead represented, and must therefore be viewed as culturally and socially produced and approached as such in the analysis.

Moreover, how nature can be understood in relation to other tropes and/or categories is also a matter of investigation (e.g., Haraway, 1991). One such category is children (e.g., Baker, 2001; Lee, 2001; Prout, 2005; Taylor, 2011). In Western societies children are understood as being closely linked to nature, and it has been argued that this notion is particularly strong in the Nordic countries (e.g., Halldén, 2009; 2011). Critical studies of the relationship between children and nature are quite rare. But there are a few that have questioned the taken-for-granted notion of children and nature as being essentially linked to each other (e.g., Halldén, 2009; 2011; Lindgren, 2013; Taylor, 2011). There are also studies of constructions of nature linked to children’s outdoor activities in institutionalized and/or urban settings (Coninck-Smith, 1999; Dyblie Nilsen, 2009; Jones, 2002; Stordal, 2009; Ånggård, 2009) and a few studies focusing on constructions of children linked to nature in educational settings (e.g., Bergnéhr, 2009; Lindgren, 2009; Linnér, 2005). Almost all of these studies conclude that the relation between children and nature is represented as something positive and good (e.g., Andersson, 2009; Bergnéhr, 2009; Coninck-Smith, 1999; Dyblie Nilsen, 2009; Halldén, 2009; 2011; Jones, 2002; Lindgren, 2009; 2013; Stordal, 2009; Ånggård, 2009).
Another category strongly linked to both nature and children is animals. This comes forward in rituals such as children visiting zoos and reading stories about animals, as well as in the strong presence of animal soft toys and mediated representations of animals for children (Berger 1982; deCordova, 1994; Nelson & Nilsson, 2002; Stockton, 2009). This essential and even naturalized notion of children’s bond to animals also needs to be questioned (cf. Berger 1982; deCordova, 1994; e.g., Stockton, 2009). In the cross-disciplinary research field of animal studies, focusing on human-animal relations, critical readings of animal representation in different forms of media are common (e.g., Bousé 2000; Chris, 2006; Ganetz, 2004; 2012; Mitman, 1999), but not the topic of animal-child relations.

On the whole, mediated representations of nature and/or animals for children have not received much scholarly attention (for exceptions see, e.g., deCordova, 1994; Janson, 2011; Lindgren, A., 2009; 2006; Linnér, 2005; Matthews, 2007). Africa Taylor (2011, 421) argues for linking childhood studies and human geography together in order to question the “‘special relationship’ between childhood and nature”. She sees the strong presence of animated films for children on the market that depict idyllic nature as an example of where this ‘special relationship’ is performed, but she does not investigate this further. The childhood researcher Alan Prout (2005) also sees mediation as an example of where blurred categories of children, nature and culture can be studied, but without taking these queries further. Rydin (2000), who has studied children’s radio and TV programmes, calls for more research on animal and nature programmes for children, as these programmes provide such a great amount of diverse content for this audience group.

To focus on nature as an example of TV content thereby relates to my own findings and responds to demands for empirical studies on this topic, as pointed out in earlier research. When I looked at this issue in more depth, the representations of nature content could be divided into three kinds of representations. The nature discourse in TV for children contained children shown outdoors, animals of all sorts and environmental issues. These three aspects should not be understood as essentially constituting nature. They are discursive representations that form the content of nature in TV-for children. In line with Donna Haraway’s (1991) questioning of binary dichotomies, the representations of children outdoors, animals and environmental issues are used to discuss and question discourses of represented ‘nature’ in TV programmes for children (see also Baker, 2001; Lee, 2001; Prout, 2005; Taylor, 2011). Such questioning opens the door to a multiplicity of possible natures and to seeing nature as relational and socially embedded (Macnaghten & Urry, 1998). Moreover, when studying nature content in TV
for children a set of questions have guided the analysis:

In what ways is the nature content produced in TV programmes for children? How is it used to perform child address? Does the nature content change over time? And finally, what does the analysis say about content as a way of configuring the imagined child audience.

An overview of the programme material looks like this:

Table 2: The number of programmes with nature content in TV for children

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1992</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programmes in total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature in total</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children outdoors</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animals</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental issues</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen in the overview, nature is a very common content in TV for children during all the studied years. It can also be noted that the proportion of this content remains quite stable over the research period. All programmes containing nature have been counted, even if they do not have nature as their prime content. That means that all programmes showing children outdoors, as well as all animal representations, are present in the overview, regardless of whether the representations portray ‘real’ footage, animated images or whether animals appear as toys. Moreover, as soon as the environment is an issue in a programme, it has been counted. This categorization was made based on the understanding that all these representations perform nature content for children, no matter what representational technique is used and whether or not it was the prime content. Programmes containing these topics are broadcast by both SVT and UR. They target children of all ages and can be found in almost all programme genres. However, programmes targeting older children and youth do not have nature as their prime content as often as do programmes targeting younger children. The selection of programmes is presented in more detail under each heading below,

198 Many programmes contain more than one of the nature categories and therefore the number of programmes containing nature is not the sum of the programmes containing children outdoors, animals and environmental issues.

199 The proportion of nature content in TV for children was about 80% during all the studied years (81% in 1980, 82% in 1992 and 88% in 2007).
where examples of programmes portraying children outdoors, animals and environmental issues as their prime content are analysed.

Outdoor life – embedding the child in nature

Children are often shown outdoors in the TV programmes broadcasted for them. This does not mean that the whole programme takes place outside but that a lot of programmes (see overview) show children in an outdoor setting at some stage. Many of these programmes just depict children outdoors in passing as a film narrative practice. This occurs in documentary programmes, as well as in those with a fictional or educational focus. There is outdoor footage of children showing them situated both in towns\(^{200}\) and in the countryside,\(^{201}\) as well as in other countries.\(^{203}\) This says something about where children are supposed to be located. No matter where they live or what their everyday life looks like, in TV for children being outdoors is strongly connected to the category children.

When the outdoor experience is the main content in programmes, they seem to target children more than young people for all the studied years. In 1980, the main focus is often on the value of children being out in the open air.\(^{204}\) Such programmes are produced both by SVT and UR this year. In 1992, many educational programmes revolve around being outdoors,\(^{205}\) and the outdoor experiences often take place in institutionalized settings, such as schools and preschools. That is not the case in 2007. When the outdoor-experience is the primary content, it is fictionalized in basically all instances.\(^{206}\) Instead of placing nature at the centre of everyday life in 2007, nature is now a special event presented in

\(^{200}\) E.g., *Anna och gänget*, SVT2, 19800406, 18.00-18.30; *Pojken som länade ut sin röst och sina tankar* (within another programme), SVT1, 19920923, 18.15-18.45; *Barens detektivbyrå*, SVT1, 20071013, 19.00-19.30.

\(^{201}\) E.g., *Arbete i närbild. Berit och Styrbjörn*, UR, SVT1, 19800909, 10.15-10.30; *Den första kärleken*, SVT1, 19920419, 16.00-16.20; *Falla vackert*, 2007, SVT1, 20070406, 13.20-15.00.

\(^{202}\) See the two previous footnotes.

\(^{203}\) There are programmes picturing children outdoors from the UK, Japan, Austria, Ecuador, Finland, the US, Denmark, Ethiopia and many, many more.

\(^{204}\) E.g., *Malin och Mats på Ängsö*, SVT2, 19800403, 17.30-17.50; *Det låter som det växer*, SVT2, 19800405, 17.30-18.00; *Runt i naturen*, UR, SVT1, 19800925, 12.00-12.15.


\(^{206}\) E.g., *The New Tomorrow*, UR, SVT1, 20070405, 10.20-10.45; *Manáid-TV*, SVT1, 20070408, 9.00-9.15; *Wild kids*, SVT1, 20070408, 18.30-19.30.
televisioned competitions\textsuperscript{207} or fictional stories\textsuperscript{208}.

Of all the programmes showing children outdoors, three – one from 1980, one from 1992 and one from 2007 – have been chosen for a more thorough analysis. These programmes all have outdoor experiences as their main content. They also have characteristics specific to each year: in 1980 focusing on the valuable outdoor experience for children, in 1992 an educational programme picturing an institutionalized outdoor setting, and in 2007 focusing on an outdoor experience within a fictional frame. Among these examples are programmes broadcast by both UR and SVT, shown on both SVT1 and SVT2 and targeting young children as well as slightly older ones. The issues at stake in this section are how programmes focusing on outdoor nature content address children, how children and outdoor life are re/produced and what kind of imagined child viewer the relation to outdoor nature configures.

The nostalgic wild

The programme \textit{Once upon a time there was a summer (Det var en gång en sommar)} has the outdoor experience as its main topic. The programme was broadcast during the regular children’s programmes in the autumn of 1980.\textsuperscript{209} In the TV guide, it is stated that it is part of a series, this being the last of four episodes. The series was produced in 1972 and it was rerun seven times on TV between 1972 and 1987.\textsuperscript{210} The episode is 20 minutes long and tells the story of three children, Mats, Kickan and Pia, having a sleepover on an island.

The programme starts by showing traditional Swedish landscape scenery with a lake surrounded by a pine forest in the late summer light. A rowboat on the lake is shown with a small island in the distance. The tempo is rather slow and the viewer gets to see long sequences of the outdoor scenery accompanied by a clas-

\textsuperscript{207} Two different competition programmes where being outdoors is a main topic are part of the material (\textit{Wild kids}, SVT1, 20070406, 17-18; 20070408, 18.30-19.30; \textit{Expedition vildmark}, SVT1 20071021, 10.35-11.00).

\textsuperscript{208} A science fiction series is part of the material, as well as a show and dancing performances, where being outdoors is the main topic: \textit{The New Tomorrow} (UR, SVT1, 20070405, 10.20-10.45; 20070911, 17.30-18.00; 20070927, 10.20-10.45); \textit{Manälid-TV} (SVT1, 20070408, 9.00-9.15); \textit{Sprattel} (UR, SVT1, 20070404, 9.30-9.35; 9.35-9.40; 9.40-9.45).

\textsuperscript{209} \textit{Det var en gång en sommar}, SVT2, 19801003, 17.30-17.50. Directed by Tomas and Yeng Löfdahl.

\textsuperscript{210} Swedish Film Institute website (Svenska filminstitutet): \url{http://www.sfi.se/sv/svensk-filmdatabas/} Retrieved 20120105
sical melody and a child voice-over. It is the youngest girl, Pia, who is the voice-over, but occasionally the voices of the three children on screen can also be heard.

On the island Pia, in her role as voice-over, reports that the children are building a shelter where they will sleep at night. The imagery shows how the children use leaves and branches to build it. When they are finished building, they have a snack. Placed on the table – which is made out of two rocks – are milk, raw carrots, tomatoes, a cucumber, raisins, bread and cheese. The girls and the boy eat and talk in what sounds like a happy manner before using some of the bread as bait for fishing. It is the older girl, Kickan, who catches the fish, but the boy, Mats, who is the oldest, that kills them (Image 2).

Image 2: Close-up on Mats’ hands killing one of the fish. Once upon a time there was a summer (Det var en gång en sommar), directed by Tomas and Yeng Löfdahl, SVT2, 19801003, 17.30-17.50.
Altogether only a few of all the programmes included in the study show dead animals, and in this programme explicit images show a child killing fish. Neither the children nor the voice-over express any feelings of discontent when the fish are killed. Instead the constitution of the fish is talked about. Mats together with Pia, in her position as voice-over, explain how a fish swims. As a clarification of these scientific facts, the swim bladder from one of the dead fish is shown floating in the water. The fish are cut up in pieces and used as bait in cages for trapping crayfish. That it is Mats who kills the fish could be seen as depicting a traditionally gendered activity (cf. Kalof & Fitzgerald, 2003). However, Kickan is the one doing the fishing and catching them in the first place, and hence this is a team activity. The practice of catching and killing animals is in this way naturalized and unquestioned in the programme (cf. Pedersen, 2007).

The three children are portrayed as well accustomed to survival in the wild. Altogether they know what to do when going on an excursion: build a shelter, bring along food and the appropriate equipment for fishing. Their packing is light, as they are wearing ordinary clothes and swimming naked. The only security devices they have are life vests used when in the boat. During the island visit, Pia expresses fear on two occasions, first for a bush-cricket, and the second time for a howling sound. On both occasions, the two older children assure her that there is no reason for worrying. Kickan explains that the howling sound is a dog and together Kickan and Mats explain that wolves do not live in the area. Their expertise is used to calm Pia. In this way, Kickan and Mats present nature as a safe place to be in. There is nothing to be afraid of and this nature can be safely enjoyed.

Mats is depicted as the one with the most knowhow and he answers most of Pia’s questions. Kickan also corrects and explains things to Pia, and it is Kickan who manages the boat, while Mats looks after Pia (Image 3). Here, Pia’s young age is a sign of having less competence than the older children. This hierarchy, however, is levelled out by the fact that Pia’s voice is used as the voice-over. It is the voice-over that explains the most complicated matters in the programme, allowing Pia as well to hold an expert position. The children work together to perform all the tasks on this outing. Thus, it can be argued that the children are not acting out stereotypical gender roles or age hierarchies, but instead cooperat-

---

211 In 1980, there are 3 other dead animals shown. In 1992, 3 dead animals are shown altogether. 4 dead animals are shown in 2007.

212 There is another young boy in the Amazons shown killing a sparrow with a catapult. This, however, is pictured at quite a distance, not showing the actual killing and only the dead body of the bird in passing (Robinson, SVT1, 19921017, 16.00-16.30).
ing and using their different competences together to manage the excursion on the island. Everyone is needed to tell this story.

When the night comes and the children are shown sitting outside the hut looking at the stars, Pia says, from her position as voice-over: “We have been sitting outside the shelter for a long time - just looking”. The outdoor experience is thus overwhelming for all three children. Pia then says directly from her position on the screen: “Never have I seen so many stars – only in fairy tales”. Here Pia is experiencing the wonder of nature’s beauty first hand. Her awe links well to the title of the programme, Once upon a time there was a summer, which draws on the fairy-tale genre. Thus it is outdoors in the countryside that children can experience stillness and good, sacralised nature. This is the ideal place for children (cf. Jones 2002).

Another clip shows the children wading around in the water checking the cages for crayfish. The morning light is so strong that it transforms them into glowing silhouettes. This sunlight and the very clear and dark midnight sky are typical for August in Sweden, and so is catching crayfish. The August light gives the television programme a dimmed framing, which visually builds an idyllic setting linked to Swedish nature. The beautiful outdoor landscape has been used to create a romanticized view that has been crucial to binding the Swedish national state together during the 19th century and afterwards (Halldén, 2009; Lindgren, 2009). This programme did not picture an historical event, at least not when it was produced in 1972 and the children fixed the programme in time with their 1970s clothes and haircuts. There is, however, a potential implicit critique in the programme title: Once upon a time there was a summer. The question is whether summers like these no longer exist? Is this a fairy-tale view of how it once was to be a child on summer holiday? Is the connection between children, their knowledge and independence, and an undisturbed outdoor life disappearing? The programme can also be interpreted as a nostalgic call to restore the bond between children and outdoor life in the wild, something every Swedish child should experience (cf. Halldén, 2009; 2011).

---

213 Some of the dimmed light can be seen in image 1, even if that pictures the children placing the cages in the water the evening before. The images picturing morning light are so bright and blurry that they cannot be printed.
Once upon a time there was a summer (Det var en gång en sommar), directed by Tomas and Yeng Löfdahl, SVT2, 19801003, 17.30-17.50.

In this programme, the children are shown on their own in nature. They manage their expedition and tasks without hesitations, and they do not seem to need help from anyone else. However, in the very last sequences, a break in the illusion of the self-sufficient child can be seen. When the children are leaving the island, the camera focuses on Pia and Mats sitting down in the boat. Pia points to something in the distance, presumably close to or behind the camera team’s boat. For a second Pia’s focus shifts, she smiles and looks straight into the camera, Mats smiles also before he hurriedly looks away, a bit embarrassed judging from the look on his face (Image 3). The illusion of being alone on the island is hereby broken (cf. Allen, 1992; Edin, 2000). The children have after all been looked after on this excursion by the camera eye and the adults behind it. This is a glance at the adults pulling the strings in the narration, the authors behind the storyboard and the speaker text. This glance reveals the narration as an adult’s nostalgic views on the connection between nature and children, and the children as acting out these views (cf. Lury, 2010; Outka, 2009; Ågren 2008). The content of this programme urges the child audience to step out into the wild, to experience the outdoor and to cherish it. However, this is more adult nostalgia talking than producing possible outings for an imagined audience to try out, as the competence and location needed seem difficult to realize for almost everybody.

The urban everyday outdoors

Day-care TV for children (Dagis-TV för barn) is a preschool programme series broadcast by UR. This programme series targets both preschool teachers and preschool children but the episodes with the postfix “for children” target children only. The programmes cover different topics, but preschool children are
depicted in both episodes part of the studied material\textsuperscript{214} (see also Lindgren, A., 2006). An autumn morning in 1992, an episode called “We play with things others throw away” is broadcast.\textsuperscript{215} This programme also focuses on an outing but in a different way than in the previous example. Here outdoor life is located in a populated urban area and the outings shown take place close to the day-care centre. The programme shows preschool children taking care of things that have been thrown away, both to clean up and to refurbish their preschool yard.

The programme starts with a young girl voiceover saying: “Today you will come along on an expedition in Day-care TV”. Several preschool children and two preschool teachers are seen walking in a line together in an urban area. The voiceover says that they are out looking for treasures. The children look well disciplined, and when they reach a park the line is abandoned and before the teachers even suggest it, the children start picking up litter that has been dropped in the surroundings (Image 4).

Image 4: The children and the teachers are picking up litter in a park. Day-care TV for children (Dagis-TV för barn), produced by UR, SVT1, 19920421, 09.30-09.45; 19921001, 9.30-9.45; 19921017, 9.00-9.15.

Agneta, one of the teachers, asks the children where litter should be disposed of and why it should not be thrown in nature, etc. The questions are pedagogical more than authentic (Dysthe, 1996), as there is no doubt that Agneta already knows the right answers. However, the children know the right answers too, and several of them answer in quite elaborate ways. For example, everyone knows that litter should be left in garbage cans and not on the ground. One boy knows that “animals can cut themselves” on garbage lying about and another one declares that people who leave plastic bags on the ground should be called “nature

\textsuperscript{214} Dagis-TV för barn, UR, SVT1, 19920421, 09.30-09.45; 19921001, 9.30-9.45; 19921017, 9.00-9.15.

\textsuperscript{215} Dagis-TV för barn, UR, SVT1, 19921001, 9.30-9.45. Produced by UR.
tormenters”. The nature referred to here is the park, and the outdoor-expedition that these children are part of takes place between buildings. Studies of preschool practices have pointed out that what counts as nature neither has to be wild nor to be located far away from the preschool (Bergnéhr, 2009; Ånggård, 2009). Being outdoors can in fact be synonymous with nature (Bergnéhr, 2009). This is only partly the case in Day-Care TV. Here nature is being outdoors, but it is also what is damaged when things are thrown away in the wrong way. Because these children are cleaning up nature, they become part of its cycle.

This expedition takes place on a grey day. There is no sun in sight and not much greenery either. The surroundings are quite muddy and the children as well as the teachers are dressed for these conditions, most of them in wellies and rainwear (Image 4 & 5). The clothing is like a uniform that cuts across age, gender and hierarchy.


The group walks on to a refuse dump (Image 5). “You can find good things there”, the voiceover says. They start looking through the containers with help from the station staff. Among other things the teacher, Agneta, asks for an old wooden door and a hammock. The children ask for old vacuum cleaners, two pipes and some other items. In the dialogue, there is no sign of the adults telling the children to hold back in their treasure hunt. Instead the group leaves the dump with their bits and pieces, and the children are shown carrying their own finds.
As soon as they are back on the yard outside the day-care centre, all the children start working with their new things and are assisted by the adults. Agneta brings out tools, and together the children and the teachers start repairing the playground boat (Image 6). Two young boys are using one of the pipes as a water groove and a few other boys are using the other pipe as a cannon on the roof of their hut. Yet another boy then transforms the water groove into a chimney pot on the boat. The fastening of the pipe on the boat is assisted by one of the teachers, but it is the boy who explains how it should be done and who attaches the pipe with planks and nails. It is mostly the boys who are seen and heard when it comes to the planning and restoration, but girls too are shown doing carpentry work. The fact that the voiceover is made by a young girl also levels out the focus on boys in the programme. Several long sequences of children in deep concentration using tools on their respective tasks are shown, and their conversation is heard without interruption, neither by the adults nor the voiceover. Even though this programme started off by showing children walking in a line and answering questions, they are allowed to be very agentive both in their treasure decisions and in how the treasures should be used in their outdoor environment. This programme portrays the activities on the yard as being based on cooperation between children and adults. Several children are seen swinging in the hammock at the end of the programme. The last thing the voiceover says is: “A treasure is something that you can play with”.

This programme draws on realism. The only encouraged make believe present is when the children’s imaginations are used to see things that others have thrown away in a new light. These children are cleaning up nature and searching the litter for things that they can play with, not standing in awe of nature’s beauty.

The children are shown outdoors during the entire programme. The notion of
children as benefitting from being outdoors is fully expressed here, even though the nature experienced is urban and institutionalized by the preschool setting (cf. Bergnér, 2009; Coninck-Smith, 1999; Dyblie Nilsen, 2009; Halldén, 2009; Jones, 2002; Sandin, 2003; Stordal, 2009; Säljö, 2000; Änggård 2009). This is not exclusive to this programme. Several other educational programmes show children leaving their indoor institutional settings, going out. In her study of a magazine for preschool teachers, Disa Bergnér (2009) recognizes that engaging in physical activity, improving one’s motor skills and being healthy means learning and that this should preferably take place outdoors (see also Änggård, 2009). Similar notions can be seen in this programme.

The children are not alone in this programme. They are looked after by their caretakers, but this hierarchy is not what the content is built on. Even if these children are portrayed as in institutionalized care (cf. Säljö, 2000), they have a say in what they do and with what material. The children are performing everyday urban life in an outdoor setting together with adults. This constitutes a form of address built on respect for the children’s own actions, for the adults caring for them and for nature. The surrounding city is thus not lacking in nature, but instead the children in the city are taking care of nature close by, living in it and creating a meaningful everyday life in relation to it. This configures an audience that recognizes everyday life in day-care settings, as the life lived there does not need to be explained. This audience, however, can be inspired and encouraged to play, be creative and recycle by the way in which this programme portrays outdoor nature as being part of the ordinary. In this programme, there is no nostalgia like that seen in the previous example, just children outdoors, cleaning and recycling in their everyday life.

The grand wilderness

Yet another programme where the outdoor experience constitutes the primary content is Expedition Wilderness (Expedition Vildmark). It is a TV series in which two teams of children compete against each other, performing various tasks and living outdoor life in different parts of Sweden, together with an adult guide. One Sunday morning in October 2007 a 25-minute-long episode shows one of the teams and the guide on a mission to transport a reindeer quite a long distance in the Northern alpine landscape. The guide and programme host,

---

216 E.g., Allt hänger ihop, UR, SVT2, 19920416, 17.45-18.15; Dagis-TV: Ett riktigt hönshus, UR, SVT1, 19921017, 9.00-9.15; Runt i naturen, UR, SVT1, 19921001, 9.15-9.30.
217 Expedition vildmark, SVT1 20071021, 10.35-11.00; it is a rerun from the 071018. Produced by SVT. 
André, sets the agenda for the programme, while the female voice-over presents background and overview information. The child contestants are quite often interviewed on screen, and they are thereby also part of telling this story.

Image 7: The host in *Expedition Wilderness* (*Expedition Vildmark*), produced by SVT, SVT1 20071021, 10.35-11.00.

The episode starts by showing André in a white snowy landscape with mountains and a large cloudy sky in the background (Image 7). It looks grand, beautiful and quite inviting. However, André immediately starts to talk about how the bears are waking up after their winter sleep, how wolves and wolverines are close by and how the approaching spring is causing the ices to melt, making it difficult to move in the area. After setting the scene like this, the friendly looking landscape might not be so friendly after all. André declares straight into the camera that: “This is Expedition Wilderness where the adventure is for real.” The scene for this episode’s adventure is also presented: “This is Lapponia, one of our world heritage areas and that means that this place must be protected”. The beautiful surroundings are in this way also put forward as a valuable and rare wilderness.

André and three children are then seen on screen (Image 8). The children are asked whether they would like to help a friend of André’s with something. The children agree to take on the task before knowing what it is. It turns out that they are to help a reindeer named Bertil back to his heard. Bertil is a reindeer, humanized by being given a name and by his friendship with André. The fact that reindeers are domestic animals belonging to the Saami, a Swedish indigenous people, is not mentioned. Thereby, the fact that Bertil is portrayed as having lost his heard and his mum, and not that it is his owner who has lost him, also builds the anthropomorphic framing of the reindeer.
The team consists of two boys, 13-year-old Nils and Brouk, and of a 12-year-old girl, Fanni, all introduced by the voiceover. The entire group is dressed in wind-and waterproof-hiking clothes marked with the SVT logo, warm hats and gloves. They are all also wearing ice prods around their necks (Image 8). The advanced clothing makes the expedition look professional and not like an everyday type of activity.

Even if the children are supposed to be the main characters of the programme, the fact that they are introduced after André explains the setting for the programme, establishes the hierarchy in the group from the start. It is also upheld by the fact that André guides the expedition, asks the children questions and has the right answers. In addition to this, André also reminds the children of the predators living in the area and asks them to keep their eyes open for any signs of bears. Fanni then tells the others to look out for the remains of anthills, because when the hungry bears wake up they eat the ants and destroy the anthills.

The children are thus shown to have competences, and they talk to the camera, quite often describing the course of events. Still, André is in charge, so Nils’, Brouk’s and Fanni’s participation mainly consists of answering Andrés’ questions and reacting to what happens during the expedition.

The programme contains several challenging parts. The group is to cross-country ski to shepherd the reindeer. Bertil is not so easily handled and the group moves quite slowly in the terrain. The animal also manages to get off his leash and the group has to work quite hard to catch him again. To teach the children and point out the seriousness of the weather conditions, André jumps into a hole in the ice to demonstrate how to properly use the security gear designed to deal with weak ice. Shortly afterwards, Fanni is shown getting her feet wet and needing assistance to get away from an area of very thin ice. André takes com-
mand in rescuing her. André is also seen helping Fanni put dry socks and plastic bags on her feet before putting the wet shoes on again. Here, the 12-year-old is getting assistance in dressing herself, which shows how exceptional and potentially dangerous the incident was. The adult guide is portrayed as responsible for the care of these children, and the hierarchy in the group is confirmed once again.

The group is shown continuing to ski on the frozen lake, and after a while the background music becomes rather dramatic. André has said that the group should aim for a rock sticking up in the ice, but when the group comes nearer it becomes obvious that it is not a rock. It is a dead reindeer that has had its intestines eaten by some animal (Image 9).

Image 9: The host, the team and Bertil looking at a cadaver in Expedition Wilderness (Expedition Vildmark), produced by SVT, SVT1 20071021, 10.35-11.00.

The group is displayed standing around the cadaver looking at it (Image 9). They look quite alone in the massive landscape stretching out in the background. Both Brouk and Fanni are expressing disgust at the sight. Nils is heard saying: "I mean I’ve seen dead animals on TV but not as dead as this one, this guy, he was like stone-dead”. He is here experiencing nature first hand, but it is not a beautiful sight, quite the contrary. André and Bertil, however, look unaffected. There is no sign of surprise on André’s part. It was he who directed the group towards what turned out to be a cadaver. In this passage, the adult seems to be a puppeteer pulling the strings to make the expedition into a ‘real’ adventure.

André asks the children where they think they should camp that evening. The children express anxiety about sleeping in a tent with a bear possibly close by and they decide to go back a bit away from the cadaver. A tent is put up and André makes dinner over an open fire before they tie Bertil to a tree and go to bed.
The programme then moves on to show the next morning when the children leave the tent. Fanni exits the tent first. She quickly moves away out of the frame but before she does one can detect a smile on her face. Then Brouk exits and Fanni is heard saying: “But where is Bertil?” The reindeer is no longer on the spot where he was tied the night before. That the reindeer is gone is portrayed as a surprise for the viewer, but it seems not to be news for the children taking part in this so-called ‘real’ adventure, judging by Fanni’s smile. Good shots are needed to make the programme, but it does not star professional actors (cf. Lury, 2010; Ågren 2008). Here it becomes clear that the children on screen are experiencing a different adventure than the viewers are. It is also possible that the adventure is only real when watched on TV. The fact that the reindeer is gone is also the perfect TV cliffhanger to introduce the coming episode, and this is how the programme ends. Fanni, Brouk and Nils took on the task of delivering Bertil the reindeer and now he is gone, which means that they may lose the Expedition Wilderness competition.

In this programme, the outdoors becomes a scene for the competition. Outdoor nature is portrayed as grand, dangerous and not easily enjoyed without the proper professional gear and adult guidance. The children experiencing the adventure on screen are portrayed as taking part in the competition rather than dealing with the wilderness. The narrative is built up for the imagined child audience and not to the same extent for the children taking part in the adventure. The outdoor nature is in this respect portrayed as wild and grand, but this content is perhaps most exiting, safest and most enjoyable when seen on TV.

**The outdoors as a form of child address**

The analysis shows that the outdoor content produces different discourses of nature. For instance, nature in the programmes on outdoor life is portrayed as good, ordinary, in need of protection as well as dangerous. The nostalgic discourse portrays the outdoors as beautiful, giving and stable. It is safe and just waiting out there to be explored by children. But a glance at the camera reveals even the most competent children to be a product of adult nostalgia (cf. Outka, 2009). The everyday discourse portrays outdoor nature as close by, ordinary and in need of care. It is waiting for urban children to come out and help clean it up. Here, everyday outdoor life is portrayed as documentary and no narrated plot is revealed. The grand discourse pictures the outdoors as breathtaking, far away and not altogether kind (cf. Cronon, 1995). It has its own conditions and children need expert help in order to make it there. This outdoor representation is said to be real, but a puppeteer is visible as well as the fact that the children are acting out a plot. In this way, also how natural outdoor nature is portrayed to be differs across representations.
Outdoor life also re/produces different discourses in relation to the represented children in these programmes. Outdoor nature thus depicts children as belonging to and enjoying outdoor life, but it positions them quite differently. Children in these programmes are shown to be competent users of outdoor nature, as cooperating to handle their everyday outdoor experience and as in need of adult guidance to manage. This is not dependent on age. The children in the programme needing the most assistance were the oldest. This competence also does not grow with time, as the programme portraying children in most need of assistance was the most recent. Something that can also be noted in the representation of children outdoors is that even if outdoor nature is portrayed as distinctly Swedish (cf. Halldén, 2009; Lindgren, 2009; 1999) – through use of a once-upon-a-time approach, everyday Swedish life and the Swedish world heritage – the children are not portrayed as stereotypical ethnic Swedes. All three programmes star children with seemingly different ethnic backgrounds, judging from their names and appearance. They are all portrayed as Swedish children, and their respective backgrounds are not pointed out in any way.

These discursive notions of outdoor life and of the category children also allow for the configuration of different child audiences. The audience addressed by the nostalgic view on outdoor life has little chance of living up to the depicted competence and beautiful location, and they thereby share in the adult nostalgia – once there were children and places like these. The target audience for the everyday discourse of outdoor life has a better chance of living the life portrayed, and what it needs to pick up on is the moral obligation to care about one’s surroundings. The audience addressed by the grand discourse of outdoor life is more likely to be positioned in front of the TV than expected to take part in the adventure. Thus, over the years, outdoor nature content has been used to target quite different audiences, but they are all imagined to take an interest in and have a relation to outdoor life.

Animal-child relations

Animals constitute the largest nature content category for all years studied, and more than half of all programmes contain animals of some sort (see overview).

---

218 There are, however, also exceptions. For example, in Ants in the pants (Myror i brallan) (within Bolibompa, SVT1, 20070410, 18.00-18.30) several children, both very young and a bit older, are very knowledgeable about animals and outdoor life.
This is a diverse category. The variety of animals portrayed is huge; some are more domesticated than others and they are present on a multitude of arenas. Animated images as well as more documentary footage of animals exists in the material, and both SVT and UR broadcast programmes starring animals. Many of these programmes have an animal focus as their primary content and the programmes span several genres. Animals are used in multiple ways, for example, to draw children’s attention to environmental issues, to engage in educational programmes, to bridge generational gaps and to address different target groups in family programmes, and animals are also used for discussing human relations through fables (cf. Bousé, 2000; Boglind & Nordenstam, 2010). Therefore almost any principal of selection could be used when choosing examples for in-depth analysis, but I have decided to make a case of one small animal, the bee. This is because bees are not obviously connected to the category children, unlike other animals such as kittens or teddy bears for example. In this way, bees provide a good example for studying animal-child relations, because if programmes containing bees, which have no special relationship to children, can create a child address, then so can programmes containing any animal. One programme on bees from 1980, one from 1992 and one from 2007 have been chosen for a more thorough analysis. These programmes all focus on bees as their main content or as part of it. They also have characteristics significant to

---

219 Present in the programmes are chickens, horses, monkeys, dogs, cats, cows, butterflies, bees, bugs, lizards, hedgehogs, hippopotamuses, crocodiles, fish, elks, hares, birds, bears, ducks, mice, foxes, pigs, tigers, penguins, etc.

220 There are animals shown on farms, in people’s homes, in zoos, in day-care centres, in schools, in parks, in urban settings, in the countryside, in lakes, in woods and so forth. Animals are shown in Sweden, Austria, Ecuador, Ethiopia, Japan, Tanzania, the UK, the US, Germany, Finland, Norway, Brazil and so forth.

221 About 100 programmes have animals as their primary content.

222 Animations, documentaries, quizzes, shows, fairy tales, etc.

223 E.g., Zoom - tropisk regnskog, UR, SVT1, 19800901, 10.10-10.40; Teckenkvarten NU, UR, SVT1, 19921017, 15.45-16.00; Runt i naturen - Hemma hos en skalbagge, UR, SVT1, 20070405, 10.15-10.20.

224 E.g., Switch on 1, UR, SVT1, 19800901, 9.00-9.10; Dagis-tv: Ett riktigt hönshus, UR, SVT1, 19921017, 09.00-09.15; Katten, musen, tiotusen – spanska UR, SVT1, 20070927, 11.30-11.40.

225 E.g., Gomorron Sverige!, SVT1, 19800405, 8.00-10.00; 7-9, SVT1, 19921017, 19.00-21.00; Sündagsöppet, SVT1, 19921025, 17.30-20.00.

226 E.g., Strumpfolket, Om, UR, SVT1, 19800925, 09.20-09.40; Rävaktiga historier (within another programme), SVT1, 19921009, 18.15-18.45; Örjan den höjdrädda örnen (Bolibompa), SVT1, 20070406, 8.35-9.00.
the programme material: in 1980 focusing on the factual aspects of animals and in 2007 focusing on animal content with a fictional frame. The programme on bees from 1992 is an example of an evergreen fictional content in TV for children: the cartoon. These programmes all target younger children. There are altogether few programmes with a main focus on animals for older children or youth. The issues at stake in this section are how programmes focusing on animal content address children, how animal life is reproduced and what kind of imagined child viewer the animal relation configures.

The factual bee

*The Bee’s world (Biets värld)* is a UR programme for primary and middle school broadcast at noon in early September 1980. The programme is the first episode in a series about bees and their behaviour. This episode is entitled “The Bee and the Bee Society”. It is twenty minutes long and begins by showing a snowy countryside landscape. There is a female voice-over providing the narrative and presenting facts in the programme.

The camera focus moves over the landscape scenery and sets on two beehives. The voiceover reports that bees are not asleep during the winter but living in their hives off the honey that they collected during the summer. The camera focus is then moved and the inside of the hive is shown. One can see images of bees sitting close to each other (image 10), and the voice-over explains that this is a way of keeping warm. While the imagery of bees and the inside of a hive is visible on screen, the voiceover presents other facts about bees. The bees are almost exclusively seen in close-ups, but the difficulties in picturing small flying bees as well as the inside of a usually dark beehive are handled here using technology. The magnifying close-ups make it possible to show cells in cross-

---

227 E.g., *Det låter som det växer*, SVT2, 19800405, 17.30-18.00; *Halvfem - Igelkotten*, SVT1, 19800408, 16.30-17.00; *Här kommer schimpansen*, SVT2, 19800408, 17.40-18.00. There are very few programmes only focusing on facts about animals in a documentary setting in 1992 and 2007.

228 E.g., stories with a fictional framing of documentary footage of animals: There is one example from 1992: *Grodan Max*, (within another programme) SVT1, 19920907, 18.15-18.45; but several from 2007 e.g: *Geckoödlan Emil (Krokomax)*, UR, SVT1, 2007-04-10 17.30-18.00, *Allt om djur (Bolibompa)*, SVT1, 2007-09-03 18.30-18.55; *Jordlöparen Johnny (Klorofyll)*, UR, SVT1, 2007-04-04 17.55-18.00.

229 E.g., *Woody Woodpecker* (within another programme), SVT1, 19800405, 8.00-10.00; Ett spännande paket *Pluto* (within another programme), SVT1, 19920417, 19.00-20.00; *Disney’s classic cartoons, Pluto’s heart throb* (within another programme), SVT1, 20071013, 18.00-19.00.

230 *Biets värld*, UR, SVT1, 19800901, 12.00-12.20. Produced by UR.
section, freeze the image when pointing something out and show the movements of bees in slow-motion. In this way, the viewers are invited to look at the workings of nature first hand, and the educational aspect of this programme is accentuated by the possibility to show what cannot be seen with the human eye. The ability to use technology to show things previously unseen has been an argument for educational visual media from its start (Lindgren, 2009; see also Crary, 1992; Lindgren, Sparrman & Eriksson-Barajas, 2012; Sturken & Cartwright 2009; Sparrman, 2006).

Image 10: Inside a beehive in The Bee’s World (Biets värld), produced by UR, SVT1, 19800901, 12.00-12.20.

The focus again is moved outside the hive. The narrator points out that the days are getting longer and that the sun feels quite warm. The viewer sees what looks like snow with a yellowish stain on it. It is explained to be droppings from a bee and one can see the bee sitting on the snow. The voice-over says that the warmth of the sun has lured the bee outside but that it is still too cold for it. The bee has become stiff from sitting on the snow and it is therefore unable to fly. Two children on skis are shown moving in close to the hives and one of them picks up the bee (image 11).
The camera focuses on the child’s hand holding the bee (image 12). It is explained that a warm hand rapidly makes the bee warm enough to fly back into the hive. The children are not visible on screen for long and their voices can only be heard for a few seconds. When the scene changes they have disappeared and instead spring has arrived. However brief their appearance is, the children are depicted as showing interest in bees and their presence forms a child-animal relation (cf. Berger 1982; deCordova, 1994). This relation connects the content of this programme to viewers, who are represented by the children on screen, and in this way the programme also comes to address children (cf. Lury, 2010; Ågren 2008).

Facts about how fast a bee grows, what it eats and what its tasks are in the group are part of the story. The queen bee is shown and the egg laying process is described (image 13). The other bees are said to feed and take care of the queen.
while she lays her eggs. What is also pointed out as a fact by the voiceover is that the title ‘queen’ has noting to do with a hierarchy in the hive, but that all bees cooperate to make the society work. The development from egg to bee is shown and “the first job that the new bee takes on is to clean the cells” reports the voice-over, which functions as an omniscient teacher explaining what the images are showing and thereby also deciding what is important and should be focused on.

The life of bees is portrayed using a scientific, factual approach that tries to capture what is going on in a beehive when humans are not looking. With the scientific content and the use of technology, children can see with their own eyes how bees live. In this way children are supposed to learn about and to appreciate this animal.

The stereotyped bee

Image 14: A skyscraper in Window Cleaners, produced by Disney, from The Disney Club (Disneyklubben), SVT1, 19921001, 18.45-20.00.

Another programme also starring a bee, but in a much more fictional way, is an animated eight-minute-long Disney cartoon produced in 1940. This short film is part of the programme The Disney Club (Disneyklubben) and was broadcast on a Thursday evening in October 1992.\textsuperscript{231} The storyline in this classical cartoon is that Pluto and Donald Duck are window cleaners. The duck is standing on a platform made out of planks and ropes, and the whole construction lacks security devices altogether. He is high up in the air along the outside of a skyscraper (image 14) when the next important character comes along, the bee.

\textsuperscript{231} Disneyklubben, SVT1 19921001, 18.45-20.00. Window Cleaners is a Disney production.
About four minutes into the film, the bee comes flying past Donald Duck and lands on a plant placed on a windowsill (Image 15). The bee is minding its own business and takes no notice of the duck. Donald Duck, however, smiles mischievously and pours water into the flower when he sees the bee disappear into it. The bee is then seen fighting to reach the surface of the flower coughing and panting for breath (Image 16). It slowly manages to reach the top of the flower and Donald Duck is heard laughing. The bee gets very upset and decides to sting the duck.

Donald defends himself by holding the bee back with his bucket and by blowing at it. This whole fight is going on very high up on the windowsill and on the small cleaning platform. The bee is quite determined and when Donald thinks he has outsmarted it, the bee laughs at him. The bee is by now very exhausted but musters all its forces and manages to sting Donald, who—of course—falls down.
into the drainpipe and gets stuck there with no help from Pluto. What happens to the bee is not shown.

The narrative of this short film concerns the mischief done by Donald Duck and how the bee fights back. The bee is portrayed as peaceful and doing its job until provoked. It is hence hard working and innocent to start with, but revengeful once it is startled. The story draws on the fable tradition and the animals are portrayed using quite schematic, stereotype characteristics (cf. Boglind & Nordenstam, 2010; Bousé, 2000). The most stereotype portrayal is that of the bee. It is reduced to its stinging powers and determination to take revenge. These are things not even mentioned in the program The Bee’s world. The duck is the most humanlike of the animals in this cartoon, with a job and a pet dog, Pluto. The anthropomorphic shaping of the duck also becomes visible by his clothing, and the fact that he can talk (cf. Bousé, 2000; Chris 2006; Kramer, 2005). Neither the bee nor Pluto can speak nor do they have clothes on. The bee’s body, however, is slightly humanized as well, as it has two arms and two legs only (image 16) and it moves as if it could fight with its fists. Pluto too has a humanized role, as he is Donald Duck’s associate in the window cleaning business. This programme is focused on entertaining the viewer, and this is done through a combination of narrative aspects: first, the dangers of the height and the fragile equipment used and, second, the humanized fictional animals and their interaction, but mostly the morals of the situation. The address is about amusing the viewer by showing how the duck gets what he deserves as well as by drawing on stereotyped notions of bees that the viewer is expected to have known all along: You should never upset a bee.

There is a massive amount of animated animal representations in the material, more in 2007 than in 1980 owing to the technological progress that has taken place.232 Such old cartoons as this are broadcast as reruns during all the studied years.233 The fact that these old cartoons are still present in TV for children reveals the continuity of addressing children with animation, and more specifically with animated animals (cf. deCordova, 1994). In newer programmes, animated animals often have a social bound, like a family, which they exist in relation to.

---

232 About 18 programmes are animated in 1980, there are about 20 animated programmes in 1992 but then several are an hour long. In 2007 there are about 50 animated programmes of varying length. E.g., Anatole, SVT2, 19800406, 17.50-18.00; Disney-dags, SVT1, 19920417, 19.00-20.00; Landet länge sedan, 2007, SVT1, 20070406, 09.00-10.10

233 E.g., Woody Woodpecker (within another programme), SVT1, 19800405, from 1944; Mickey Mouse, The Pointer, 19920417, 19.00-20.00 (within another programme) SVT1, from 1939, Mickey Mouse, A Gentleman’s Gentleman, 20070407, 18.00-19.00 (within another programme) SVT1, from 1941.
and the morals of these programmes are therefore more focused on cooperation.\textsuperscript{234} However, the animals in this programme are individual actors. Here, the more human-like animal is only interested in its own amusement, while the more animal-like stereotyped animal acts on instinct. The audience configured by this programme content is one that knows that cooperation is more rewarding; it can see through the narrative and say with amusement: ‘I knew it’, at the end.

The anthropomorphic bee

There are also programmes with a fictional framing that show ‘authentic’ footage of insects. The programme \textit{All around in nature - Here come the egg-laying animals} (Runt i naturen – Här kommen äggdjuren) portrays bees. This UR programme is part of an educational cluster of programmes filling the entire morning slot, 9.30-11.55, on a Thursday at the end of September 2007.\textsuperscript{235} This is a five-minute-long programme in Swedish and sign language for primary school pupils, focusing on insects and their reproduction. Previously butterflies, flies, ants and their egg-laying practices have been presented. The last one and a half minutes of the programme are devoted to bees. The voice-over is a lady’s voice speaking Swedish in dialect, which gives the whole programme an informal framing. The way she tells the story also builds on talking viewers through the programme rather than educating them. The lady using sign language on screen stresses this even more by functioning as an adult guide through the programme (Image 17-19).

\textsuperscript{234} E.g., \textit{Stora Katt och Lilla Katt} (within another programme), SVT1, 20070406, 8.00-9.00; \textit{Dr. Dog} (within another programme) UR SVT1, 20070927, 17.00-17.30 \textit{Fåret Shaun} (within another programme), SVT1, 20071005, 18.30-18.34.

\textsuperscript{235} \textit{All around in nature - Here come the egg-laying animals} (Runt i naturen – Här kommen äggdjuren) UR, SVT1, 20070927, 10.10-10.15. This is an UR production.
The part on bees shows bees moving around one slightly larger bee, the queen (image 17). The voice-over talks about honeybees, that the queen bee lays all the eggs and that the holes in which the eggs are laid are called cells. She also says: “the other bees see to it that she [the queen] feels important and liked, because then you do your best.” The images still show the larger bee and the others moving around it. Here the viewer is informed about the feelings of the queen bee, but also of the intentions of the other bees, which are showing their appreciation of her to help her do her best. Using this anthropomorphic approach, human feelings, intentions and morals are incorporated into the story together with ‘facts’ about bees (cf. Bousé, 2000; Chris 2006; Gantez, 2012).

The images and the voice-over then start focusing on a new bee exiting its cell (Image 18). The development from the egg to larvae and on to a pupa is men-
tioned in passing. What is focused on in the images is the head of the new bee eating its way through the lid of the cell. The voice-over tells a story about what the other bees are doing. These bees are called “adults” and they are described as “tinkering, cleaning and chitchatting to each other” while “fixing food for the new bee.” The voice-over says: “It is so nice to be fussed over. Yes, everything goes so much easier when you feel liked from the start.” Yet again the viewer is informed of the feelings and activities of the bees. Here “adult” bees are doing their business much like adult humans usually do, minding children, cleaning and socializing. Notions of human child-raising pedagogy and advice become visible in that it is a good thing to know that one is ‘liked from the start’. There is no questioning of whether there is such a thing as a bee child in this programme. This can be compared to the ‘facts’ given in The Bee’s World, where it is reported that all bees are equal in size and in work capacity from the start. Instead the bee is called “new” or “little” throughout this sequence.

Image 19: Sign language interpreter, and a new born bee moving around in All around in nature - Here come the egg-laying animals (Runt i naturen – Här kommer äggdfuren), produced by UR, SVT1, 20070927, 10.10-10.15.

The bee exits the cell and starts to move around and the camera zooms out a bit (Image 19). The voice-over ends the programme part on bees as well as the programme by pretending to be one of the bees greeting the new bee saying: “Hello and welcome!” And then she answers in the role of the new bee: “Okay, thank you! Wow what a place!”

In this way the programme uses a fictional and anthropomorphic framing of the animal imagery (cf. Bousé, 2000; Chris 2006; Ganetz, 2012). The bees are talked about in a way that humanizes them, but the voice-over also shares information about how bees develop. The fictional frame blurs the ‘facts’, as it is the story that is in focus, rendering this short sequence mostly sweet and entertaining.
By focusing on the narrative, the voice-over is referring to both the fable tradition and fairy-tales as well as relating ‘facts’ about the animals’ lives (cf. Boglind & Nordenstam, 2010; Bousé, 2000). These programmes take the anthropomorphic representation even further than wildlife films for adult audiences do, as they so not hide the storytelling, but use fictive dialogue, for example (cf. Bousé 2000; Chris 2006; Ganetz, 2012). The programme portrays bees as being a lot like humans. This configures an audience that takes an interest in creeping and potentially stinging things, if they are framed as cute and likeable. The imagined audience is thus produced as one that needs fiction and entertainment to watch educational programme content about animals.

The animal as a form of child address

The analysis shows that a child-animal relation is formed in the programmes even if bees are not cuddly and do not have any pet potential. This connection also draws on the discursive notion of the close link between children and animals (cf. Baker, 2001; Berger, 1982; deCordova, 1994; Rydin, 2000). The viewers are thereby firstly expected to be interested in animals because they are imagined to be children. The type of animal that this relation is built on seems irrelevant if we consider the huge presence of animal content in TV for children. Children are also expected to learn about animals as part of the construction of children as both needing to be educated and being interested in animals. In this way, the imagined child audience is configured by the animal TV content, by the educational address and by the children visible in one of the programmes (cf. Berger, 1982; Buckingham, 2003; Sparrman, 2010).

But the representations of bees also blur boundaries. The first programme is shot in the wild, but it focuses on domesticated animals and thereby shows the nature-culture complexity in action (cf. Garnetz, 2012; Haraway, 1991; Macnaghten & Urry, 1998). When the humanlike duck gets what he deserves from the more animal-like animals, these representations blur the whole category ‘animals’ (cf. Haraway, 1991). The focus on the likeness between bee babies and human babies in the last example serves to destabilize what is human, what is animal and what a child is (cf. Baker, 2001; Haraway, 1991; Lee, 2001; Prout, 2005; Taylor, 2011).

These different animal content discourses in TV for children produce different notions of children. The factual discourse reports scientifically on bees. This forms an educational address and positions the imagined child viewer as a pupil. The fictional discourse tells a story about a bee caricature, and thereby forms an entertaining address that positions the viewer as being in on the joke. When the-
These two discourses are combined, the fictional framing and the factual aspects are linked together to tell an appealing and informative story about bees. Here, the viewer is imagined as only being interested in animals if they are like humans and if they are cute.

Environmental issues - saving the world

Environmental issues are not as large a category as the two previous ones, but they are present in the programming to the same extent during all the studied years (about 10%). Three examples of environmental issues, one from each year, have been chosen for in-depth analysis. These examples consist of parts of programmes that focus primarily on environmental issues. They also have characteristics specific to each year: In 1980, the environment and man-made problems are in focus.236 In 1992, environmental issues are often present in educational programmes.237 In 2007, children act in regard to the environment.238 The examples analysed here target young children, children as well as youth. The issues at stake in this section are how programmes containing environmental issues address children, how environmental issues are re/produced for children and what kind of imagined child audience this content configures.

Adults destroy - technology saves

The children’s programme series Our amazing world (Vår fantastiska värld) contains many different parts. The episode analysed here was broadcast on the 8th of April 1980, a Tuesday evening.239 It contained: what has happened on the 8th of April previously in history; the development of the postal service; camouflage in the animal world; the whooping crane; a science fiction series; and an animated series on human history. The male programme host introduces all the different clips and is the voice-over for most parts of this seventy-minute-long episode.

---

236 E.g., Malin och Mats på Ängsö, SVT2, 19800403, 17.30-17.50; Sverige i närbild, UR, SVT1, 19800901, 9.20-9.40; Naturvetenskapligt magasin, UR, SVT1 19800925, 13.35-14.00.
237 E.g., Högttryck: Öst i förändring - Uzbekistan, UR, SVT1, 19921017, 9.15-9.45; Kunskap och känsla: Maten, makten och girigheten, UR, SVT1 19921001, 11.45-12.15; Teckenkvartern NU, UR, SVT1, 19921017, 15.45-16.00.
238 E.g., Pi, UR SVT1, 20071013, 09.45-10.00; Unna Junná, SVT1 20071021, 09.00-09.15; Runt i naturen – Alice i energilandet, UR STV1, 20070405, 11.20-11.30.
239 Vår fantastiska värld, SVT1, 19800408, 18.10-19.20. It was produced by SVT. The clip on cranes looks quite old, but no credits for this part are shown so it cannot be dated, nor can the original producer be named.
programme. In this section, an eight-minute-long clip on the whooping crane will be analysed. The voice-over informs the viewers about different kinds of cranes, but more specifically about the endangered whooping crane (Image 20). He introduces the clip by saying: “Wouldn’t it be a shame if this bird were not allowed to live any longer?”

The storyline focuses on cranes, but also raises the issue of endangered animals more generally. ‘Facts’ about them are presented and the reasons for their endangerment are said to be hunting and/or a massive decline in these species’ natural habitats. “And this is the fault of humans”, says the voice-over, and continues by explaining that some humans are making amends for the damage humankind has caused. This brings the story to a nature reserve in the US. In the reserve, the voiceover reports, animals are not only protected, but efforts are also being made to improve their living conditions. The voice-over continues by saying that is done using modern technology. Images are shown of how tractors and bulldozers reshape nature in the reserve to make it more suited to the needs of endangered animals (Image 21). “The humans are helping nature”, says the voice-over.
Image 21: Improvement of the reserve by the use of tractors in Our amazing world (Vår fantastiska värld), produced by SVT, SVT1, 19800408, 18.10-19.20.

The nature reserve staff are reported to fly over the reserve once a week to count the cranes and locate precisely where they are (Image 22). Why that should be important is not mentioned. There is also no estimate of the environmental damage that the bulldozers and the planes could cause, or mention that it could be a source of disturbance for the precious species. What is reported, though, is that tourists are allowed to visit the reserve only in very restricted ways so as not to disturb the animals. It is hence humans that cause disturbance and are a threat to these animals – machines and technology are not.

Image 22: The plane that surveys the whooping cranes in Our amazing world (Vår fantastiska värld), produced by SVT, SVT1, 19800408, 18.10-19.20.

However, an oil company in the neighbourhood and the US air force have adapted their transport routes in consideration of the animals in the reserve, but more space cannot be set aside for the cranes because the land is being explored for farming, industries and residential areas, says the voice-over. And continues that about 1000 animal species around the world are threatened. The cranes are
reported to have lived for at least 2 million years, and the programme ends by the voice-over saying: “Now they need all the help they can get to only survive the next ten years.”

This programme draws on a risk discourse according to which the human lifestyle is causing other species to become extinct. However, in this programme humans are not expected to change. Still, with the help of technology some of the endangered animals can be protected in confined areas. Humans are thus the culprits, but with the help of technology also the possible saviours. The way the content of this programme is presented places the child audience in a peculiar position. Nothing is said about what children can or should do. It is completely the fault of adults that animals risk extinction, and it is only adults, with their technological knowledge, who can do anything about it. Thus, the configured child audience should know about the state of the world and it should be both anxious and slightly hopeful about the future as regards endangered species.

Adults destroy – politics saves

The TV guide states that Little News Billboard (Lilla löpsedeln) is a UR news show for middle school and secondary school pupils, and for children and young people. The first topic on a Tuesday morning in April 1992 is the Baltic Sea and the serious pollution in those waters. One of the news anchors says that the Ministers for the Environment in the countries bordering on the Baltic Sea have had a meeting about the pollution. A female reporter is reading the speaker text as well as interviewing people in a three-and-a-half-minute-long reportage about the issue. The damages are reported to be caused by industry, sewage, agriculture and traffic. Swedish industry, traffic and agriculture are mentioned, but the worst polluters are located in the area around St. Petersburg, the Baltic countries and Poland, says the voice-over. This can also be seen in the graphic image where more smoke is shown coming from bigger industries placed on the eastern side of the Baltic (Image 23).

---

240 Which means between 10 and 15 years of age. Lilla löpsedeln, UR, SVT1, 19920421, 9.15-9.30. It is produced by UR.
The alarming effects of this are said to be reproduction difficulties among seals and death of the seabed due to the concentration of poisonous chemicals and eutrophication. It all sounds rather pessimistic, a notion that is supported by the Swedish Minister for the Environment, Olof Johansson (Image 24). He says that there is no time to lose when it comes to the Baltic Sea. In his opinion, the current conditions could be considered an environmental disaster, especially on the eastern side. The Minister is portrayed in his office, where several shelves of books and reports are seen in the background. This gives his statements seriousness and his conclusions a scientific framing.

A representative for the nongovernmental organization (NGO) Greenpeace, Rune Eriksen, comments on the action plan for the Baltic Sea that the ministers have sanctioned (Image 25). In his opinion, the actions suggested are not tough enough. The reporter asks him whether these actions will bring new life to the Baltic Sea’s dead seabed. He answers quite firmly: “No”. The NGO expert is
portrayed outdoors with water in the background. He is thereby portrayed as being in closer contact with the actual water conditions than the politician is. Neither the reporter nor the spokesperson from the NGO questions the Swedish minister’s view that the worst problems are on the eastern side of the Baltic.

Images are shown of dead seabed, industrial buildings with smoking chimneys, foamy waters and of a tractor with a pesticide-spreading device (Image 26). Where these images are supposed to be located is not altogether clear. But most of them seem to stem from the eastern side of the Baltic Sea, judging by how they are framed by the speaker text.


The reporter says that there is one positive side to the action plan, in that something has been decided about the Baltic Sea. The reporter adds: “In 10-20 years’ time, the beaches will be clean and the water will be clean enough to swim in again.” She frames the pessimistic story by ending in a prophesy about the effect the action plan will hopefully have. It is not made clear in the programme what the relations are between clean beaches, waters fit for swimming, dead seabed and reproductive difficulties among seals.

The address put forward in this news clip is multi-layered. The state of the Baltic Sea is grave and actions need to be taken now, that is declared by the minister in charge, as well as by the NGO and the reporter. The pollution in the Baltic Sea is put forward as a disaster – and one that crosses national borders and requires serious action from politicians in several countries. Whether or not the suggested actions will be sufficient is contested, but the reporter decides to end the clip on an optimistic note. Even though the message draws on a risk discourse, child viewers are not to be left in despair by the newscast (cf. Carter & Davies, 2005). There are, however, no suggestions as to how children them-
selves can improve the status of the Baltic Sea, and children are not pictured in this clip. The viewers addressed by this newscast are to wait and see (cf. Buckingham, 2000b), and hopefully they will have a Baltic Sea that is in better shape when they are grown up, in 10-20 years’ time. This produces a passive audience that has to rely on adult politicians making things better and cannot do anything about the disaster but hope for the best.

Adults enjoy – children fix

*The brain office (Hjärnkontoret)* is a popular series on natural science that started in 1995 and is still running (Rydin, 2000). The show has a clearly articulated interest in science, yet it is not an UR programme but a SVT children’s programme. The environment is in focus as regards waste and recycling in a section of the programme called *Junk TV (Skräp-TV)*. This particular sequence was broadcast on a Saturday morning in October 2007. *Junk TV’s* content is inspired by watchdog journalism; it has an intro of its own and it is only two minutes long. In the intro, a pile of TV sets with screens showing the word ‘Junk TV’ (Skräp-TV) is shown, followed by fast clips in black and white, accompanied by music. The images show a young girl confronting people about their garbage. The voiceover introduces the girl as “Nadja, the Waste Detective” and advises the viewer to go to the programme website:

> Where you easily can influence what we throw away as garbage. Go to svt.se/skraptv and you will get lots of good advice on how you can make sure your family throws things away in the right way.

---


242 Hjärnkontoret, SVT1, 20071013 10.15-10.40. It produced by SVT. This broadcast was a rerun. Originally it was broadcast in the evening a few days earlier.
Then Nadja appears on screen in colour with what looks like a portable broadcasting device in a backpack, with headphones and an antenna (Image 27). She addresses the camera when she informs the viewer that she is somewhere in Sweden where she will control what is thrown away. She looks around holding up the antenna as if detecting something, and says that she will start with the house closest to her. It is a block of flats. When Nadja enters the house, the scene changes and a living room table surrounded by three ladies is shown. They are having coffee and buns, and playing cards. In the next sequence, we see Nadja again. She is exiting the elevator and bursts in on the ladies calling out “Waste control”. Nadja declares that she will hold a competition. She then gets the bag of waste from the kitchen and empties it on the table in front of the ladies. The table is still set for coffee and buns (Image 28).

Nadja informs the ladies that they have 30 seconds to put the waste into the right
recycling containers. Nadja places herself in the corner with a stopwatch and asks: “Are you ready?” The ladies answer: “Yes!” They look quite happy and engage eagerly in sorting the litter into the right containers. Nadja keeps track of time (Image 29).

Image 29: Nadja supervises the ladies’ filing The brain office (Hjärnkontoret), produced by SVT, SVT1, 20071013, 10.15-10.40.

Nadja cheers them on and the ladies manage their task within the time limit. “Well done. You did it!” Nadja says and adds: “Now we can celebrate with buns”. She reaches for a bun on the ladies’ cake stand. “All right, now remember to recycle. We must all help out with the waste experiment!” Nadja says and leaves. The ladies wave goodbye and continue playing their card game and drinking coffee.

In this short clip, it is the child who has the knowledge and the knowhow. Nadja knows how to recycle properly. That recycling is important is implicit in this programme and something that all addressed children should already know. Nadja also knows that not all people handle their waste in this way. She is competent enough to be the judge of whether they are doing it correctly. The fact that Nadja is bossy makes the clip funny. She has the authority to question adults, to interrupt and also to make adults redo what they have already done in an unsatisfactory way. This is not how children are usually allowed to treat adults. Coming up with a competition to make people do things is usually something adults impose on children. Thereby this programme manages to set normality aside and the child serves to blur the norms of the child-adult hierarchy (cf. Baker, 2001; Prout, 2005; Taylor, 2011).

It is the child who forces adults not only to take responsibility for their environmental footprint but also who assesses them. The voiceover also urges viewers to check out the website to get advice on how to manage their families in regard
to recycling. It is the individual child’s responsibility to set their families straight in the name of the environment. This content configures an audience that should be interested in saving the world by acting locally and take responsibility for the actions of their family members.

The environment as a form of child address

The discourse on environmental issues is largely the same one that is visible in all of the above examples. It is a discourse that draws on notions of risk and danger, according to which something must be done about the state of the environment. However, how children are configured by this discourse differ. In all of the programme content on environmental issues in the material, the environment is presented as a matter of importance for a child audience. But in the first two programmes, no possible action is presented that is open to the targeted children. In these programmes it is only technology, politics and money that viewers can set their hopes on, but still the future looks grave. In 2007, on the other hand, the environmental discourse provides children both on screen and at home with a position from which to act on an individual consumer level (cf. Linnér, 2005).

In his study of Swedish educational programming on environmental issues for all target groups 1962-2002, Björn-Ola Linnér (2005) points out that children are portrayed as the hope for solving the environmental crisis in all programmes not only those targeting them. In *TV for children*, the child viewer is only informed but not asked to act in 1980 and in 1992. All blame for environmental problems is thereby put on adult society. In 2007, however, children are asked to step up and set adults straight. But when there are things children can do about the problem, this also has consequences. Children are all of a sudden responsible for controlling adults, and thereby responsible for saving the world. This relieves adults of responsibility for acting on the crisis they have caused, placing it on children instead.

Content configuring an imagined child audience

The analysis in this chapter has focused on how the content of nature configures a child audience. Research spotlighting the child-nature relationship has been called for (e.g., Prout, 2005; Rydin, 2000; Taylor, 2011) and, for example, Taylor (2011) has argued, drawing on Prout and Haraway, that questioning both na-

---

243 See also *Day-care TV* from 1992, where children could at least pick up litter even if this was not portrayed as saving the environment.
ture/culture and child/adult dichotomies allows us to study children and nature in new ways, focusing on how they interact. In the present analysis, this has been shown in several respects. To start with, the vast presence of nature content in TV for children reproduces the discursive notion of children as being linked to nature (cf. Halldén, 2009; 2011; Prout, 2005; Taylor, 2011). But focusing on the relation between nature TV content and the category children also allows us to study the nuances of how this bond is upheld.

The nature discourse in TV for children does not only present nature as something good and positive in relation to children as suggested in previous research (e.g., Halldén, 2009). The nature representations analysed here also portray nature as manifold: as magnificent, natural, everyday-like, nice, intriguing, dangerous, reliable, unreliable, funny, destroyed and needing to be saved, for example. Representations of a multiplicity of natures thus coexist in TV for children (cf. Macnaghten & Urry, 1998). But nature cannot be represented in all possible ways for children in the nature content studied here. It is neither evil nor all-mighty, and no natural disasters that leave people helpless before the powers of nature are shown.

In these nature representations, children belong in outdoor nature, but they are also struggling to manage outdoor life, recycling to establish a place in nature’s cycle and working to save it. Children can also not easily be separated from animals, as they are seen killing animals – even if that is very rare, saving animals and knowing things about animals. Children are also to be entertained by animal stories, where animals quite often portray children244 and the likeness between animal children and human children is stressed. In these televised representations of the outdoors, the environment, animals and children blur boundaries and questions dichotomies, none of them being possible to label as pure ‘nature’ or pure ‘culture’ (cf. Baker, 2001; Haraway, 1991; Lee, 2001; Prout, 2005; Taylor, 2011). Notions of the child audience are hence embedded in these nature representations. Children are to engage in nature, be interested in nature as well as want to watch TV programmes containing nature. In this way, televised nature for children also maintains the dichotomy between children and adults (cf. Lee, 2001; deCordova, 1994), as adults do not have to be particularly interested in nature. They also do not have to take an interest in animals, and as has been shown here, nor do they have to become engaged in environmental issues.

The representations of children and nature draw on primordial notions of chi-

244 E.g., Strumppfolket, OM, UR, SVT1, 1980-09-25 09.20-09.40; Sigge och Siri (within another programme), SVT2, 19921025, 08.00-08.30; Pingu (within another programme), SVT1, 20070408, 08.00-09.00.
Children as mysteries of nature and nature as a mystery for children (cf. deCordova, 1994; Halldén, 2009; 2011; Ånggård, 2009). These are indeed adult views on these categories, and they uphold discourses that configure an imagined child audience in the TV content under study. This might seem obvious, as the people pulling the strings behind the scene are by definition adults. However, these adult notions of what children are, what they are interested in and what they should take an interest in determine what TV content is shown for children on TV and how this audience group is imagined.

A study of content in this way shows how the programming is addressing the imagined audience. Firstly, by showing what the programming for this audience is all about. Second, by showing how that content is narrated, what it is focused on, and how the imagined audience is represented in it.

The nature content in TV for children also contains a pedagogical address. It draws on delivering facts and knowledge linked to the natural sciences and it intersects the categories children outdoors, animals and environmental issues in the material. Children are supposed to learn things about nature from the programmes. This pedagogical address is what the next chapter will focus on.
Chapter 5
The pedagogical voice
– talk as address in TV for children

Introduction
In this chapter, I focus on how talk in TV for children configures an imagined child audience. Talk is an important mode of address for the TV medium. It is part of the audial frame that forms a TV programme, it is crucial for the programme message and it presents ideas about the audience (cf. Allen, 1992; Corner, 1999; Edin, 2000; Ellis, 1992; Livingstone & Lunt, 1994; Lury, 2005). Talk takes different forms in different programmes; it is presented by different kinds of voices and it has different targets (cf. Lury, 2005). As talk is such an omnipresent and varied mode of address in television, the study focuses on a specific speech genre (Bakhtin, 1996), namely, what I would like to call the pretend, direct, face-to-face pedagogical voice. The basis for studying this kind of talk already exists within TV studies.

The example chosen for analysis is talk explicitly directed to the viewer, where the people on the screen address the actual audience by talking and looking straight into the camera (e.g., Allen, 1992; Edin, 2000). Robert C. Allen (1992) analyses modes of address used in commercial television. He sees the direct address as typical for the television medium and argues that: “By simulating face-to-face exchanges, television attempts to ‘de-mediate’ our relationship with it” (Allen, 1992: 125). In Allen’s (1992) analysis, simulated face-to-face address creates a bond between the TV addresser and the viewer, which positions the viewer as a potential consumer. In her study of Swedish public service TV, Edin (2000: 45) draws on Allen when discussing how talk directed to the camera creates a joint “fictive we” between the people on screen and the viewers at home, especially in entertainment TV from the 1970s onwards. In this way the on-screen addresser’s direct talk to the audience indicates what kind of audience the addresser imagines.
This simulated face-to-face direct address, where a person on screen addresses the viewers off screen by talking and looking straight into the camera, is common also in TV for children. What differs between the simulated face-to-face direct address aimed at adults and that used for children is the level of the simulation. According to Edin (2000), the addressers using simulated face-to-face direct address in TV for adults are portraying themselves on screen, such as news anchors or announcers, rather than playing a fictive role. In TV for children, this is not always the case. The speech genre of addressing viewers directly from an on-screen position was used from the start of children’s television in the 1950s, but it was then a fictional voice (cf. Oswell, 1995; Rydin, 2000). In the UK, the first TV programmes for children, Andy Pandy and Muffin the Mule, were both fictional stories starring adult voices speaking to and for the characters on screen, as well as to the viewer off screen (Oswell, 1995). Andy Pandy was the first TV programme for children in Sweden as well. It was imported from the UK together with its direct address, described as the voice of a mother (Oswell, 1995; Rydin 2000). This voice was also copied in early Swedish productions, like Ferlinda’s school (Ferlinda skolan) (Rydin, 2000). The direct address of the mother in this programming draws on preschool pedagogy, learning nursery rhymes by repeating them and performing craft-related activities through on-screen instructions (Rydin, 2000). Rydin (2000) connects this direct address to the early days of children’s TV, and argues that it was later debated,245 because pretending to see the children through the screen was seen as a form of dishonesty towards child viewers (Rydin, 2000). In this respect, the direct address aimed at children is more simulated than that aimed at adult viewers, because it both can be used in fictional stories and pretends to ‘see’ child viewers in more explicit ways (cf. Oswell, 1995; Rydin, 2000). Direct address targeting children also differs in that it is not connected to a commercial form of address, but rather to a pedagogical voice. I have therefore called this voice: the pretend, direct, face-to-face pedagogical voice. It is a speech genre where the on-screen addressers pretend to see and even hear viewers off-screen. This is made clear by how they talk directly to the viewers and how they face the camera, as if they are in an ‘actual’ ongoing dialogue with the viewers. The voice used in this fictive dialogue is a pedagogical voice, which seeks to educate the viewers.

Notions and ideas about pedagogy, education and learning are intimately connected to children as well as to children’s television (cf. Anderson-Levitt, forthcoming; Hämäläinen, forthcoming; James & James, 2008; Buckingham, 2000a; Buckingham & Scanlon, 2005; Goldfarb, 2002; Scanlon & Buckingham, 2002; Säljö, 2000). The idea that TV could be used for educational purposes was in

245 Rydin (2000) does not specify when this debate took place.
place already when TV first started in Sweden (Runcis & Sandin, 2010; Rydin, 2000; Wallengren, 2005). TV for children was looked upon as having unifying potential, which could enable less privileged children to gain knowledge, and some programmes for children were based on this idea (cf. Rydin, 2000). TV’s entertaining aspects have been seen as an asset when used for learning purposes (cf. Buckingham & Scanlon, 2005), and the visual, per se, is something that has long been used as a learning tool (Buhl & Flensborg, 2011; Goldfarb, 2002; Lindgren, 2009; Sparrman, 2006). In Sweden, different pedagogical theories of child development have also been used over the years in deciding what should be broadcast for children both by the educational broadcasting company and by SVT, even though formal educational aims are only put forward for UR (cf. BL UR, 2007; BC UR, 1992; BC UR, 1980; Lindgren, A., 2006; 2003; Rydin, 2000).

Both SVT and UR programmes for children with learning aims are found in the studied material. All UR programmes are supposed to be educational owing to UR’s mission (BC UR, 1980; BC UR, 1992; BL UR, 2007), and the programmes must therefore be understood as having learning aims, by definition. SVT seldom states whether programmes have learning aims. Therefore, when analysing the material, programmes containing any form of learning aim have been defined as educational, for example instructional programming, informational programming, programming in which children’s knowledge is tested and stories ending with a moral that is to be learnt. When I analysed the UR programmes, they could all be categorized as educational by the above-mentioned criteria as well.

---

246 For a similar discussion on film, see also, Lindgren, 2009.
247 E.g., Filmbitarna, SVT2, 19800405, 18.00-18.30; Att pyssla på danskt vis, SVT1, 19920420, 18.40-18.45; Hjärnkontoret, SVT1, 20071013, 10.15-10.40.
248 E.g., I guldgravarnas spår, SVT2, 19800402, 18.00-18.30; Bullen, SVT1, 19920415, 19.10-20.00; Funksi (within another programme), SVT1, 20071013, 09.00 - 09.30.
249 E.g., Vi i femman, SVT2, 19800404, 16.15-17.00; Röda Träd, SVT1, 19920415, 18.45-19.10; Amigo, SVT1, 20070406, 19.00-19.30.
250 E.g., Halv fem - Inga Sarri läser och berättar, SVT1, 19800402, 16.30-17.00; Barnprogram: Sagan om lillebror, SVT1, 19920415, 18.15-18.40; Josef Lamm vill också ha en människa, SVT1, 20070927, 18.30-18.40.
An overview of programmes with learning aims in the material looks like this:

Table 3: The total number of programmes in the study, and the number of UR and SVT programmes with learning aims.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1992</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programmes in total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UR broadcasts</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVT broadcasts</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this respect, most of the studied programmes have a learning aim, and these aims are put forward through an educational address in the form of pedagogical voices. The pretend, direct, face-to-face pedagogical voice studied here, is both an example of the vast presence of educational aims in TV for children, as well as an example of talk as an important mode of address in TV. The pretend, direct, face-to-face pedagogical voice is a speech genre that makes the imagined child audience explicit through a particular way of talking.

The pretend, direct, face-to-face pedagogical voice is chosen because it makes the imagined audience explicitly visible through its way of pretending to hear and talk with the audience. It can only be found in the material from 2007, as no programmes for children pretend to talk with the audience in this direct way in the studied material from 1980 or 1992. All programmes containing this voice is broadcast by SVT and labelled entertainment (AR, SVT, 2007). About 15 programmes use this address.

The pretend, direct, face-to-face pedagogical voice is thereby not characteristic of the studied material, but the fact that this pretend interaction on all occasions use a pedagogical voice does make it part of the large educational discourse found in TV for children (see overview). Four programmes using this voice have been selected for further analysis. One is an example from Bolibompa, the SVT-produced flagship studio show that frames children’s programmes for the youngest audience (AR, SVT, 2007). There are several examples where the hosts in Bolibompa pretend that the viewers can interact with the on-screen hap-

---

251 The number stated here are all UR programmes in the material, as all had educational aims.

252 E.g., *Fifi och blomsterfröna* (within another programme), SVT1, 20070404, 18.00-19.00; *Sagoträd*, SVT1, 20070405, 17.45-18.00; Världens största kör, SVT1, 20070919, 18.15.

253 *Bolibompa*, SVT1, 20070406, 08.00-09.00; 20070408, 08.00-09.00; 20070409, 08.00-09.00; 20070409, 18.00-19.00; 20070410, 18.00-19.00; 20070927, 18.00-19.00; 20071005, 18.00-19.00
penings directly, and one of these occasions has been chosen. Three other programmes using the pretend, direct, face-to-face pedagogical voice have also been selected: *JoJo’s Circus*, *Little Einsteins* and *Bear in the Big Blue House*, all of which are American fictional series, starring animated or doll characters. They are all broadcast within *Bolibompa* programmes. The first part of the *Bolibompa* show targets the youngest audience, all four of these programmes or programme parts were broadcast during the first 30 minutes of their respective *Bolibompa* programmes, and hence they all target the youngest viewers. A fifth programme has also been chosen for further analysis. It is a consumer rights oriented programme called *Sale* (*Rea*), broadcast within the *Bobster* show, the SVT-produced studio show that frames programmes for somewhat older children on all weekdays in SVT 2007. This show as well is labelled entertainment by SVT (*AR*, SVT, 2007) and presents a pedagogical voice and a direct, face-to-face address. It does not, however, pretend to be able to see and hear the viewer. The analysis of this programme serves as a comparison to the other four, and it is chosen because an analysis of this programme can put the uniqueness of the pretend, direct, face-to-face pedagogical voice in perspective to its target group and help point out the particularities of this speech genre.

The analysis of the pretend, direct, face-to-face pedagogical voice focuses on what kind of imagined audience is being configured through the pretend interaction, and what the pedagogical voice brings to this configuration. A set of questions has guided this analysis: Who is using this speech genre and when is it used in terms of context, relations, and storyline? What does this speech genre

---

254 *Bolibompa*, SVT1, 20070409, 18.00-19.00
255 *JoJos cirkus*, SVT1, 20070408, 8.01-8.11.
256 *Små Einsteins*, SVT1, 20071021, 8.01-8.25.
257 *Nalle har ett stort blått hus*, SVT1, 20070405, 18.00-18.25.
258 These programmes are all Playhouse Disney series and they were also broadcast on Disney Channel, where their target group was set to 2- to 5-year-olds in 2007. *JoJo’s Circus* and *Little Einsteins* are still shown on what is now called Disney Junior (http://www.disney.se/disney-junior/index.jsp). Retrieved, 20130426.
259 This is not made explicit for viewers, but the programmes are scheduled in this way. Telephone conversation with Ragna Walmark. It is not totally clear which age groups this programme targets, but judging from the *AR*, SVT (2007) an informed guess would be up to 9 years of age.
260 *Rea*, TV1, SVT, 20070404, 19.00-19.25.
261 An informed guess drawing on the *AR*, SVT (2007) would set the targeted audience for *Bobster* to those aged between 9 and 13.
say about the imagined audience, about pedagogy, and about preferred learning outcomes?

With these questions in mind, we now turn to the pretended audience interaction, the pedagogical voices and the educational aims of five different TV programmes for children.

Traditional disciplining pedagogy and instruction

JoJo’s circus

Image 30: JoJo, her classmates, Mrs Kersplatski, and Uncle Flippy in JoJo’s circus, SVT1, 20070408, 8.01-8.11, produced by Cuppa Coffee Studios, Cartoon Pizza and Disney Channel.

Many programmes broadcast by SVT are animated fictional stories. One such programme is JoJo’s circus.262 The episode analysed here was made in 2003, it is about 10 minutes long and was broadcast at 8am on a Sunday morning in 2007, as part of the Bolibompa weekend morning show. It is a stop motion animation, using bright colours and starring a diverse set of characters (Image 30). The storyline is that the leading character JoJo, a young animated clown, is going on an excursion to a farm with her263 circus school. The schoolteacher, Mrs

---

262 JoJos cirkus, SVT1, 20070408, 8.01-8.11. It was produced by Cuppa Coffee Studios, Cartoon Pizza and Disney Channel.
263 It is not possible to determine the sex of the main character from the programme, but in the archive text JoJo is described as a six-year-old girl (KB database).
Kersplatski, is the one pulling the strings in the entire programme along with the owner of the farm, Uncle Flippy. The pupils are not only human-like creatures: For example a frog, an elephant and a pupil who looks like Mr Potato Head also attend the school. Several artefacts have been humanized as well; for example, the bus and the silo have eyes. At the farm the pupils look at other animals – these animals do attend school.

Pedagogical voices in JoJo’s Circus

In JoJo’s Circus it is the main character JoJo, who uses a pretend face-to-face pedagogical voice. However, there is a second pedagogical voice in this programme as well, which belongs to Mrs Kersplatski. She has a teacher’s voice when talking to JoJo, and her voice positions JoJo’s talk in relation to the imagined viewer. The analysis, therefore, starts with Mrs Kersplatski’s voice.

Mrs Kersplatski

Mrs Kersplatski addresses the pupils in her class with school-related questions, requests and admonitions. Before even going to the farm, Mrs Kersplatski lines up the pupils and conducts a roll call, where she predetermines the approved answer: “Say ‘here’ when I call you!” This demonstration brings up notions of disciplining practices from both schooling and military systems (cf. Enloe, 2000; Foucault, 1991; Stensmo, 2000). Both doing a roll call and stating the right answer when there are only six children present can be seen more as a demonstration of power and as teaching obedience than as a necessary action to keep track
of the group. This way of talking sets the scene for the outing as being school-related, which is important to the storyline.

Mrs Kersplatski drives the bus to the farm. Once the class arrives, she and the farmer, Uncle Flippy, instruct the pupils as to the rules that must be obeyed.

Excerpt 1:264
1. Mrs Kersplatski: The first rule is this: See to it that you stick together! We wouldn’t want anybody getting lost, right? /
2. Uncle Flippy: The second rule is: Please, don’t touch the tractor, it’s very ticklish. /
3. And last but not least: See that you close all gates and doors behind you. That is the most important rule of all! /
4. Circus animals love to run lose and cause trouble. /

The conversation is not a dialogue, as the pupils are only spoken to, and hence raise no questions in regard to the rules. The address is formed by the teacher and by the other adult in charge, and the pupils are expected to listen and obey. This is a traditional view of the teacher’s disciplinary role, which also legitimizes the rules (cf. Edwards & Mercer, 1989; Stensmo, 2000). The teacher is addressed as: “Mrs Kersplatski” by JoJo also in Swedish, which is rather remarkable, as titles are not used in Swedish schools. This forms a traditional school-related address, which takes us back to the Swedish schooling systems of the 1960s and earlier, when titles were used (cf. Mårtensson, 1988).

At the end of the programme – of course – the farm animals manage to escape, as JoJo has forgotten to close the door behind her. Together, the pupils, Mrs Kersplatski and Uncle Flippy manage to gather the animals by singing a song, parading and dancing in what looks like a joyful manner. But when all the animals are safe back in their places, Mrs Kersplatski wonders:

Excerpt 2:
1. Mrs Kersplatski: But who left the door open, if I may ask? ((Long pause in which all children look uncomfortable and shake their heads, all except JoJo)) /
2. JoJo: Eee, I think it was maybe, perhaps, me. /
3. Mrs Kersplatski: JoJo! Uncle Flippy did say that the most important thing of all was to keep the door closed! /

264 All the talk in the excerpts is originally in Swedish and has been translated by the author. The organisation of the transcription is inspired by Kjerstin Andersson’s (2008) study. See appendix for transcription symbols.
4. Didn’t you hear that? /
5. JoJo: I think I happened to not pay attention. /
6. I am really sorry, everyone! ((JoJo looks down and ashamed)) /
7. Uncle Flippy: Oh don’t worry about it, JoJo! Ah, I haven’t had this much fun since the wild wine gum hunt! Yee haw! /

The authority belongs to the teacher’s position, which can be seen in how Mrs Kersplat斯基’s voice puts an end to the singing and laughing, when she demands that the culprit step forward (line 1). JoJo admits to being the guilty party, and the teacher then goes on interrogating the clown child, reminding her of the rules (line 3) and asking why they were not followed (line 4). JoJo admits to not having paid attention (line 5) and directs her apology to everybody (line 6), except the viewers. This can be seen because she is not looking straight into the camera when talking here. The teacher is also not looking into the camera (Image 31), and thereby the disciplining voice does not target an imagined audience, but the on-screen pupils only. When uncle Flippy then tells the clown not to worry about what has happened (line 7), he absolves the child of guilt and focuses on the fun they all had. However, it is not until Jojo has admitted to the crime and apologized that one of the adults moves the focus away from the rule breaking and on to the amusing event.

**JoJo**

Image 32: JoJo instructing the viewer in *JoJo’s cirkus*, SVT1, 20070408, 8.01-8.11, produced by Cuppa Coffee Studios, Cartoon Pizza and Disney Channel.

The more interesting pedagogical voice belongs to the main character of the programme, the clown JoJo. She often addresses the viewer when she is not talking to the other characters in the programme. The pretend, direct, face-to-
face address is formed by asking the viewers to participate in singing, moving, dancing and answering questions. When everybody has just arrived at the farm, all the pupils walk around the stables looking at the circus animals. When they look at the tiger cubs, the cubs start to wave and JoJo then turns around and asks straight into the camera:

Excerpt 3:
1. JoJo: Would you like to wave to the tiger cubs together with Croaky and me? (looking straight into the camera.) /
2. (A ringing sound is heard) /
3. First you must stand up. /
4. Come on, there you go, stand up now! /
5. And hold up your arms in front of you and fold your hands so that they look like paws, like this. (folds hands) /
6. And wave your hands like this, one after the other and reach high and wave, wave, wave. (waves hands) /
7. So, now we look like the tiger cubs. /

JoJo turns to the camera and asks a question straight into it (line 1). It is the individual viewer whom JoJo addresses here, which is signalled by how she looks beyond the screen (Image 32) and the use of “you” (singular in Swedish) when asking the question. A pause for a possible answer from the viewer follows in the conversation, and during this pause a ringing sound is heard (line 2). There is no explanation as to why the sound is present in the programme, but it turns out that it is heard when the viewers are asked to engage in the programme. The sound can be seen as representing an answer from the viewer, but it can also be linked to what Michel Foucault calls “Signal” (1991:166), i.e. using a sound to promote an action. With this term, Foucault discusses the disciplining activities that schools now use and have long used to control children. “The pupil will have to have learnt the code of the signals and respond automatically to them,” Foucault (1991: 166) argues, giving the school bell as an example. When it rings, the pupils should know what is expected of them and act accordingly. The signal in JoJo’s Circus is a way of extending the programme’s school setting so that it reaches the viewer. The viewer cannot answer to the calls made by the clown, so the signal is used to answer for the viewer. In this way, the viewers may be imagined as experienced viewers of the programme and thereby disciplined to know that one is expected to take part when JoJo is talking straight into the camera and the ringing sound is heard. The viewers may also be imagined to be so accustomed to schooling practices that they will know anyway that a bell means to pay attention and act.

265 On 4 of 5 occasion.
JoJo’s question is a friendly offer (line 1), which means that the viewer is included in the programme if s/he wishes to participate. However, when the ringing sound is heard, the accepted answer is predestined, as the conversation goes on in line 3 independent of whether the viewer answers and what the answer is. The viewer is even supposed to hesitate in joining in, as an extra exhortation is needed in line 4. In this very specific way, the viewer is asked to engage in bodily movements on four occasions in the programme.

In the conversation shown above, and throughout the programme, JoJo acts as if s/he can hear and see the audience. In line 7, it is expressed that both the viewer and JoJo look like tiger cubs, and JoJo looks into the camera when saying this. This is an example of the pretend, direct, face-to-face speech genre. As a viewer, you have to accept this fictive communication and agree to play along with the clown, or you have to in fact believe that the clown can actually see you off screen, while you are at home watching the programme.

The school setting is important for the narrative in this programme, as it frames the rules, the orders and the questions as legitimate (cf. Stemsmo, 2000; Säljö, 2000). But also the fairy-tale part, which is the opposite of rule following, is important for telling the story and it adds another layer to the narrative. The children meet circus animals, such as rubber hens, dancing penguins and waving tigers, and the farmer grows unusual crops. There are plants that have coconut and vanilla meringue pies as flowers, cotton candy plants, plants that look like corn but bear hotdogs and a well full of soda (some of which can be seen in image 30). The pupils eat and look happy. One contradiction is worth pointing out, however, that in a programme that so purposefully focuses on getting viewers to move off screen, ‘junk food’ is present and promoted as an on-screen treat. Having make-believe crops produce ready-made ‘junk food’ on a farm excursion also raises the question of what it is exactly that the pupils are supposed to learn on this excursion.

Discussion - Educational aims in JoJo’s Circus

The educational aims in JoJo’s Circus are summed up last in the programme. Just when Uncle Flippy has told JoJo not to worry about having forgotten to close the door (excerpt 2), Mrs Kersplatski joins the conversation again:

Excerpt 4:
1. Mrs Kersplatski: So JoJo, what have you learnt? /
2. All: So JoJo what do you say
we would like to know what you learnt today
we would like to know if you figured something out
we would like to know what you learnt here today. ((All
the pupils sing and a stage is built on screen)) /

3. JoJo: I think that I have learnt two things. ((JoJo is now on a stage facing the viewers)) /

4. Number one: It is very, very important to do as I’ve been told, because it is important! /

5. And number two: I also realized that I would like to become a farmer clown and have lots and lots of rubber hens when I grow up. /

Mrs Kersplatski hereby overrules what Uncle Flippy said in Excerpt 2, as JoJo’s wrongdoing is not forgotten. JoJo should instead elaborate on what the wrongdoing has taught her (line 1). As soon as the teacher has posed the question, the whole setting changes and a stage is built. During this change of scene, all the children sing a song (line 2). All episodes of JoJo’s circus end with this question to JoJo from the teacher (line 1) and the song sung by the other pupils.266 This question could be called “quasi-authentic” (Dysthe, 1996: 58) as the teacher wonders what the pupil has learnt but already has a fixed notion of what answer she would like to hear (line 1). The other pupils also take for granted that something should have been learnt, when singing the song. However, JoJo is required to spell out, in her own words, what the pedagogical lesson from this visit must be, which also allows her to define what learning is. JoJo is not altogether sure about what she has learnt (line 3), but when expressing the learning outcomes (lines 4-5), she thinks that she has learnt that it is important to do as one has been told (line 4). The explanation JoJo gives is that it is important because it is important. The clown pupil in this way accepts the rules and the schooling customs established by the adult teacher. Childhood researchers Allison James and Adrian James (2004: 3) discuss the phrase: “Do as you’re told” as an articulation of and a symbol for adult authority over children. No matter the issue at stake, the idea is that children should generally obey adults (cf. James & James, 2004), and perhaps especially if the adults are teachers (cf. Edwards & Mercer, 1989; Stensmo, 2000).

The second thing that JoJo has learnt is something about herself. The excursion has made her reflect on what she would like as a future occupation (line 5). This way of talking is also explicitly linked to children. There is a taken-for-granted notion that children should be able to elaborate on what they would like to become when they grow up. But in this fairy-tale, it is not a conventional occupation that JoJo expresses as a future wish, but to be a farmer clown and to breed rubber hens. This is an animated, entertainment programme and the fairy-tale

266 There is another episode of JoJo’s circus broadcast just after this one and it ends in just the same way. JoJo’s circus, SVT1, 20070408, 8.11-8.21.
part is crucial in making it so. This can also be seen by the fact that the conversation bears no signs of expecting that viewers will move around too much or need to be told to stand still, something that would have positioned the talk in a school setting to an even greater degree. In this case, the audience is asked to be more physically active while viewing TV, which links to fears that the TV medium will cause children to become passive and overweight (cf. Buckingham, 2007; Cox et al., 2012; Jordan, 2007). As the last part of the conversation draws on the fairy-tail entertainment elements, it softens the authoritarian tone of the programme.

In this programme, rules and a school setting promote a traditional pedagogical view on what children should learn (cf. Edwards & Mercer, 1989; James & James, 2004; Stensmo, 2000). However, doing what you are told to do is not what is generally promoted for children in a Swedish learning environment (cf. Läroplan förskolan, 1998; Läroplan Grundskolan, 2011). Instead, the educational ideology promoted by the Swedish school system is more focused on participation, and an involved and democratic way of educating children in which children are asked to join in and be part of the decision-making, and where critical thinking is a virtue (cf. Läroplan förskolan, 1998; Läroplan Grundskolan, 2011). This traditional pedagogical voice is foremost put forward by the teacher and targets the pupil characters, primarily JoJo. This voice places JoJo in a pupil role and forms how JoJo’s way of talking to the viewer can be understood. JoJo’s talk to the viewer performs a form of address that is more in line with participation and getting involved, as it is built on requests and on inviting the viewer to be part of the game. However, the way in which the face-to-face talking practices in JoJo’s circus are built up in the form of fictive dialogues limits the impact of the requesting address. The viewer is not told what to do by JoJo, but no choice is given but to participate. If they follow the storyline, the viewers will answer questions, sing and dance and move according to JoJo’s instructions. JoJo is the pupil taking orders in the programme, but JoJo is the one giving, if not orders, then at least tasks for the viewers to perform. By pretending to see the viewers, JoJo’s way of talking encourages them to actively move and take part in the fictional dialogue. In this conversation, viewers are rendered passive, as they have to follow JoJo’s lead and cannot influence the conversation in any way. In this way, the imagined viewers are given the most subordinated position in the programme.
Authoritarian child professors assessing viewers

Little Einsteins

Image 33: The Little Einsteins, June, Annie, Leo and Quincy, in Little Einsteins (Små Einsteins), SVT1, 20071021, 8.01-8.25, produced by The Baby Einstein Company and Curious Pictures.

Little Einsteins (Små Einsteins) is an animated programme series in which two girls, Annie and June, and two boys, Leo and Quincy, play the leading roles, i.e. the Little Einsteins (Image 33). Every programme promotes a specific piece of music and a piece of art. This episode from 2007 is 20 minutes long and it begins with the Einsteins introducing Mozart’s concerto number 21 for piano. Both the composer and the notes are shown and talked about. Throughout the programme, a piece of the Mozart concerto is repeated and contrasted by other tunes. It is referred to as Annie’s friendship song, and the lyrics go like this: “Hey, I like you, shall we be friends? I do like you, shall we be friends?” The Einsteins introduce the artwork as Kuna Molas. The fact that Kuna Molas is a form of textile art from South America is not mentioned. The name of it is mentioned twice and parts of the art are used in the animated background of the programme. This is not pointed out; the pattern is just there if someone happens to recognize it from the beginning of the programme. It is thus the piece of music that is in focus in this programme.

267 Små Einsteins, TV1, SVT, 20071021, 8.01-8.25. This programme series is produced by The Baby Einstein Company and Curious Pictures.
Once the music and artwork have been introduced, the scene changes and the storyline is presented. It is built up around a missing hermit crab. The Einstein children see a hermit crab being flushed out to sea by a wave and caught by, what is said to be, the Gulf Stream. Left on the beach is another hermit crab, and the Einsteins promise the hermit crab to help rescue its friend. They all jump on board the children’s rocket and start a search party at sea.

**Pedagogical voice in Little Einsteins**

Image 34: Annie asking the viewer questions in *Little Einsteins* (Små Einsteins), SVT1, 20071021, 8.01-8.25, produced by The Baby Einstein Company and Curious Pictures.

The Einsteins seldom talk to each other, but mostly to the viewer. The address used then is a *pretend, direct, face-to-face pedagogical voice*. It is the children’s voices in *Little Einsteins* that are used to address the viewer in this way. They explain what happens on screen and their talk is what makes the story progress.

When the search starts, the Einsteins’ rocket transforms into a submarine and dives into the ocean. After a while the rocket is said to need camouflage to escape a shark.

Excerpt 5:

1. Quincy: We must also find a place for Rocket to camouflage itself.
2. Annie: What colour is Rocket?
   ((Annie looks into the camera and pauses))
3. He is red, absolutely!
4. Can you find something in the sea that is red?
   ((Annie looks into the camera and pauses, the windscreen of Rocket is visible in the background showing something)}
The viewer has just been shown a fish camouflaging itself and should thereby understand what camouflage is. A pause follows on Annie’s question, which gives the viewer a chance to answer before Annie gives the right answer herself and adds an affirmation (line 3). It implies that an answer from the viewer has been heard and that it was the right one. This form of fictional dialogue continues (lines 4-5). But it is also used to define what it is the viewer sees, like when Annie assesses the pretend answer and declares that the red thing is supposed to be a coral (line 5; image 34). In the conversation, the viewer is addressed as an individual and not as a collective of children watching, like in JoJo’s circus (see, e.g., line 4 where the word “you” (du) is singular in Swedish). It is this individual that is to perform in accordance with the on-screen child’s demands.

A coral reef is said to be in the expedition’s way. A fish is shown getting over it by swimming up and down, and June says to Rocket:

Excerpt 6:
1. June: 
   I can help you to move like that, Rocket.
   I can teach you a coral reef dance. /
2. But then I want you to dance with us! ((Looks into the camera)) /
3. Reach out your hands in front of you, like this. ((Looks at the camera and has her hands in front of her)) /
4. Then move them up and down over the coral reef.
   Up and down. Up and down. ((Looks into the camera and
6. June: Thank you for helping Rocket with the coral reef dance! And for helping us escape the shark! (Looks into the camera)/
7. You are a wonderful friend!

Here, June says that she can help Rocket with the problem of getting over the coral reef (line 1). But in order to teach Rocket the dance that is needed to solve it, she wants the viewer to dance with them (line 2). The question is not whether or not the viewer would like to partake, it is a demand, which can be seen by the use of “but” and the stressed “I want you” in line 2. This comes forward as meaning that if the viewer does not dance with June and Rocket, June will not be able to teach Rocket the dance. When the teaching begins, June does not face Rocket, but instead faces the viewer via the camera (Image 35). Furthermore, Rocket has no arms to move, so the dance that June is teaching is aimed at the viewer only. The movement made by June, and perhaps also by the viewer causes Rocket to move up and down, and they are thus able to get over the reef. June thanks the viewer (line 6), for helping out both escaping the shark and getting Rocket over to the other side of the reef. June ends this sequence by declaring that the viewer is a wonderful friend (line 7). Friendship is thus put forward in relation to helping others out, but the help is initiated by the demand to join in the dancing (line 2). The friendship referred to here is conditional, and it is offered to the viewer as a reward for doing what they were told. If the viewer does not dance or answer questions, s/he is not a good friend in this story.

The hermit crab is now shown trapped in a fishing device, and Annie says that the Einsteins need to reach the captured crab fast:

Excerpt 7:
1. Leo: Can you help me to fly Rocket superfast? (Looks into the camera and holds out his hands in an encouraging gesture)/
2. Great! Superfast! (Does thumbs up) /
3. All Einsteins: SUPERFAST! (The Mozart tune starts playing) /
4. Leo: To reach superfast we need to start at adagio. Clap the rhythm on your knees, slowly! (He beats a slow rhythm with his hands onto his knees at the same time as a sign on the dashboard starts flashing ADAGIO) /
5. Moderato. Now clap the rhythm on your belly. A bit faster. (The sign changes to MODERATO. The boy looks into the camera except for a quick glance at the sign. He starts to clap on his stomach instead) /
6. Allegro! Now clap the rhythm on your shoulders. Even faster! (The tune is now played at a slightly faster tempo.
The boy starts to clap his own shoulders looking into the camera. The sign is now showing ALLEGRO.)

7. PRESTO. Now reach your hands up in the air and shake your whole body! ((The sign blinks PRESTO. The boy and the rest of the characters on board the rocket reach their hands up in the air.))

8. We succeeded! Now we are flying superfast! ((The rocket is shown flying through the water.))

This time the viewer is requested to help out (line 1), but when the pause is over it becomes obvious that the viewer is supposed to have volunteered to do so, as Leo replies: “Great!” (line 2). All the Einsteins engage in making Rocket speed up (line 3). The viewers are asked to move in relation to the different paces of the Mozart piece (lines 4-8), which goes from slow to ‘superfast’. Every time the tempo changes, the sign on the rocket’s dashboard shows the musical term for the tempo. What in the first line is introduced as a request for help, transforms into a musical exercise for both body and mind. The musical vocabulary is not introduced or explained to the viewers. That it is somehow linked to the tempo of the tune can perhaps be figured out as it changes when the tempo does, and the boy glances at the sign when this happens. It also seems to be of importance in the programme, as the musical terms are so carefully both shown, and pronounced by Leo (lines 4-8). Something else that is not explained is how the movements of the children on board and of the viewer at home are linked to the movement of the rocket. This is the fairy-tail part of the story, which tries to involve everybody in the expedition.

**Discussion - Educational aims in Little Einsteins**

The viewer is asked to join in all activities and to help out on all missions that the Einstein children are engaged in. The educational aims of this programme are incorporated into the pretend, direct, face-to-face pedagogical voice. Even if the plot is not built around a school setting, the flow of the storyline depends on a master and a novice, the master being the Einstein children and the novice the viewer. Also the way in which the questions are posed draws on the “basic ‘I-R-F’ exchange structure”, meaning “an initiation by a teacher, which elicits a response from a pupil, followed by an evaluative comment or feedback from the teacher” (Edwards & Mercer, 1989: 9). This way of asking questions is a common part of classroom talk, but it also implies that the teacher is mostly asking questions to evaluate the viewer and not because s/he actually wonders something (Edwards & Mercer, 1989; Dysthe, 1996). This talking practice is not put forward as a pedagogical ideal in research, because it produces students who memorize and reproduce answers and thus does not promote critical thinking
(Dysthe, 1996). This kind of talk in the programme produces a pretend viewer who can be tested by the on-screen children, which principally serves to make the Einsteins look knowledgeable.

What the viewers of Little Einsteins are to learn is what the child scientists tell them to keep in mind, and without asking why, which renders the viewers passive. The pedagogical idea used is that knowledge will be internalized by just hearing it or seeing it. Moreover, the multitude of information and things taught are not summed up in the end. What is a coral reef? How are the terms flashing on the dashboard related to the tempo of the music and to the rocket? The artwork in the programme is said to be Kula Molas, but what kind of art is that? That being a good friend is something to aspire to is clear, but does an on-screen-off-screen pretend interaction in which one party tells the other party what to do count as friendship? The teaching going on is authoritative and it is conditional: if you don’t take part in the conversation you are not a good friend and thus not allowed to be part of the expedition. The Einsteins hence talk to the viewer in a hierarchical, judgemental way, much like the way adults are allowed to talk to children (cf. James & James, 2004). Here children on screen are seen disciplining children off screen.

This programme presents a view on learning in which a mixture of facts and cultural and visual aesthetics is taught using school related talk practices (cf. Edwards & Mercer, 1989; Dysthe, 1996). Visual pedagogy and aesthetics are usually linked to progressive notions of learning (cf. Buhl & Flensborg, 2011; Goldfarb, 2002), but in the programme analysed here masterpieces of highbrow culture are to be learnt by heart, and the characters evaluating the viewers are named after the grand professor of all professors, namely Einstein. However, the highbrow culture gets lost in the narrative, nothing is followed up and there are no teachers around, only bossy know-it-all child characters. The pedagogy and learning outcomes serve more to frame and legitimize the simple animated narration, for who can object to Mozart’s music?
Educational group work – We are all learners

Bear in the Big Blue House

Image 36: Bear, Ojo, Tutter, Pip, Pop and Treelo having their photo taken, in Bear in the Big Blue House (Nalle har ett stort blått hus), SVT1, 20070405, 18.00-18.25, produced by Shadow Projects and The Jim Henson Company.

*Bear in the Big Blue House*[^268] (Nalle har ett stort blått hus) is a programme series in which the main character Bear, played by a person in a bear costume, lives in a blue house together with several animal puppet friends. It is not clear whether Bear is female or male, but the Swedish voice is male and adult. This particular episode, made in 1998, is 20 minutes long and called “Picture this”. The storyline is that Bear is going to take photographs of his house and send the pictures to a friend who has not yet seen the house.

[^268]: Nalle har ett stort blått hus, TV1, SVT, 20070405, 18.00-18.25. It is produced by Shadow Projects and The Jim Henson Company.
Pedagogical voice in Bear in the Big Blue House

Image 37: Camera focuses on the hallway in Bear in the Big Blue House (Nalle har ett stort blått hus), SVT1, 20070405, 18.00-18.25, produced by Shadow Projects and The Jim Henson Company.

In this programme, Bear is the one using the pretend, direct, face-to-face pedagogical voice when he talks to the viewer. He also talks to his friends. While they, however, only talk to Bear and not to the viewer. When the programme intro comes to an end, the camera closes in on the front door of the blue house. Bear opens the door from the inside and steps out onto the porch.

Excerpt 8:
1. Bear: Oh, hi, there you are! Good to see you! Welcome! (Bear looks into the camera) /
2. Bear: ((Bear turns around and walks into the house again but turns to the camera as soon as he starts to speak)) I was just /
3. Bear: what’s that smell? (Bear sniffs and looks into the camera) /
4. Bear: Mm, ah, but it’s you! (Bear sniffs closer to the camera lens) /
5. Bear: tell me, did you just drink fresh milk? Cause you smell like fresh milk today. (Bear looks into the camera) /
6. Bear: Ah, but you might always smell this good? heh heh /
7. Bear: Well, today I’m going to take some pictures with my camera of some of my favourite things in the blue house, which I will send to my friend Ursa. /
8. Bear: She has never seen the blue house so now I will photograph my favourite things and make a picture book and send it to her. /
9. Bear: For example, we are right now standing in what is called the hallway or the entrance, say after me, entrance ((Bear says in a pretend posh voice and ‘entrance’ is pronounced with a French accent)) /
10. Let’s take a picture of it. /
11. (a musical sound is heard and Bear turns to the camera) /
12. Yes, would you like to see what I see through my camera? /
13. Look at this. ((the image now has a frame and a focus mark just like on a camera screen and the viewer is allowed to ‘see’ through the camera Bear is holding. Image 37)) /
14. This is perfect. You see exactly what I see. /
15. Okay, then we can take a picture. /
16. Wow, we just took a picture! /

From the start of the programme, Bear acknowledges the viewer as an expected visitor, whom he can smell, see and hear (lines 1, 3-6, 11). The conversation is relaxed and welcoming and Bear pretends to have the viewer physically in the house through his direct, face-to-face communication. The fictive dialogue flows along owing to the fact that Bear tells the viewer, in a conversational tone, what he is going to do today (lines 7-8). When the word ‘entrance’ is explained to be the synonym of hallway and the viewer is told to repeat the word, this is done in a joking manner, where Bear changes his tone of voice and his accent (line 9). The explanation of the room and its synonym, however, is something Bear is teaching the viewer, but his funny manner of speaking puts the viewer on more equal ground with Bear.

A musical sound is played (line 11). Bear stops his actions, as if listening, and then formulates a question, as if the viewer has asked to see what he sees (line 12). Here, the viewer is represented by the sound rather than it being a signal for the viewer to pay attention, like in JoJo’s Circus. As it is framed as a request from the viewer, the pretend conversation comes forward as two-way and not as an assessment. When the camera focus mark appears on screen, the viewer is invited into the technology of photography. This changes the pedagogical focus from Bear being the photographer and the teacher into it becoming a joint activity, as the bear and the viewer are now photographing together. The fact that Bear also says “we” (lines 15-16) stresses that the viewer is part of both the practice and the story.

Bear continues with his task of taking pictures and walks around the kitchen searching for the right object to photograph. The camera focus represents several things in this part of the programme. It represents the viewer, following Bear around, and Bear faces the camera when talking to the viewer. But it also represents what Bear’s camera is focused on, and then the screen has the focus mark of a camera.

When Bear is done with the kitchen, he stops and talks with the viewers more explicitly again.
Excerpt 9:
1. Bear: There are many ways to create pictures ((looks into the camera)) /
2. Using a camera is, you know, only one of the ways /
3. One can for example draw with crayons ((A drawn box of crayons becomes visible on screen)) /
4. or use finger-paint ((Handprints in different colours become visible on screen)) /
5. And all pictures have something to tell ((Bear nods)) /
6. and when you make a picture it can become exactly what you want it to be /
   (...) 
7. That’s what a picture can be, so if it is painted, or if it is drawn, if you have seen it or if you have found it, captured it on film, or maybe fantasized it, you will get pictures of life ((Bear starts to sing a song about pictures. Line 7 is the refrain of the song)) /

Bear is the one with knowledge and he is explaining the diversity of images to the viewer in this sequence. Bear stresses that several different techniques can be used to make pictures (lines 2-4), but by inserting “you know” (line 2) the explanations also portray the viewer as knowledgeable and as part of this conversation. The value of every picture is also put forward by Bear (line 5), and the viewer should feel free to make pictures in any way s/he prefers (line 6). The song Bear sings to further explain what a picture is focuses on the notion that the viewer can and should make pictures (line 7). Whether the pictures portray real events or fantasies is not important. What is emphasized here is that pictures have value. Images are a source of knowledge (cf. Buhl & Flensborg, 2011; Goldfarb, 2002), and Bear has high praise for children’s individual creativity.
In the last part of the programme, Bear comes down to the kitchen again. The other animals living in the house have borrowed Bear's camera and taken pictures. Bear is not aware of this.

Excerpt 10:
1. Tutter: It was like this, Bear, that because it was such a good idea to take pictures for Ursa, we made a picture book ((The grey mouse looks at Bear)) /  
2. Everybody: Yes! /  
3. Bear: Oh. ((Bear sounds surprised and not altogether happy)) /  
4. Ojo: That we did. Here you are. ((The bear cub shows Bear a picture)) /  
5. Bear: Wow it's wonderful! /  
6. Everybody: Yes, super nice! ((The picture book is opened)) /  
7. Tutter: ((Tutter's image is shown)) You see, Bear, you wanted pictures of unique places in the blue house. But you are too big for my nest. Too big! heh heh /  
8. Bear: Yes, that is true, Tutter.  
9. Pip & Pop: ((The lilac otters Pip & Pop's image is shown)) Ah, that is what the otter pond looks like from the otter pond. /  
10. Pip: A frog took the picture. Yeah, he's a splendid photographer. /  
11. Pop: Yeah, really. /  
12. Bear: Yes, I have never seen the pond from that angle.  
13. Ojo: ((The bear cub Ojo's image is shown)) Oh, look, look, Bear. This is a picture of the swing from the sofa where Snow Bear and me play. heh heh /  
14. Bear: Yeah, absolutely, heh heh /
15. Treelo: ((The green animal Treelo’s image is shown)) Oh look, Bear, look Treelo’s picture! /
16. Bear: How did you take this picture?
17. Treelo: Treelo took the picture of Bear from the tree.
18. Bear: Aha, from the tree? Wow, great! /
19. Thanks Treelo, thanks everybody! /
20. Ursa will surely love this picture book /
21. Everybody: Yeah! Jippi!
22. Bear: But do you know, I have yet another photo that I would like to take. And I have actually one picture left in the camera, so come on now, everybody! ((Bear and everybody else leave the kitchen and move out in the hallway)) /
23. Bear: Hey you, would you like to take a picture of us? ((Bear addresses the viewer and Bear and the others look into the camera and pauses. A focus mark becomes visible on screen: see image 38)) /
24. Thanks! /

In the end, despite the fact that Bear has been the one with the photography ambitions, the other animals have taken most of the pictures. He does not seem happy about this until he is shown the photos (lines 3 & 5). These images are pictures that Bear could not have taken himself (lines 7, 9, 13 & 17), as they are taken from the perspective of the other animals, who are of different sizes (line 7 & 13) and spend time in different places in and around the house (lines 9 & 17). Bear is here acknowledging the others’ pictures and he is surprised but pleased with them (lines 5, 8, 12, 14, 18 & 19). Thus, the differences in perspective depending on who you are are shown with the help of the other animals in several ways.

Thus far during the programme Bear has been the one who knows about pictures, and he has had the answers to the other animals’ questions. Bear is also significantly bigger than the rest of the animals, he has an adult voice and appears to be more grownup than the lemur Treelo, who speaks like a baby (lines 15 & 17), and the little bear cub Ojo, who has a child’s voice. This, however, does not prevent Bear from learning new things from the others when he sees his house from new angles. Bear asks the viewer for assistance in line 23. The viewer is portrayed as an individual in this programme as well. In the pretend conversation, the question is followed by a short pause and then by a “Thanks” (line 24), which implies that the viewer cannot do anything but help Bear out. However, this question is not an order, and what the viewer is asked to do is not linked to a schooling practice. The viewer is to take a picture of the animals in the blue house, and s/he is thereby positioned as being able to take photographs on her/his own. All the animals have acted on their own initiative when borrow-
ing the camera from Bear. The only one taking photos who has been asked to do so is the imagined viewer. By taking the last picture, the viewer is also the only one who is not part of the group, hence the pretend, direct, face-to-face address has its limits in terms of inclusion. It cannot make the viewer appear on screen.

Discussion - Educational aims in Bear in the Big Blue House

It is Bear who uses the pretend, direct, face-to-face pedagogical voice in this programme. Bear is also the animal portrayed as the most grown up, has an adult voice and explains things. What he explains concerns different kinds of images in terms of technique as well as their relations to life. His explanations are directed both to the viewer and to the other animals living in the blue house.

In this programme, the learning objective is rather advanced, as it concerns a complex way of seeing and seeing things from different perspectives (cf. Buhl & Flensborg, 2011; Sparrman, 2006). Nothing is declared as right or wrong, but instead the programme calls for an understanding of different viewpoints. Because the viewer is included in the “we” of the story, the teaching going on is not imposed but instead offered. Bear is not telling the viewer or the other animals what to do, but instead answers the questions posed by the other animals and brings the viewer in as a pretend companion in the task of picture taking. The other animals are used as the novices, and words and causalities are explained to the viewer without pointing her/him out as lacking in knowledge. Even though Bear is the knowledgeable character in this programme, also he learns things and, in the end, can see his home environment in a different light, thanks to his friends. Accordingly, in this programme, both the novice and the master have opportunities for learning. The characters in this programme are animals, and the adult pedagogical voice takes the shape of a bear. Here the animal-child relation can be understood to blur boundaries between the dichotomies adult/child and human/animal (cf. Baker, 2001; Haraway, 1991; Stockton, 2009; Taylor, 2011), making the hierarchical structure loose and sometimes unfixed.

The pedagogical voice in this programme is in dialogue with its recipients. It is willing to listen and learn, even from the characters it is in dialogue with (cf. Stensmo, 2000; Säljö, 2000). It is interested in creativity and not in fixed notions of right and wrong. The audience is instructed that difference in images is something good, an idea that can be transferred to understandings of life and people. In this programme, everyone is valuable the way they are, and everyone is acknowledged as important and expected friends by the use of the pretend, direct, face-to-face pedagogical voice.
The educational novice-novice interaction

Bolibompa

Image 39: Stephan surfing the programme website in Bolibompa, produced by SVT, SVT1, 20070409, 18.00-19.00.

Bolibompa is the studio show that frames all other short programmes, clips and films in SVT’s children’s programming. The specific programme analysed here was broadcast early one evening in April 2007 and framed three short programmes (Charlie & Lola, Brum and Ella’s Saturday). It is the programme talk taking place in the studio in between the other programmes that is analysed here.

For about a week the storyline in Bolibompa has been that one of the hosts, Markus, has been trapped on the programme website. In the studio a large screen is in place showing the Bolibompa website. Markus is from time to time seen moving on the computer screen (Image 39). During the week, Markus has played hide and seek with the other hosts and the viewers, dropping clues as to where on the website one can find him.
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The ones using the pretend, direct, face-to-face pedagogical voice in Bolibompa are the hosts. One of them, Stephan, enters the studio and greets the viewers as soon as the episode starts. He seems a bit low. It turns out that he has not managed to find Markus on the website and he misses him. The clue Markus has given to where he is hiding is: “in the world of books”. Stephan looks for Markus in the Bolibompa diary, a book in the studio, and discusses this with the robot, Marit, who is heard making electronic beeping sounds. Stephan appears to understand her with ease. (Marit can be seen in the left corner far down in image 40.)

Excerpt 11:

1. Marit: ((an electronic beeping sound is heard from the robot)) /  
2. Stephan: Smart, Marit, that must be it, if Markus is not in the Bolibompa diary here in the studio, well then he must have hidden in the studio on our Bolibompa website, naturally. ((Stephan leaves the actual diary gets up and walks over to the big screen showing the website and starts to click on it looking concentrated but confused. A replica of the studio becomes visible on the screen while Stephan clicks on it.)) /  
3. Now let’s see, wait, then one should click oneself forward, there, yes, the studio, where one clicks further. ((He is now talking to the viewers more than to Marit.)) /  
4. So one presses these, like this, and do you see the diary anywhere? ((The virtual studio is scrolled over on the large screen, in search of the virtual diary.)) /  
5. I don’t see it. Can you find it? ((Stephan is talking with the viewer.)) /  
6. Yes, there, you can see it there. Up, on top of the lights,
press it.

7. So, now click, where are we now. There, do you see what is written on top?

8. It says, hmm, weird I’ll click it and we’ll see what happens.

9. It, it, it IS Markus! He is there, he is there. ((Markus becomes visible on the screen.))

10. Markus: Congrats Stephan and all of you at home!

11. Stephan: Thanks

12. Marcus: You found me!

13. Stephan: But how are you? Haven’t you grown tired of being in there on the Bolibompa website?

14. Marcus: Well, yes, but there are so many fun things to do in here on the Bolibompa site, its unbelievable.

15. But that is true I long for you at home a bit and to shake somebody’s hand for real or maybe to hug someone.

Stephan is not portrayed as particularly smart, as he has started off by trying to find Markus in the actual diary in the studio. But Marit, portrayed as the bright one of the two, comes to Stephan’s rescue (line 1). Stephan moves over to the screen and starts to click on it. While he does this he hesitates a bit concerning how to manage the site, and he talks with the viewers about it (lines 3-8). When the studio replica appears on screen, Stephan starts the search for the diary and asks the viewers if they can see the book (lines 4-5). Because it is the viewers as a collective (“you” here being plural in Swedish) that are encouraged to click on the virtual book and asked what the page says (line 7), they are included in this task, as well as in the pretend conversation.

Whether the idea is that viewers should follow this only on TV, or also try to navigate the website at home at the same time, is unclear. However, to make sense of the encouragements to click on the website, a computer is needed, unless the viewer is so familiar with both computers and the Bolibompa website that s/he already knows how it works (lines 4-7). The message is that you do not need to be an experienced Net-surfer to explore this site. Stephan is not, as he needs advice from the robot and help from the viewers (lines 1, 4, 5 & 7). The viewers are not, however, put forward as more acquainted with surfing on websites than Stephan, as it is Stephan who finds the diary in the online studio and advises the viewers to press and click on things that he locates (lines 6 & 7).

When Markus appears on screen, he congratulates both Stephan and the viewers on succeeding in their joint task (lines 10 & 12). The viewer is thereby included in finding Markus and not just a tagalong on Stephan’s mission. In the next part of the conversation the story is wrapped up. When Stephan brings up the possibility of growing tired of the website (line 13), Markus takes his lead. However, the conclusion is not that one gets tired of the website. Markus instead points out
how many fun things the website has to offer (line 14), but adds that he misses the viewers and being able to touch real people (line 15). One could ask how the host’s relationship with the viewers differs when he is on the website and when he is in the programme studio, but what these sentences create is a chance for the storyline to come to an end. They also manage to add a moral twist to the narrative: Too much surfing on the Net is not good for you. It cannot replace contact with real people.

Image 41: Markus and Stephan thanking the viewer for their help in Bolibompa, produced by SVT, SVT1, 20070409, 18.00-19.00.

Markus expresses that he would not mind leaving the website now, but the problem is he does not know how to get out. Stephan introduces a few programmes while they think of a solution. Once again Marit comes to the rescue:

Excerpt 12:
1. Marit ((an electronic beeping sound is heard from the robot)) / 
2. Stephan. Aha, heh heh / 
3. Markus: Yeah, that might be something / 
4. Stephan: Ah but wait, did I understand this right now: that we all together should call: Markus get out? / 
5. Marit ((an electronic beeping sound is heard from the robot)) / 
6. Stephan: That might work then, but then we do it together then, and we call, ((Stephan looks at the camera and addresses the viewer)) / 
7. Are you ready then? ((Addressing Markus)) / 
8. Markus: I’m ready. / 
9. Stephan: Ah but okay then, we do it then, everybody together and so we call, okay: Markus get out! ((Looking at the camera, and not at Markus)) / 
10. Markus: Nope, didn’t feel anything. / 
11. Stephan: No okay, but if we call louder then, everybody, you too at home, even louder ((Looks at the camera and addresses the
Okay Markus now we will call even louder, now it will, now, I promise you, Okay, 1, 2, Markus, get out!!

Did anything happen? ((Looks at Markus))

Markus: Nope

Markus: Did you notice anything, now then? ((Looks at Markus))

Markus: You did that so well! Thank you so much all of you at home! ((Markus addresses the viewer. Both Markus & Stephan look at the camera))

Stephan is a bit hesitant about Marit’s plan, but he is willing to try it if the viewers are in on it too (line 6). The viewers are the key addressees here (lines 9, 11-12 & 15), as Marit is not heard calling at all and Stephan is not calling all that loud in the studio. The plan seems unsuccessful at first, but Stephan persists in calling even if Markus feels noting to start with, (lines 10, 14) and eventually Markus turns up in the studio next to him. The viewers are than thanked by Markus (line 19). The programme has a fantasy storyline that shows the adult hosts using a pretend, direct, face-to-face mode of addressing the viewers. This address implies that the viewer can influence what happens on screen (line 19 especially), rubbing out the boundaries between the studio and the viewers (cf. Allen, 1992).

Discussion- Educational aims in Bolibompa

The pedagogical mission here is to show how the programme website can be used and how to navigate on it. Stephan is the one doing most of the talking, and the viewers are invited in to his pretend conversation. They are to help out when he finds his way in the virtual world through trial and error. Everyone is included in this task and Markus recognizes the work of both Stephan and the viewers. The studio narration builds on closeness with the viewers. They are greeted like people who already know the hosts and the studio, and thereby as regular Bolibompa viewers.

The pedagogical voice in this programme is that of an adult friend. It is exploring the site together with the audience, and it is not acting from an expert position. Connected to the make-believe approach of the narrative, however, one
might ask whether Stephan’s novice role is not also part of the fiction. In this programme, the imagined child audience is invited to join Stephan in exploring the website, but the shared level of competence between the adult friend and the viewers is fictitious. If the viewer needs to know what Stephan is teaching, s/he needs assistance to even reach the site. But promotion of the site and the wish to communicate with the audience are in earnest and not part of the pretend address.

The authoritarian child – adult interaction

Sale

Image 42: The child reporter Laura introducing the issue of environmentally unfriendly jeans in Sale (Rea), produced by SVT, SVT1, 20070404, 19.00-19.25.

A 25-minute-long episode of the consumer programme series Sale (Rea) was broadcast on a Wednesday at 7pm within the studio show Bobster. In Sale, children work as reporters and the only adults shown are invited experts or other adult individuals who are interviewed by the young reporters. The address in this programme can be linked more to a consumer programme for adults than to the other programmes analysed thus far, and no pretend address is used. Age is a crucial issue here, as the target audience for this programme is older than for the other four programmes. The programme contains several parts, but this episode focuses mainly on how environmentally unfriendly most jeans are, and it is this part that is analysed here.

271 Rea, TV1, SVT, 20070404, 19.00-19.25. This programme is produced by SVT.
272 The target group is about 9-13 year of age if judging from the AR, SVT (2007).
Pedagogical voice in Sale

There are three pedagogical voices in the part of the programme on jeans. Two voices are used when the child reporter Laura (image 42) talks to adults and another one is used when she talks to the viewer.

The pedagogical voice addressing viewers

Image 43: Text addressing viewers in Sale (Rea), produced by SVT, SVT1, 20070404, 19.00-19.25.

Only on a few occasions is the viewer addressed directly by the reporter in this part of the programme. That is in the beginning when the problem about jeans is introduced and the reporter faces the camera (Image 42), but then without pointing at the viewers in her talk. The viewer is also addressed when the reportage on jeans ends. Then a heading reading: “Did you know that…” (Image 43) is shown on the screen. Fast cuts and informative talk from Laura, as the voice-over, follow the heading:

Excerpt 13:
1. Laura: In Sweden we bought clothes for 47 billion crowns last year. That is 3 billion more than all schools in Sweden get per year from the state. /
2. And something that we buy a lot of is jeans. We actually bought almost 13 million pairs of jeans last year. /
3. Do you know why they are called jeans by the way? /
4. Well, it comes from a cloth made of cotton that was called jean. And from the very beginning it came from Genoa in Italy. Thereby, Genoa, gean, jean, jeans. /
5. The world’s first pair of jeans was manufactured in 1873 by Levi Strauss and from then on the Levi Strauss company has sold over 3.5 billion pairs of jeans. /
6. If one were to lay all those pairs of jeans in a row, they would reach to the moon and back 7 times. /
As we see above, the viewer is addressed by questions both written on the screen (Image 43) and spoken in line 3. These questions are rhetorical and thus the viewer is not expected to answer them, which is evident in that no pause is left in the talk for an answer, or for that matter for bells or ringing sounds. Instead these questions imply that the viewer might already know this; there are no implicit demands for an answer and no assessment is made. The talk provides information on perhaps both useful and trivial knowledge, as indicated by the expression “by the way” (line 3). The pedagogical voice is not focused on telling the viewer what to do, nor does it pretend to see, hear or smell the viewer. It is instead informing viewers about consumer issues. Still the reporter is talking directly to the camera, and the voice-over is calling the individual viewer “you”, but without pretending to have a conversation that reaches off screen.

The pedagogical voice addressing adults

In the reportage on organic jeans, there are also other pedagogical voices that are not aimed directly at the viewer. These are the voices of the child reporter talking with adults. The reporter has phoned several of the major clothing chains and asked them if they sell organic jeans. Most of them did not. One of the major retailers that did not, JC – jeans and clothes, is asked about this issue in more depth when the reporter, Laura, interviews the quality engineer of the brand, Sara Één:

Excerpt 14:
1. Reporter: So you have no organic jeans, why not? ((Both the reporter and the interviewee are seen on screen. Image 44))
2. Quality engineer: We will have organic jeans starting in August /
3. Reporter: But why haven’t you got them now? ((Focus on the
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4. Quality engineer: It has been quite difficult to get hold of organic cotton, but it’s a bit hot now – if I may say so – so the demand is getting bigger and we have managed to get a better price and in this way we have got hold of the cotton we need.

5. Reporter: But there are several other shops that have managed to get hold of it, Why haven’t you? ((Focus back on both speakers.))

6. Quality engineer: The ones that have got hold of it are the big ones like Hennes [H&M] and Levi’s and they have been on, ee due to their size it has been easier for them to get hold of it.

7. Reporter: But you are called Jeans and clothes, shouldn’t you be the first to present news on jeans?

8. Quality engineer: That’s what we think also, so it’s a pity but we’re working on it.

9. Reporter: But what do you think that I should do now when I need a pair of new jeans?

10. Quality engineer: Ee, yes unfortunately if you must have a pair of organic jeans you will have to look in other stores. ((The scene ends with the camera focus being fixed on the child reporter glancing up at the adult female engineer, who smiles uncomfortably.))

Laura is asking pretty tough questions in this sequence (lines 1, 3, 5, 7, 9 & 10), and Sara has a hard time explaining why the company does not sell organic jeans at the moment. The reporter continues to pose questions, not accepting the given answers, and forces the interviewee in the end to admit that other brands must be chosen (line 11). The TV production positions Laura as the reporter, and the way in which she asks questions follows on this journalistic role. However, the age difference between her and Sara tilts the relationship between the reporter and the interviewee a bit, as the relationship also builds on the child/adult dichotomy (cf. Lee, 2001). It therefore seems impossible for the adult to tell the child to her face on public service TV that the environment is not worth making less profit (see Chapter 5). That would mean bad publicity for the brand, and Sara instead formulates the lack of organic jeans as an issue of supply (line 4). This requires a long explanation, which does not come across as logical in the end. How can the brand possibly have managed to get organic cotton at a better price when demand for it has risen? The final image in the clip shows the child looking at the adult woman and at the brand without batting an eye. This leaves Sara in an impossible situation. Nothing else can be said or done but to stand there, being looked at from below by a disappointed child. The adult woman
smiles uncomfortably, as if ashamed at not having lived up to the child’s expectations. However, the reporter knew from the start that this company sold no organic jeans, as she had already phoned them. Here it is the journalistic role combined with a notion of the innocent child (cf. Higonnet, 1998; Holland; 2006; James & James 2008) that provides the child with an authoritarian pedagogical voice.

The reporter has yet another pedagogical voice when she asks young people on the street how many pairs of jeans they buy per year and if they know that jeans are not environmentally friendly.

Image 45: Laura informing young adults on the street about the environmentally unfriendliness of jeans in Sale (Rea), produced by SVT, SVT1, 20070404, 19.00-19.25.

Excerpt 15:
1. Reporter: But did you know that making a pair of jeans requires half a kilo of chemicals, that are dangerous to health and the environment? ((The reporter looks up at a young woman on the street.))
2. Young woman: I didn’t know that, in fact! ((Looks a bit surprised))
3. Reporter: But what do you think of that?
4. Young woman: That it’s not good at all and I think it’s important to inform consumers about there being environmental poison in jeans before they are bought.

The young woman who is interviewed is troubled by the facts given to her by the reporter, and stresses that this is news to her (line 2). When asked, she says that she doesn’t think this is “good at all” and demands more consumer information from the retail businesses (line 4). The young reporter asks the same question of several young people on the street, and most of them look quite taken aback by the message. The fact that the child is teaching young people and questioning their knowledge and their consumption lifestyles might be part of
the uncomfortableness they display. In this way, the child reporter teaches adult consumers and the brand manager on screen, as well as viewers at home, not to take environmental issues lightly.

Discussion - Educational aims in Sale

In this programme, the focus is obviously on consumer issues, as that is the topic of the series, but in analysing the pedagogical voices other learning objectives also becomes visible. When the child on screen addresses the children off screen, this is done in a quite friendly and informative way. The address used is not pretend, but can rather be seen to simulate a direct, face-to-face communication similar to the one used when addressing adult viewers (cf. Allen, 1992). This highlights how the pretend part in the previous examples addresses the viewer more actively, but also brings make-believe into the address. This is something that does not fit the storyline of this consumer programme. Here we see a competent child talking to other competent children, who may or may not need the given information. When the child reporter addresses adults, the roles are different. Laura comes forward as a professional reporter when questioning the brand representative. She is setting the adult straight, but she is also doing this from her position as a child, as she is not really a professional reporter. That her surname is not presented is a sign of this. When Laura talks to people on the street, she is the master with the pertinent knowledge and the young adults she talks to are the novices. However, in all these three roles there is an underlying lesson: Do not underestimate children, neither as reporters nor as consumers. This is a lesson both the child viewers and the retail businesses should learn.

The audience and the pedagogical address

In this chapter, the focus has been on how a child audience is configured by talk in TV for children, as exemplified by the pretend, direct, face-to-face pedagogical voice. This speech genre allows us to study how the audience is portrayed. The fact that this speech genre only exists in the 2007 material also makes it possible to investigate pedagogical voices coexisting during the same time period in the research material, as well as the explicit learning outcomes these voices create.

In four of the programmes studied here, animated, costumed and ‘real’ characters talk to the camera, as if it were possible to hear, see and even smell the viewers. This pretend part of the address, I would claim, targets the youngest
The viewers can go along with this illusion, believing in it or not, but the fictive interaction has consequences for the addresser-addressee relationship. For instance, the child can only participate to a certain degree in a programme. In *Bear in the big blue house*, the viewer is a companion but cannot be part of the photographed group in the end. In *Bolibompa*, the fictive interaction aims at transforming viewers into an audience for the website, and thus at creating a non-fictive means of communication on the Web by using a fictive one. The pretend, direct, face-to-face address can in this respect be viewed as a substitute for communicating directly with actual viewers. This can also be seen in how this address changes when the imagined audience is older. The reporter in *Sale* addresses the audience directly as well, and even simulates a face-to-face address in the same way that TV addresses adult audiences (cf. Allen, 1992; Edin, 2000). What is different here is that no illusion is created that the viewers can answer back. In the *Sale* programme there is a recurrent, expressed wish for the viewers to contact the programme. The target audience here is older, and programme-viewer interactivity can be seen as replacing the pretend face-to-face interaction directed at younger children.

The pretend address creates a bond between the addresser and the imagined viewers, which builds an illusion that interaction between them is possible. The direct address performs both disciplining talk and looks by having the characters on screen pretend to see and assess the child viewers off screen, which is most obvious in *JoJo’s Circus* and in *The Little Einsteins*. This address thereby makes the child viewer both visible and the object of an inspecting gaze (cf. Foucault, 1991; Lutz & Collins, 1991; Oswell, 1995; Rogoff: 1996; Sturken & Cartwright, 2009). Thus, it is not possible for an imagined child audience to lean back in front of the TV; it has many tasks to perform and it is being monitored.

The pedagogical voices in the programmes build relationships with the imagined audience in terms of who addresses whom with what and in what ways. There is a diverse set of voices in the example analysed here, wherein adults as well as children are allowed to use both authoritarian and novice voices. Thus, the hierarchical order is not linear in terms of age or adulthood, but the voices used most often put the imagined child audience at the bottom, because it is told what to do, informed and cannot answer back.

All the pedagogical voices produce ideas about preferred learning outcomes. The imagined child audience is configured by these voices as individuals who

---

273 For example, in Edin’s (2000) study of how SVT addresses an adult audience, she reports no traces of the on-screen addressers pretending to communicate in this explicit way with the audience. Nor does Allen (1992) in his study.
should develop the ability to take different perspectives, be able to navigate on a website and be critical consumers, as well as follow the lead of authorities, do as they are told, focus on traditional virtues and get moving. These rather different viewpoints put forward in the programmes show how multi-layered elements of pedagogy and learning are in *TV for children*.

Legislative requirements concerning SVT does not put forward education as a more pressing aim for the child audience than for the adult audience (*BC SVT*, 2007). Still in the overview shows that most of the programming, also among SVT programmes, is educational in some way. What has been shown in the analysis is that the pedagogical voices form child address in entertainment programmes for a child TV audience. Incorporating education into the entertainment programmes legitimates TV production for a child audience, as it makes TV ‘useful’ and less likely to be associated with the passivity and unhealthy bodies often attributed to entertainment *TV for children* (cf. Buckingham et al., 1999; Buckingham, 2007; Jordan, 2007). It it could also be argued that because pedagogy, education and learning are such crucial parts of the child discourse in general, even when producing entertainment for this audience the link between children and education remains unbroken.

Ideas about pedagogy, education and learning affect all children in society (cf. Anderson-Levitt, forthcoming; Hämäläinen, forthcoming; James & James, 2008), and learning is almost always referred to as something good (cf. Graff, 2001; Säljö, 2000). But the learning objectives adult society sets for children are quite high (e.g., Buckingham & Scanlon, 2005; 2003; Scanlon & Buckingham 2002), and the concept of learning needs to be questioned and not assumed to be solely positive (cf. Graff, 2001; Säljö, 2000). The fact that adult society takes the right to ‘pedagogize’ (cf. Davies, 1987; Sparrman, 2010; Sparrman, 2006) children’s everyday life can thus be questioned in regard to *TV for children*. The configured child audience is supposed to be educated and to even feel it is being addressed by pedagogical voices per se. Thus, when looking at the use of pedagogical voices, it seems impossible to imagine a child TV audience that is only entertained and not required to learn.

TV talk is in this way configuring a child audience by different verbal addresses. To look into the camera and direct the talk to this audience makes explicit how the audience is imagined in terms of age, interests and needs.

The next chapter considers the actual interactivity that TV offers and makes possible for child viewers, as opposed to the pretend one investigated here.
Chapter 6
Visualizing the audience in TV for children

Introduction
This chapter focuses on how visual aspects of TV for children configure a child audience. As discussed in the first chapter, the importance of television’s visual aspects has been downplayed by TV researchers (e.g., Ellis, 2002; Corner 1999). However, other scholars have argued for quite the opposite approach. For example, visual studies researcher W. J. T. Mitchell (2005a: 211) views images as “the principal currency of media” (see also, e.g., Corner, 1999; Caldwell, 1995; Lury, 2005). In the present study, the visual aspects of television are not only viewed as important in terms of TV programming, but TV imagery is also seen as central to the TV institution’s relationship with its audience. The TV researcher John Thornton Caldwell (1995: 353), for example, argues that: “The workings of the televisual image […] make up the very heart of television’s engagement with viewers”. This means that TV produces notions of a time period, a programme genre (cf. Sandin, 2001; Wallengren, 2005; Wallengren, 2001), as well as of a targeted audience, through its visuality. In this chapter, the scope of addressing children visually has been limited to one visual aspect: how child viewers are made visible on screen in TV for children.

In the studied programme material, viewers are visualized on screen through different interactive strategies. Interactivity in this sense refers to when viewers in some way act to communicate with a TV programme, i.e. when there appears to be a viewer influencing what is shown in a programme (Lury, 2005). In TV studies, interactivity has been discussed in relation to aspects of adult viewer participation (cf. Allen, 1992; Bennett, 2006; Lind, 2008; Livingstone & Lunt, 1994; Lury, 2005; Svensson, 2001; Örnebring; 2001). However, to understand what kind of interaction is made visible and what kind of child audience this interactivity configures, the examples of interactivity studied in this chapter are linked to ideas about the possibilities for the category ‘children’ to participate and be seen both in TV and in society.
Being allowed to be seen in society is key to having rights and citizenship, which is why visibility is an issue of importance also for the category ‘children’ (Casper & Moore, 2009; Rogoff, 2002; Söderlind & Engvall: 2005). ‘Children’ is commonly an underrepresented category, missing and/or invisible on many arenas, such as in the public debate and political decision-making (Casper & Moore, 2009; Söderlind & Engvall, 2005). Still, many children can be seen in different public image genres (cf. Higonnet, 1998; Holland, 2004; for research overview see, e.g., Sparrman, forthcoming). However, these visual representations of children seldom have a liberating potential for them, as children are often stereotypically portrayed as merely innocents, and in this way silenced by the way in which they are visualized (Casper & Moore, 2009; Hart, 1992; Higonnet, 1998). Patricia Holland (2004: 20), who studies popular visual representations of children, points to the fact that children themselves seldom can influence how they are represented in the public sphere. This can be argued also in relation to TV and children (Carlsson & von Feilizen, 2006). The children seen in TV for children are mostly there in their role as actors, and even though they represent the category ‘children’ on screen, these children are always selected and directed by adults (cf. Lury, 2010; Ågren, 2008).

The ability of child viewers to become visible on screen can thereby also be seen as an issue of being allowed to participate in TV. Child researcher Roger Hart (1992) argues that children’s participation is an important political issue, and he defines how children are permitted to participate in society using eight levels. These levels range from “manipulation” to “child-initiated decisions shared with adults” in what Hart (1992:8) calls “the ladder of participation”. In the three first rungs on this ladder, children are seen as non-participants, who are being manipulated by adults to think that they are participating, and who are working as decorations for adult projects or as tokens that are given voice in adult projects without being listened to (Hart, 1992: 8). The five other rungs on the ladder mark “degrees of participation” focusing on whose initiative enables the participation to happen. These levels of participation span from “assigned but not informed” to children initiating and deciding things together with adults (Hart, 1992: 8).

If we link Hart’s (1992) notions of child participation to TV, children’s possibility to participate in media production is basically non-existent, as the production level is adult dominated (Buckingham, 2002a; Carlsson & von Feilizen, 2006). However, it is stated in the SVT and UR broadcasting licences in 2007 that they have to produce programming for and, more importantly, with children and young people, something that is not stressed for any other audience group (BL SVT, 2007: 11§; BL UR, 2007: 11§). This formulation points to the importance of representing children in the programmes (cf. Janson, 2013), but also of chil-
children having a say in the programming production. With this in mind, children’s possibilities to participate in *TV for children* become a special case to study.

To investigate participation in *TV for children* further, the level of initiative and the interactive means provided by programmes for child viewers needs to be explored. This means trying to understand how children are invited to interact in TV, what level of initiative this renders viewers, and what level of participation the programmes initiate, which would make Hart’s (1992) ladder useful for discussing TV.

Interactivity occurs in all programme categories in the research material, such as in children’s programmes\(^{274}\), young people’s programmes\(^{275}\), family programmes\(^{276}\) and educational programmes\(^{277}\). Interactivity is strongly connected to a direct audience address (cf. Allen, 1992; see also chapter 5) as well as to specific programme genres, such as quiz programmes.

Table 4: The total number of programmes in the study, and the number of UR and SVT programmes containing interactivity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programmes in total</th>
<th>1980</th>
<th>1992</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UR broadcasts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVT broadcasts</td>
<td>16(^{278})</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table presents an overview of programmes in which viewers are visualized as interacting with the programmes. Drawings, letters, video recordings and artefacts portrayed as having been sent to TV by viewers have been counted, as have child viewers who are heard calling programmes and child viewers visualized in programmes.\(^{279}\) The table shows that the number of occasions when chil-

\(^{274}\) E.g., *Vi i femman*, SVT2, 19800404, 16.15-17.00; *Disneyklubben*, SVT1, 19921025, 10.30-11.45; *Hjärnkontoret*, SVT1, 20070404, 18.30-18.45.

\(^{275}\) E.g., *Popitopp*, SVT1, 19920420, 15.35-16.20; *Bullen*, SVT1, 19920415, 19.10-20.00; *PM*, SVT2, 19921009, 16.30-18.15.

\(^{276}\) E.g., *Gomorron Sverige!*, SVT1, 19800405, 8.00-10.00; 7-9, SVT1, 19921017, 19.00-21.00; *Söndagsöppet*, SVT1, 19921025, 19.15-20.00.

\(^{277}\) E.g., *Teckenkvarter. NU*, UR, SVT1, 19921017, 15.45-16.00; *Krokodill. UR*, SVT1, 20070404, 17.30-18.00; *Krokomax. UR*, SVT1, 20070903, 17.30-18.00.

\(^{278}\) The announcers and the clocks for some of the children’s programmes from 1980 have not been saved in the archive, and it is therefore possible that there are more children’s drawings shown before the programme starts than what is visible in the material.

\(^{279}\) Verbal invitations to interactivity have not been counted here, as they do not leave visual traces in the programmes. Moreover, the means for interacting with programmes, such as mail addresses etc., have not been included in the table. This is because there were so very many addresses, especially in 2007 that they, if included here, would have hidden the occasions.
Children are seen interacting on screen have risen over the years, and that this rise concerns SVT only. It should also be noted that some of these programmes, especially for SVT in 2007, contain several cases of interactivity but have only been counted once.

When interactivity is visualized in *TV for children*, this is done differently in the programmes depending on the time period, programme type, the age of the audience and in terms of participation level. How the interactive practices shown in *TV for children* relate to notions of child participation will therefore be looked into. When we now turn to the in-depth analysis of interactive practices, there is a set of questions that have guided the analysis of how child viewers are made visible on screen. These are: In what ways, where, when and by whom, are child viewers invited to interact with *TV for children*? What kinds of interactivity are the viewers visually engaging in, and how is interactivity visualized in the TV programmes? What imagined child audience is configured through this visualization, and does it change over time?

The analysis is divided into seven different parts, to illustrate how the aspects of viewer interactivity produce ways of making the viewers visible in the programmes. The section starts by elaborating on how interaction can be seen in the programmes, following the markings that signal viewer interactivity. Next is an analysis of how viewers are made visible when their drawings are presented to the camera. Thereafter I move on to discuss what means of interacting the programmes offer their viewers. How viewers’ interaction becomes visible as elaborated programme content is analysed next, first focusing on drawings and thereafter on other interactive means. This is followed by an investigation of how viewers are put forward as interacting in competition programmes. Last in this section is an analysis of programmes that contain several coexisting interactive practices.

### Seeing the viewer on screen

#### Signalling viewer interaction

The targeted viewers of many TV programmes for children are not yet able to read. In line with this notion, the possibilities to visualize these viewers’ particip-

when children are actually shown interacting on screen. However, these means for interactivity will be discussed in the analysis.
participation on TV have been adjusted to what the public service TV institution thinks these viewers are capable of in terms of interaction, and what they will like.

To set the scene for how viewers are portrayed as interacting with TV on screen, some context is needed. In 1980, there are long periods when nothing is broadcast at all on TV, and waiting periods before programmes begin are frequent. During these periods, the TV test card or just white noise is shown. When a broadcast is approaching, things like the logo of the TV channel, a clock and/or the programme title are shown on screen (e.g., Images 46-48). In these waiting periods, there are ways of explicitly visualizing child address, as well as signaling possible viewer participation in TV, namely by displaying child drawings on screen.

Image 46: The clock before *Half past four, The animal’s Thursday* (*Halvfem, Djurens torsdag*), SVT1, 19800403, 16.30-17.00; Image 47: The clock before *Mumin* (*Mumintroll*) SVT2, 19800925, 17.30-17.55; Image 48: The clock before *Mumin* (*Mumintroll*), SVT2, 19800917, 17.30-17.55. These programme parts were all produced by SVT.

Both the public service channels, SVT1 and SVT2, broadcast children’s programmes in 1980. During the waiting time for the children’s programmes the channels show clocks telling the time (Images 46-48). SVT2, however, shows the clock against a background of child drawings. These drawings change from day to day, and they all visually signal that they are made by children. This can
be seen, for example, through the use of crayons, the colouring technique, and how the main motifs are centred in the drawings (cf. Aronsson, 1997). Support for the notion that these drawings perform that they are *made by a child* can also be seen by making a comparison to Image 49. This drawing from 1992 is also made with crayons, but it does not come forward as a child drawing like the ones from 1980. This becomes clear, for example, in how the crayons follow the lines of the curtains rather than going in many different directions like in Images 47 & 48, and in the perspective that shows the foot part of the bed only. This image still performs child address by the use of crayons and in terms of its colourfulness, but it is not performing *made by a child.*

![Image 49: The clock before and the intro to *Up and Look (Upp och titta).* SVT1, 19921025, 08.00-09.15. This programme part was produced by SVT.](image)

The way the child drawings are used in SVT2 in 1980 allows a potential viewer who is neither able to read text nor to read a clock to understand that the programme targets children. This makes explicit the child address, as compared to the clock without a drawing background (Image 46). But in signalling that children have made these drawings, the drawings are also put forward as a possible way for child viewers to participate in TV. However, there are no artist names presented, and no other acknowledgement; in fact, these drawings are not mentioned at all by anyone. Still, by being made visible on screen, they signal that interactivity is possible.

---

280 This was the only clock with a drawing as background in the 1992 material. In the 2007 material, clocks are rare and none of them had a drawing as background.

281 These drawings were sent to SVT by viewers, despite the fact that they were never mentioned on screen and that there were never any invitations to send drawings to TV. This information was provided by Ragna Wahlmark, who worked at the children’s departments in both SVT and UR for quite a long time. Telephone conversation 130403.
Child drawings are also made visible in other settings in *TV for children*.

Image 50: From the studio before the start of *Maja’s boat (Majas båt)*. SVT1, 19920421, 18.15-18.20; Image 51: From the studio before the start of *The seasons in the town (Årstiderna i stan)*. SVT1, 19920915, 18.15-18.45; Image 52: *Bolibompa*, SVT1, 20070410, 18.00-19.00. These programmes were all produced by SVT.

For example, in the main children’s programmes in 1992 in SVT1, the same studio is used on Tuesdays and Thursdays. It features the host Johan (Image 50) or Karin (Image 51), and the actions in the studio frame short programme parts, and construe the children’s programmes as an entity. As part of the studio interior there are several child drawings pinned to the wall behind the hosts (Images 50-51). Hanging up drawings like this is a way of visualizing children’s places. It is a practice common in day-care centres, primary schools, children’s museums, children’s home environments, etc. (cf. Image 53, a school setting shown in *Sweets (Karamelli)*, a programme for Finnish-speaking children).
The drawings put up in the studio in this way perform visual child address merely by being there, and the studio becomes a place for children’s television in that it is decorated with child drawings (cf. Lury, 2005). The drawings in the children’s programmes in 1992 also go unmentioned, just like the drawings behind the clocks in 1980. The fact that they change over the different programmes (cf. Images 50-51), however, signals possible child viewer interactivity. The same strategy of using child drawings to make the studio in the children’s programme Bolibompa a place for children’s TV can also be seen in 2007 (e.g., Image 52), here the drawings still signal that there are viewers interacting with the TV programmes.

In regard to Hart’s (1992) levels of participation, these practices of just displaying children’s drawings could be described as decoration, given that these creations are not commented on and their creators never presented. Moreover, the drawings on screen have all been selected by adults, which limits the level of child participation to basically nothing. However, it takes a great deal of initiative to manage to send one’s drawing to TV and to get it shown when no request for drawings has been seen or heard. Hence, Hart’s (1992) participation ladder needs to be adjusted to what the TV medium is capable of. It is an adult-led medium to be sure, but I would argue that the kind of participation that interacting with TV makes possible must be considered twofold. First, the shown interactivity must be analysed in terms of what possibilities children have to participate in the adult-led medium. And second, it must be analysed in terms of the level of initiative that the shown interactive practices can be understood to entail with regard to both viewers and the TV programmes. These two perspectives of participation will be discussed throughout this chapter.

However, drawings have much more participatory potential than just marking child places and signalling potential viewer interaction.
Child drawings on display

In TV for children, there are more interactive ways of showing the drawings sent to the programmes by child viewers. In 1980, some of the Doing language (Språka) programmes, for children in minority languages, devote time to show drawings from viewers.282 These drawings are held up to the camera by the programme hosts, adjusted to be in the camera focus, and the name of the child who has drawn the picture is read out loud (Images 54-55). In, for example, Doing language in Serbo-Croatian, the host talks about having posed a riddle in the previous programme. She is now showing many viewer drawings that are said to portray the right answer, a donkey, to the camera. In this way, the host has requested drawings, and a selection of viewer drawings are shown on TV. The drawings are acknowledged as answers to a question, and the young artists are recognized by having their names and locations mentioned on TV. For child viewers, the benefit of interacting with this programme is thus to be seen by having one’s drawing displayed to the camera and hearing one’s name on TV.

![Image 54: Doing language: in Turkish (Språka: på turkiska), SVT1, 19800408, 17.00-17.15; Image 55: Doing language: in Serbo-Croatian (Språka: på serbo-kroatiska), SVT1, 19800403, 17.00-17.15. These programmes were produced by SVT.]

The practice of showing drawings to the camera and stating the names of the children who have made them is observed during all the studied years. However, in 1992, there is only one occasion when the drawings are not related to explicit competitions or more elaborated programme content. This occurs in the UR programme Finnish half hour (Finsk halvtimme),283 a programme for children in Finnish. In this programme, a drawing is shown on-screen by the host (Image 56). He explains what it portrays and he mentions the names and location of the two children who drew it. This practice does not come forward as a competition,

282 Doing language: in Turkish (Språka: på turkiska), SVT1, 19800408, 17.00-17.15; Doing language: in Serbo-Croacian (Språka: på serbo-kroatiska), SVT1, 19800403, 17.00-17.15.
283 Finnish half-hour (Finsk halvtimme). UR, SVT1, 19921001, 10.30-11.00
but the children get a programme T-shirt for sending their drawing to the show. The host also asks for more drawings from viewers, and he suggests “friendship” as a new drawing topic.

In 2007 there are more child drawings shown to the camera in programmes for children than in 1992. One example is the programme *Sweets (Karamelli)* for Finnish-speaking children. This programme has no studio at all, which is unusual for programmes that address children directly (cf. Images 51, 52 & 54). *Sweets*, in this way, is filmed in different locations each time. In the episode referred to here, Heli, the programme host, is visiting a chocolate factory. When she is done making chocolate, she sits down in the factory cafeteria and fills the table in front of her with drawings (Image 57). In a previous programme, Heli has asked viewers to post drawings of horses to her. She holds up some of the drawings to the camera/audience, like Amanda’s drawing of horses (Image 58). Thus, it would seem that being able to show viewer-programme interactivity in

---

284 It is broadcast with Swedish subtitles by SVT and has been since 2001; it is still being broadcast (KB database).

285 *Sweets (Karamelli)*, SVT1, 20070407, 09.20-9.50.
this way is so important to this programme that it is worth the struggle of transporting drawings to the different filming sites.

In *Sweets*, just like in the other programmes in minority languages exemplified here, it is the host who functions as a familiar visual marker from programme to programme, because these programmes have no studio space at all, or studios that are not addressing children specifically (cf. Images 54-56; see also: Lury, 2005). The fact that viewers are allowed to participate in these programmes creates explicit visual markings, which works to strengthen the child address. In 1992 and 2007, not having a studio doing explicit child address is something unique to the programmes in minority languages, but doing child address by showing child viewers’ drawings to the camera is not. Especially in 2007 this is quite a common practice in *Bolibompa*, the main SVT children’s programme.

Requesting drawings, showing them explicitly to the camera and mentioning the names of the children who made them performs the notion that there actually is interaction between the programmes on screen and the viewers off screen, as it makes viewers’ creations visible. This produces more explicit child viewer participation than when drawings are just shown but not mentioned, as the hosts are acknowledging the viewers and foregrounding their creations. Several of the exemplified programmes in this section have asked their viewers to post drawings to them, and the level of initiative on the part of the programmes is thereby greater than when studios are merely decorated with anonymous drawings. However, it could also be argued that the viewers’ initiative is reduced, as the child viewers have responded to adult requests instead of just posting drawings to TV on their own initiative.

**TV providing means for interaction**

One way of inviting viewers to interact becomes visible when programmes include contact information in the credits. In 1980, providing a postal address is not a common practice in programmes for children. The ones that supply addresses are usually the programmes that also show viewer interaction on screen. For example, the *Doing language* programmes, where there is a practice of showing viewers’ drawings (e.g., Image 59). There is also an educational pro-

---

286 *Doing language: in Finnish - Storey (Språka: på finska-Juttu), SVT1, 19801003, 17.00-17.15; Doing language: in Turkish (Språka: på turkiska), SVT1, 19800408, 17.00-17.15; Doing language: in Serbo-Croacian (Språka: på serbo-kroatiska), SVT1, 19800403, 17.00-17.15.*
gramme where viewers can request reruns, which makes both the postal address and phone number available (Image 60). In the research material, one episode of the children’s programme in SVT1, *Half past four*, displays the postal address to the camera (Image 61). The content of this programme, as will be shown below, is built up through viewer interaction. Even if the postal address is stated on screen, many of the targeted viewers for these programmes are not likely to be able to read or write, judging from the drawings they send to the programmes (cf. Images 75-77). Thus, they may have needed assistance to use these addresses in the first place.

There are also programmes that let viewers participate without having requested interaction. This could be seen in the earlier examples where the decorative

---

287 About - one more time. Soon, said Laban and Labolina (*Om igen. Kommer strax, sa Laban och Labolina*), UR, SVT2, 19801003, 18.20-18.30
drawings behind the clocks (Images 47-48) and the drawings pinned to the studio walls (Images 50-51) were displayed even though no postal addresses had been supplied. However, there are also examples of more elaborated uninvited interactivity. In the SVT2 children’s programme *It sounds like it’s growing (Det låter som det växer)* the host shows two letters reported to be from viewers, one also contains a drawing (Images 62-63). The host reads the letters out loud, picks up on the questions on wildlife that the letters pose and answers them in a serious manner.

*Images 62, 63 & 64: It sounds like it’s growing (Det låter som det växer), SVT2, 19800405, 17.30-18.00. This programme was produced by SVT.*

No further invitation to interactivity is made in this programme, however, and it ends without stating a postal address (Image 64). It therefore seems likely that the viewers who managed to communicate with this programme worked quite hard to find out how to reach it, and in doing so showed quite a lot of initiative. This could be seen as Hart’s (1992: 8) highest level of participation: “child-initiated, shared decisions with adults”, in that the letters are also shown and the questions taken up in the adult-led programme.

---

288 *It sounds like it’s growing (Det låter som det växer), SVT2, 19800405, 17.30-18.00*
Programmes provide postal addresses in 1992 as well. For example, the programme *Finnish half hour* ends with the address displayed on top of the programme mascot. Thus, it is clear to those who can read how they can interact with this programme (Image 65). Another UR programme, *15 Minutes of Signing. Now (Teckenkvarten Nu)*, in sign language and Swedish, targets children and young people with hearing difficulties. This programme presents several possibilities for communicating; apart from a postal address, a phone, fax and text phone number are given at the end of the show (Image 66). The educational programmes are, in line with these examples, eager to interact with their audiences. Also programmes like *The Little Sports Show (Lilla Sportspegeln)*, which communicates an explicit desire for viewers to partake, end the programme by showing the postal address on screen (Image 67). Even if the invitations to interaction are more frequent in 1992 than in 1980, still only a few programmes provide a means for interactivity.

By 2007 this has changed, and in fact, there are basically no programmes that do not stress their postal address, their web address and/or their e-mail address at the end. For example both main shows for children, *Bolibompa* and *Bobster*, al-
ways end by presenting several means of contacting the shows in writing on screen (Images 68-69). The two shows in sign language, \textit{Pi} and \textit{The Fairy Tale Tree (Sago trädet)}\textsuperscript{289} offer the most means of communication in the analysed material. Their audiences have the possibility to call, mail, text and e-mail the programmes. \textit{Pi} also offers the possibility of using a text phone (Image 70). In most other programmes in 2007, it is web and mail addresses that are made visible when they end.

Something that can be seen in 2007 is that signs are held up by the hosts or in other ways displayed to the camera, alongside the use of digital text at the end of programmes (Images 71-73). These more personalized signs could be understood as a means by which the 2007 programmes try to differentiate themselves to attract viewer interactivity, as they cannot assume that viewers will respond to their requests as readily as they did previously when such a multitude of invites exist.

\textsuperscript{289} E.g., \textit{The Fairy Tale Tree (Sagoträdet)}, SVT1, 20070405, 17.45-18.00;
The fact that so many means for interactivity are open to viewers in 2007 might not be surprising, as it is stated in the public service companies’ broadcasting licenses (valid in 2007) that SVT and UR are also supposed to produce programming with children, something which is not stated in the licences valid in 1980 or 1992 (BL SVT, 2007: 11§; BL UR, 2007: 11§). Independent of whether or not the increase in interactive means provided in 2007 is a legislative consequence, participation has become easier and is more encouraged in 2007 than in the previous years.

However, as I will go on to discuss, quite advanced levels of initiative on the part of programmes as well as viewer participation have also been present dur-
ing all the studied years. This can be seen if we look, for example, at programme content, which will be discussed below.

**Drawings producing programme content**

Some programme concepts are based on viewer input. For example, one episode in the 1980 research material of the SVT1 children’s programme *Half past four (Halvfem)* is called *What’s that sound?*, and the programme content consists of child viewers’ drawings.

![Image 74, 75, 76 & 77: Half past four, What’s that sound? (Halvfem: Vad är det som låter?) SVT1, 19801003, 16.30-17.00. This programme was produced by SVT.](image)

At the start of the programme, the host, Peter, is sitting behind a desk covered with children’s drawings (Image 74).²⁹⁰ He introduces what is going to happen in the programme this day and he reminds the audience of what happened in last

²⁹⁰ *Half past four, What’s that sound? (Halvfem: Vad är det som låter?)* SVT1 19801003 17.30-18.00
week’s programme. The programme concept works by showing an animation to the viewers, starring an animated girl. Her name is Mina and she is wearing a blue coverall (Images 75-76). All that the viewers have seen in the previous programmes are Mina’s movements, and they have heard sounds corresponding to what she is doing. The film, in this way, lacks props and background altogether. The viewers are asked to draw backgrounds and props for what they think Mina is doing and to post their drawings to the programme. It is the viewers’ drawings for last week’s film that are lying on the desk in front of Peter (Image 74). Last week’s film was set on a farm and some of the farm images made by viewers have been fitted into the film in this programme. Thus, the film now shows the animated girl character, Mina, moving around on a farm illustrated by the viewers’ drawings (Images 75-76). This film is the main feature of the programme this day. A new animation lacking a background and starring Mina is also shown. This time, one can hear that Mina is at the seaside, and the viewers are asked, once again, to draw what they think is happening.

When the film ends, the host shows many additional child drawings to the camera (e.g., Image 77), and together with the film about two thirds of the programme is devoted to the viewers’ drawings. Both in the film and when drawings are shown, the names of the children only come forward if they are written on the front of the pictures. Some of the additional drawings portraying horses are accompanied by the sound of horses galloping when they are shown. However, most of the drawings are just shown while a tune is being played and nothing is said about them. In this way, many drawings are displayed with no reference to what they portray or to who has drawn them.

If a picture is to make it into the film, the Mina character must have been left out, as the animation of her already exists (Images 75-76). Creating a drawing without the main figure is advanced, and goes against the idea that young children tend to focus on what is most important in the picture they are drawing (Aronsson, 1997). This can be seen in that several drawings shown after the film picture Mina (e.g., Image 77). Thus, having a chance to participate in the film requires certain drawing skills.

The offered possibility to interact has also been used by some viewers to pose questions to the host. The letters are not displayed to the camera, but the host holds them in his hand while reading them out loud. The viewers wonder whether it is fun to be on TV and what kind of education one needs to do his job. The host is not really taking the question about education seriously, as he says that what one needs is to foremost be able to read, write and count. What these questions make clear is that there are viewers interested in what being on TV is like, and the vast number of drawings mailed to the programme might also be a sign of this.
The whole programme content rests on viewer participation, but the host does not seem worried that there will not be enough drawings mailed to the programme for making next week’s film. Making a drawing and mailing it to the programme is worded as an invitation: “if you would like to”, says the host. Peter also says that the drawings must be posted to the programme before Tuesday in the upcoming week in order to be considered for next week’s programme. In addition to this, Peter explains that he cannot show all drawings in the programme and that he cannot send the drawings back to their creators. The viewers are thus to respond to the host’s request by drawing, mailing him and following the set timeframe, but the viewers are not to ask for much in return; they can only hope that their drawings will be selected and made visible on screen. The programme ends by showing the postal address to the viewers, thus making it possible for them to do what the host has asked and also maybe be represented on screen (Image 61).

*Bolibompa* is the studio show that frames the short clips and programme parts that make up the SVT children’s programmes for the youngest viewers in 2007. Drawings also play an important part in this programme’s content. As already mentioned, the studio has drawings pinned to the wall (Image 52), and there is also a practice of showing viewers’ drawings to the camera. This is done in several Bolibompa programmes, but in one programme the practice of showing them is made into a narrative. The studio in this episode is filled with plants, as if it has turned into a jungle (Image 78). The host, Nina, is walking around amongst the plants and the sounds of different animals are heard. When a sound is heard, Nina ‘finds’ a drawing in the jungle portraying an animal that can be connected to the sound. The drawing is shown in close up and the name of the child that has drawn it is stated. For example, after a roaring sound, Nina looks in in the greenery and finds a dragon that Dylan has drawn (Image 78). In this way the drawings are put forward as part of a narrative, rather than just something shown on screen, and the children are seen through their drawings and they participate in making programme content.
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291 *Bolibompa*, SVT1, 20070911, 18.00-19.00
In another Bolibompa programme, the host Markus is promoting an archive on the Bolibompa website that contains viewers’ drawings. The drawings mailed to the show is here used to encourage viewers to interact with the programme again, by looking at their own and other children’s drawings on the programme website (Image 79). The viewers’ drawings are shown on the studio computer screen in this programme, but to take a closer look at them one needs to go to the website. Once on the site, viewers can interact with the Bolibompa programme in more ways, for example through e-mail. In this way, the drawings are made into a bridge between the broadcast programme and its website, allowing viewers to be seen and participate on both platforms.

Participation involving mailing drawings to the Bolibompa show can also be seen in a project where viewers are asked to make and send drawings to a school class in Guatemala that Bolibompa has befriended. The show received and showed drawings from Guatemalan children in a previous programme and the host, Markus, then asked Bolibompa viewers to post drawings to the show picturing how they live. He recapitulates this before showing a short clip said to be sent in by a young Guatemalan boy named Otilio. In the clip, Otilio is showing his school to the viewers. When the clip ends, Markus stands behind a table

292 A 4-minute-long sequence in Bolibompa, SVT1, 20070407, 08.00-09.00
293 Bolibompa, SVT1, 20070919, 18.00-19.00
filled with drawings (Image 80). This is, as shown above, a common way of displaying the vast number of viewer drawings (cf. Images 57 & 74). Markus also holds some drawings up to the camera in, what I would call, a typical children’s programme manner (cf. Images 54-56, 58, 62 & 77-78). He then gathers all the drawings and puts them in a large pink envelope placed on the table, which is addressed to the school in Guatemala. Thus, the drawings are not only used to fill programme content. They also offer means for the youngest viewers to be seen and to interact with the programme, with other viewers, and also with children across national borders.

Hence, the drawings perform many things in TV for children: they fill programme time, they constitute a central means of interaction between viewers and programmes, they make viewers and viewers’ participation in programmes visible, they enable communication between children across geographical and language boundaries, and they even form an online library of drawings by and for children. In this way, drawings make up an important means of participation if one is a young child. However, interacting with TV programmes through drawings requires viewer initiative, and it also sometimes takes drawing skills. This participation in programme content is adult initiated, as the drawings have been requested in both Half past four and also occasionally in Bolibompa. The level of initiative on the part of the programmes is therefore high, while the viewers are responding to the hosts’ requests. From the programmes’ point of view, they must ask for, provide the means for interacting but also show the drawings and place them in a meaningful setting to make young children’s participation possible, visible and meaningful. This participation could therefore be placed somewhere around the 6th level on Hart’s (1992:8) ladder, as “Adult-initiated, shared decisions with children”. What this implies is that more means of participation offered to viewers by the TV institution gives children more possibilities to interact, but also that it takes less own initiative to participate, and thereby the ranking on the ladder decreases.

Viewer interaction as programme content

Aside from drawings, there are also other means children can use to interact and become visible in TV for children. Letters are one such means. For example, in one episode of the Children’s News Show (Barnjournalen)294 in 1980, the host, Bengt, declares that the programme receives a lot of letters from viewers, and a pile of letters is shown on screen (Image 81). It can be seen that they are written
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294 Children’s News (Barnjournalen), SVT1, 19800405, 19.00-19.30
by hand and some seem to be quite long. It is therefore not likely that it is the youngest viewers who are interacting with this programme.

Image 81: Children’s News (Barnjournalen), produced by SVT, SVT1, 19800405, 19.00-19.30.

The host says that it is exciting and also of great benefit to the programme to get to know what the viewers think. He also declares that something that is request-ed in many of the letters is an interview with the King. This is followed by an extensive interview with the Swedish King, performed by two child reporters and one adult woman. The interview shows that a letter sent to the programme can result in getting one’s wishes granted, and that interacting with TV has something to offer viewers. However, once again, no postal address is stated in the programme, and thus no further encouragement is given for viewers to interact with the programme. Thereby, the level of initiative to interact with this programme is quite high on the part of viewers, as they must find out where to send their letters. For the programme, this example shows that when viewers take the initiative, they may be able to participate and allowed to set the agenda for a whole reportage. The programme itself, however, does not initiate any interaction. This would be as close as TV comes to providing for the top level of participation on Hart’s (1992) ladder, as it is both child-initiated and adults have shared the interacting children’s interest in the topic and decided to conduct the interview. Yet again, the issue of high ranking is a result of the lack of initiative on the part of the TV institution, not supplying the means for interaction.

The changing possibilities to participate in TV programmes can also be seen in regard to technologies (cf. Bennet, 2006; Enblom & Wombs, 2007; Lind, 2008; Lury, 2005). In 1992, new technology provides other means for child viewers to be visible on screen. For example, The Little News Billboard (Lilla Lö-psedeln)295 is a UR news programme targeting children and young people. The

295 It was broadcast from 1992 to 2011 (KB database).
programme follows the adult news genre in terms of intro, studio setting and the performance of the two news anchors. At the end of the programme, this model is abandoned and the viewers are invited to interact. This part is called “Open camera” and the viewers are asked to video record what they would like to share and/or discuss on TV, and post the videocassette to the programme.

“Open camera” has a short intro of its own stating the name on a background of monochromatic white noise, as if pointing out that this marks a break in the transmission (Image 82). This is followed by an image showing several children for a second, before the video clip of the day starts. This specific video clip portrays a teenage girl in a classroom setting, judging from the globe, the piles of books and the school benches visible in the background. The clip lasts for only about a minute, and during that time the girl complains about how boring the town of Uppsala is and how boring Swedes are in general (Image 83). Her recorded clip ends the programme, and the programme postal address is shown written on a package the shape and size of a videocassette (Image 84). The Little
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News Billboard is thus using what was, at the time, quite advanced technology to interact with its audience, which permitted viewers to be on screen.

When the postal address is read out loud by one of the anchors, she ensures that the programme will send the cassettes back when the broadcast has been made. In this way, the costs to viewers will be reduced, as they will get their cassettes back. By taking the trouble to return the cassettes, the programme’s eagerness to get in contact with viewers and to broadcast imagery portraying them is expressed quite explicitly. Recall that drawings are never sent back.\textsuperscript{297} The level of participation that viewers are allowed in this programme is hence quite extensive, and the initiative taken by the programme to make interaction happen is at a high level as well. Adults take the initiative, but by showing their film clips, children are given a chance to be both seen and heard without adult interference.

There are also other programmes that based extensive parts of their content on children’s participation.\textsuperscript{298} In 2007 the SVT science programme The Brain Office (Hjärnkontoret)\textsuperscript{299} encourages viewers to interact by posing questions to the show. These can be mailed, e-mailed or video recorded on the programme website, and new technology thereby again presents new means of interaction also in 2007. The addresses for interacting are displayed on the studio walls, which is almost traceable in Images 85 & 86. The name of the person posing a question, what s/he wonders and her/his location are sometimes shown as a banner at the bottom of the screen (Image 85), and if the question is filmed on the website, viewers are also seen in this programme.

Image 85: The Brain Office (Hjärnkontoret), produced by SVT, SVT1, 20071013, 10.15-10.40; Image 86: The Brain Office (Hjärnkontoret), SVT1, 20070404, 18.30-18.45.

\textsuperscript{297} Cf. Half past four, What’s that sound? (Halvfem: Vad är det som låter?) SVT1, 19801003, 16.30-17.00, discussed above, where it is stated that the programme will not send drawings back to children. No programme in the material offers to send drawings back to viewers.

\textsuperscript{298} E.g., Bullen, SVT1, 19920415, 19.10-20.00; Teckenkvarten. NU, UR, SVT1, 19921017, 15.45-16.00; 7-9, SVT1, 19921017, 19.00-21.00.

\textsuperscript{299} The Brain Office (Hjärnkontoret) is a SVT programme that was started in 1995 and is still running (Rydin, 2000; The SVT website: The SVT Website, Hjärnkontoret: http://www.svt.se/barnkanalen/hjarnkontoret/, Retrieved 130427).
The questions from viewers make up whole programme segments and the host, Frida, is devoted to discovering the answers. This takes various forms. For example, Frida explains how things work, she creates experiments to test things, and she asks experts to explain, solve and/or test the phenomena viewers seek explanations for.

In one episode, Frida enters the studio by saying: “Hi! Gustav wonders how many litres one pees out in a year”. This question is elaborated on throughout the whole program. A gigantic aquarium has been placed in the studio, with a colourful scale indicating litres, and yellow liquid is shown slowly filling it up (Image 86). The progress is shown from time to time during the programme. At the end of the programme, the tank is shown to contain 250 litres, which equals the amount that a child urinates during one year. This is also exemplified with more yellow liquid, indicating the amount an adult human and an elephant produce, respectively. Gustav’s question has thus not only been answered but also shown and scientifically visualized (cf. Crary, 1992; Lindgren, 2009; Lindgren, Sparrman & Eriksson Barajas, 2012; Sparrman, 2006; Sturken & Cartwright, 2009), and it has provided a storyline throughout the programme.

In this way, parts of this programme come forward as being driven by viewers’ interaction, and the questions posed by viewers are seriously investigated. The viewers become visible through the way in which their questions produce programme content, they are also visualized by having their names printed on screen and occasionally they are also seen when a web camera is used.

When viewers are allowed to participate in forming the programming content, their inputs come forward as valued, because they have contributed to something at the core of TV production, i.e. the content (cf. Ellis, 2007; see also Lotz, 2007). This programme content mostly takes the form of being adult initiated, as the programmes request viewers’ questions and participation. However, The Children’s News Show contradicts this practice, as the interaction in that programme is viewer initiated. The ideas that the programme content is built on also come forward as viewer initiated through the questions and requests viewers send to the programmes. All viewers’ initiatives, however, are executed by adults when made into programmes. The level of initiative thus differs between programmes, and between programmes and viewers as well. The programmes exemplified here also span all the studied years, showing that initiative and level of participation, which is quite high in all of these examples, change from programme to programme rather than over time. However, the initiative taken by the programmes to enable and encourage viewers to participate increases over the studied years.
But viewers are not only made visible by filling programme content with interaction, there are also other ways of being seen on TV. For example by competing for and winning prizes by interacting with TV.

**Competing to interact in TV for children**

Competition programmes and quizzes are programme genres that invite viewers to interact with TV (cf. Allen, 1992; Enblom & Wombs, 2007; Lind, 2008; Lury, 2005). In *TV for children*, these types of programmes offer possibilities to win prizes and sometimes also to become visible on screen. Competitions are present in the research material during all of the studied years. In the 1980 material, there are two programmes that children are explicitly invited to partake in.

In the Saturday family morning show, *Good morning, Sweden!* (*Gomorron Sverige*) there is a competition open to children. This is a family program, where most programme parts in the 2-hour-long broadcast target adults. However, in this particular episode a fairy-tale, a puppeteer, a Woody Woodpecker cartoon as well as a competition target children. The host Lennart Hyland, a well-known family entertainment TV host at the time, introduced all programme parts.
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300 The show was broadcast for two whole hours on Saturday mornings from the late 1970s to mid-1990s (cf. KB database).

301 *Good morning, Sweden!* (*Gomorron Sverige*), SVT1, 19800405, 08.00-10.00.
The children’s competition is introduced and presented by referring to the means for participating. Lennart starts by rolling two dice to determine the last two digits of the telephone number, which a viewer must have to be allowed to call in and partake in the contest. When the show’s phone number is displayed on screen, a text stating “For children only” is shown too (Image 87), and the host also adds that competitors should be no older than thirteen years of age. This age restriction also defines the category children in the programme. Children meeting these criteria need to figure out what is hiding behind an image of a keyhole as well (Image 88). When this image is shown, the text “For children only” is still displayed. What is hiding in the image is a children’s swimming award pin. If one has the right age, the right phone number, and knows what is hiding in the keyhole one can call the show. If a viewer manages to get through to the programme, s/he has to answer more questions to be able to win prizes.

The zooming camera carefully displays these prizes before the host starts asking the calling child viewer questions (Image 89). The prizes include a T-shirt with the name of the show, a board game, cinema tickets, a camera, an encyclopaedia and fishing gear. A viewer has to go through quite an extensive process before being given the chance to win. These items are portrayed by the host as desirable objects for a child viewer, but the process itself also produces these prizes as valuable. Seeing the calling child viewer on TV is not possible in 1980, but by showing the prizes and stating in writing on screen that this competition targets children, the show manages to visually address child viewers and to invite them to participate.

In the analysed programme, a 10-year-old girl with a southern Swedish accent has managed to get through to the programme. She is talkative and answers all the host’s questions about where she lives and what she will be doing during the summer. However, her answer to the first question is incorrect. During their whole conversation, Lennart talks to the girl from an adult patriarchal position.
He imitates her dialect in a slightly mocking way and he also makes fun of her answer. In this way, the competition is visually inviting child viewers to participate, but as the host lacks a child approach, this contradicts the visual address and comes to mostly target the adult audience, in that the host is seen laughing at the child. This participation cannot really be fit into Hart’s (1992) participation ladder, as the child has to take the initiative, be lucky and knowledgeable to just reach the show, and once there, the adult who has invited her mocks her.

The only way to be seen as a viewer in TV for children in the research material from 1980 is to partake in the quiz programme We fifth graders (Vi i femman). The public service institution has broadcast this quiz, first on radio and later on TV, since 1963 and it is still being broadcast. The questions range from current affairs and mathematics to languages and sports. There are several conditions to be met if one wishes to be seen in this programme. First, one must be a fifth grader. Second, one must be very knowledgeable, and third, one’s classmates must be knowledgeable too, as this programme is built on nationwide trials set in schools, where all fifth graders can partake in a knowledge-based test for entering this competition. About 100,000 fifth graders participated in the trials in 1980, according to The TV guide (Röster i Radio TV 1980, 15: 39).\(^{302}\) The school classes that performed best in these trials are invited to partake in a series of elimination contests, the final rounds of which are shown on TV. Each winning class selects three pupils to represent them, forming a team. The ones who do well get to be on TV, and if they manage to win, a lot of money is awarded to the school class.\(^{303}\)

\(^{302}\) The SR website states that nowadays about 70,000 fifth graders take part in the trials (http://sverigesradio.se/sida/artikel.aspx?programid=3033&artikel=1781906. Retrieved 130110).

\(^{303}\) The winning team gets a prize of 15,000 SEK to be used for a class trip. The runner up gets 12,500 SEK, 3rd 10,000 SEK, 4th 7,500 SEK and 5th 5,000 SEK. In 2013 the winner will receive 30,000 SEK, the second runner up 10,000 SEK and 3rd to 5th 5000 SEK. E-mail correspondence with Anna-Maria Nildén, the SVT project manager for the programme We fifth graders 20130122.
The first of the TV broadcast elimination contests in 1980 was aired on Good Friday in SVT2. Three teams were competing for a position in the semi-finals, and the programme was set in a jungle inspired studio (Image 91). The children shown on screen had not been on TV before and they all looked quite nervous. These children are shown as representatives for their respective school classes, and the name of the school is stated on the sign in front of them (Image 92). There is a large studio audience consisting of the classmates, teachers and parents of members of the competing teams (Image 90).

Becoming visible on TV in this way requires a great deal of initiative and determination. Everyone seen on TV through this programme has had to know the answers to numerous questions, and therefore participation requires having knowledge. In this way, participation is conditioned, and the children allowed to be seen in this programme are portrayed as the most knowledgeable ones. The competition is adult initiated, as are the questions and the judging. While this is something known to the viewers from the start, it does not diminish the fact that
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304 We fifth graders (Vi i femman), SVT2, 19800404, 16.15-17.00.
the possibilities for these children to use their time in the limelight for their own purposes are minimal.

In 1992 there are more programmes inviting their child viewers to interact via competitions than in 1980.\textsuperscript{305} To be seen on screen as a viewer is, however, quite rare, and \textit{The Little Sports Show (Lilla Sportspegeln)}\textsuperscript{306} is one of the few that offer this possibility. This programme is focused on sports for both children and young people. Viewers can interact by taking part in a competition, where drawing skills, knowledge on sports and bodily competence are needed. The competition starts with a question about a current sports event, and viewers are asked to draw the right answer and mail it to the programme. One of the drawings is selected as the winning piece, and the viewer who has made it is invited to the upcoming week’s show.

\begin{center}
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\end{center}

About 20 competitions invite child viewers to partake in 1992. E.g., 7-9, SVT1, 19921017, 19.00-21.00; \textit{(Good morning, Sweden) Go’morron Sverige}, SVT2, 19921017, 08.00-10.00; \textit{The Bun (Bullen)}, SVT1, 19921025, 18.45-19.15. In 2007 there are only about 15 competition programmes targeting child viewers, but several competitions exist within the same programmes, like in the \textit{Bobster} show, which will be discussed below.

\textsuperscript{305} About 20 competitions invite child viewers to partake in 1992. E.g., 7-9, SVT1, 19921017, 19.00-21.00; \textit{(Good morning, Sweden) Go’morron Sverige}, SVT2, 19921017, 08.00-10.00; \textit{The Bun (Bullen)}, SVT1, 19921025, 18.45-19.15. In 2007 there are only about 15 competition programmes targeting child viewers, but several competitions exist within the same programmes, like in the \textit{Bobster} show, which will be discussed below.

\textsuperscript{306} \textit{Little Sports Show (Lilla Sportspegeln)} has been broadcast by SVT since 1983 and still is (The KB database; SVT website: http://www.svt.se/barnkanalen/lilla-sportspegeln/ Retrieved 130427).
In this particular programme, the right answer to the question posed in the previous programme was canoe slalom, and numerous viewer-made drawings picturing this sport are shown in the programme (e.g., Image 93).\textsuperscript{307} So far, drawings have been discussed as visualizing and working as a means of interaction for young children who lack writing skills. The children visible in The Little Sports Show (Lilla Sportspegeln) are slightly older than those usually asked to post drawings to children’s programmes. This can be seen in that the shown drawings are more elaborated and contain more written text (cf. Aronsson 1997). David’s drawing has been selected as the winning piece, and David is present in the studio (Image 94). However, it is not only advanced writing and drawing skills that are needed to compete successfully in this programme. One also needs to have quite advanced knowledge about sports. In the programme, David is shown sitting opposite the adult host, Jan. He is wearing a programme T-shirt, which one gets if one is selected to be on the show. Jan is asking David more questions on sports (Image 94). For every correct answer, David gets a golf ball. After answering the questions, David uses the golf balls on the miniature golf course where he can win the prizes standing next to the course (Image 95). Here motor skills are needed as well if one is to perform on the golf course. David wins a backpack and a football, but misses the hole that would have won him the bike.

To be allowed to be seen and participate in this programme means performing and showing one’s competence in several ways. In this competition as well the initiative and the invitation are foremost adult-led practices, but the children who respond to this request, have the competences needed, and are selected to partake, are seen and are heard on TV.

\textsuperscript{307}Little Sports Show (Lilla Sportspegeln), SVT2, 19920907, 18.45-19.15.
There is another show in 1992 in which viewers and their drawings can be seen when partaking in a competition, however less explicitly so than in the Little Sports Show. The evening family show Open Sunday (Söndags öppet) was broadcast for a few hours early Sunday evenings in SVT1 from 1990 to 2003 (The KB database). It contains many different parts, such as artists singing, interviews with people, comedy pieces and competitions. Among the competitions some target viewers. These build on questions, riddles and/or tasks posed in one programme, with winners announced in the following programme.

In this programme several viewers win prizes for different contributions. When announcing the winners in one competition, the three adult programme hosts show a selection of drawings to the camera/audience. To take part in this competition, one is to draw the right answer and mail it to the show together with a photograph of oneself. The right answer this time was Roxette, a popular Swedish pop band at the time. Most of the selected winners, 10 out of 11, who knew this were children. That they are children becomes visible by the photo-

308 Open Sunday (Söndagsöppet). SVT1, 19920419, 17.30-18.00, 18.15-20.00.
graphs they have included in the correspondence (Image 97), but also through
the drawing techniques (Images 96-97). Some children have stated their ages on
the drawings as well. The way that the hosts present the winners, for example by
referring to their contributions as cute, also portray them as children. However,
one of the winners is an adult man. The camera zooms in on his drawing and the
photograph he has included, just like for all the other winners (Images 98-99).
Judging from the photograph he has posted, which only shows his behind (Im-
age 99), he seems to see this as a kind of joke. The hosts also treat it as a joke as
they smile and award him last as an additional eleventh winner. Even if neither
the adult man nor the hosts take his participation all that seriously, he wins the
same prize as the child winners: a watch with the programme’s logo on it. All
wining viewers are in this way visualized by their drawings and photos, but also
by the prizes they win. This is not unique. In the same programme another set of
winners is awarded, also here the main winners are children, and one additional-
ly awarded winner, approaching the competitions ironically, is an adult man.

By almost exclusively awarding children, *Open Sunday* makes clear what kind
of audience it imagines for these competitions. Also the child viewers seem to
feel addressed by these competitions, as there are so many participating children
to award. As has been shown, adults can contest that these competitions solely
address children. But to successfully challenge the reading of this address, their
contributions must be put forward as a tongue-in-cheek action to be sanctioned
by the programme. When taken seriously, competitions that involve submitting
drawings constitute a children’s TV practice. It could be argued that the humor-
ous aspect of these competitions is in line with the family programme genre. The
target group of the competitions is not defined. That children answer and are
awarded prizes works as a child address, and this in itself encourages other child
viewers to participate. That the children’s contributions are put forward as cute
by the hosts, illustrates that adult viewers are being addressed. Adults posting
drawings to the show also help to make the programme funny and thus help to
make the programme funny and thus to target the whole family. The most initia-
tive to enter these kinds of competitions and manage to be seen in them is re-
quired of adult competitors.

In these competition programmes, children respond to the invitation to interact
and occasionally also manage to be seen on screen. They also compete to win
prizes, and even if no target group is stated children accept the invitations to
compete. Nonetheless, participation in competitions is exclusively adult and
programme regulated. To compete is to follow the rules and to answer correctly.
The possibility for viewers to take their own initiative in the competition setting
is marginal. Hart (1992) argues that competitions have limited participatory pos-
sibilities, even if they are not manipulative while being clear about the rules. I
would argue that there are participatory aspects of competitions, both in terms of the initiative taken to partake in the first place, but foremost in terms of being seen and heard. In this respect the TV medium complicates the matter of participation, as it can provide the crucial aspect of being made visible.

Programme content as interaction

If we look at programmes that invite their viewers to interact, there are youth programmes in both 1992 and in 2007 that offer a selection of interactive practices to their viewers. A programme series that did this in 1992 was called PM.\textsuperscript{309} PM was aired three times a week, and contained music videos, reportages and drama series for young people, starring three young hosts (see also Forsman, 2000). Judging by the viewers who were allowed to participate in the programme, the target audience was teenagers.

\textbf{Image 100:} PM, SVT1, 19921009, 16.30-18.15. Image 101: PM, SVT2, 19921001, 16.30-18.15. Image 102-103: PM, SVT1, 19921009, 16.30-18.15. PM was produced by SVT.

\textsuperscript{309} PM was aired from the autumn of 1992 to the spring of 1995 (KB database).
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In this programme, viewers are addressed directly by the hosts, who look and talk into the camera, and they are asked to participate live in the programme as soon as the hosts are seen on screen. The means for interacting are displayed visually almost immediately, by showing the programme phone and fax number on screen during the first music video (Images 100-101). The programme offers viewers the chance to participate by taking part in competitions involving answering questions on popular music, requesting music videos, and sharing comments on things. This makes the programme very interactive and inviting as soon as the hosts and the studio are displayed, while the other more static programme parts are not.

As this programme is broadcast live, there are limited ways to allow the viewers to be seen on screen. Nonetheless, viewers whose requests for music videos were granted had their name and location shown in a by-line in the video (Image 103). Also the faxes sent to the programme by viewers could be shown, thus making their participation visible.

By inviting viewers to participate on numerous ways, this programme comes forward as being interested in what viewers have to contribute. The young people participating, however, are viewed as having more to gain from the programme than the programme has to gain from their participation. This becomes clear in two respects: viewers need to present good reasons for having their favourite video shown and the hosts are not overly friendly to the viewers who are interacting. Viewer participation is asked for in this programme, but it is still conditioned and the viewers who get to partake are selected. Adult initiation and control of participatory possibilities seems to be something that cannot be countered in television.

In 2007 there is a show similar to PM, where viewer participation is again the core of the programme. The show is called Bobster, and this is as close as one gets to a young people’s programme in 2007, equivalent to PM. However, this show targets a much younger audience than PM did. Judging by the viewers who are allowed to participate in Bobster, the show targets children slightly older than the Bolibompa audience. Bobster was broadcast just after Bolibompa on all weekdays in 2007.

310 This is done in all three PM programmes in the material (SVT1, 19920923; 19921001; 19921009 16.30-18.15).
311 The Bobster show was broadcast by SVT between 2006-2010 (KB database). It was also broadcast on the SVT digital Children’s Channel. It seems to be targeting an audience of about 10- to 13-year-olds judging by the unclear message in The AR, SVT 2007.
The *Bobster* programme is built up around the hosts and the Bobster studio, and it works as a frame for other programmes, in the same way as *Bolibompa* does. The activities going on in the studio in between the programme parts are almost always related to interacting with the viewers. For example, the host, Jakob, is wearing the show’s phone number on his T-shirt and asking viewers to call or text him (Image 104). With a mobile phone viewers can also participate in creating a list of music videos for a part of the *Bobster* programme called *Grand Prix*. Viewers vote for their favourite video and the videos that receive the most votes are shown longest on screen. In Image 105 the sign says: “Vote now!” and the phone number for sending text messages is stated together with the web address that can also be used for voting. All of these means of interacting are done live, and in this way viewers can influence the programme directly, like the *PM* viewers could in 1992. The *Bobster* viewers are also invited to be present in the studio. The hosts ask viewers to contact the programme if they want to show things that they are good at or something that they find interesting. Several children are shown doing tricks, sports, dancing and one boy has brought his camera collection (Image 106). He shows it to the host, Gonza, and to the studio audience of children, as well as to the viewers.312 If someone watching this wants to partake and show something on screen, it is possible to register on the programme website.

---

312 *Bobster*, SVT1, 20070409, 19.00-19.30.
The programme website also provides other opportunities to be seen in the programme. On the website two competitions are ongoing. One of them is called the Karaoke booth. Anyone with Internet access and a web camera can sing to the music of a few popular tunes at home and record it on the website. Madushani and Patricia, 12 years old from Eskilstuna, are singing Cara Mia, a song from the Swedish trials for the Eurovision song contest (Image 107). Their recorded clip has been selected to be placed on the webpage as well as shown in the TV programme. The names, location and ages of the children are stated on screen (Image 107). When the recordings are broadcast on the Bobster TV show, Jakob encourages viewers to go to the website and vote for their favourite singer. The winners are later shown again in the TV show and awarded prizes, often a box-set of some popular TV series (see, e.g., the boxes displayed on the desk next to Jakob in Image 104).

In this way, viewers are made visible on screen on several occasions in Bobster and they are asked to use many forms of technology to participate in the programme. For the programme concept, it is crucial that viewers watch the show on TV, as well as visit and contribute to the show on the website. These two places are linked together by the interaction of viewers and work alongside each other to make interaction possible. The viewers in Bobster come forward as competent users of technology, and as agentive in showing and telling. Interacting with the Bobster show is not something for a shy audience. The viewers here produce programme content, are artists and contribute to the show by letting themselves be judged by other viewers, but they are also judging, and voting to making the show happen. In this way, child viewers are allowed to participate in the programme and they are seen on screen. The level of participation could therefore be considered high, but all activities one can take part in are initiated by adults. Thus, the children are responding to adult requests even when they participate a great deal in this programme. Although these interactive practices offer little space for taking the initiative outside the given frames, they at least offer possibilities to be seen in the programmes and the hosts are friendly and seem genuinely interested in getting viewers to partake. However, influencing the programme’s content is possible only within the established frames.

Interaction as participation in TV for children

As shown in this chapter, being visualized and shown as a child viewer on screen in TV for children is not a straightforward issue in terms of child participation. To actually be allowed to appear on screen, one has to be invited and selected by the adult-led programming production. The child viewers who are vis-
ible in the programmes and the artefacts displayed (for example drawings) visually represent the viewers and serve to perform a child address. In this way, the ways in which viewers are allowed to participate and be seen on screen configures a visual image of what the imagined child audience looks like.

The kinds of technical access children had turned out to be a key issue that determined if and how they could interact and be seen in TV for children. During the time period from 1980 to 2007, the fax machine and the videocassette entered the arena and disappeared again, and what remains is the postal service, which has offered continuity over this 27-year-long period. Use of the postal system is constant, especially for young children communicating via drawings. For somewhat older children the new technologies of the time have all offered new means of interacting with and participating in programmes. This configures an imagined audience of technically competent actors who have access to modern technology, the knowledge to use them, or helpful adults that do. Still, far from every child viewer had access to, for example, video cameras and fax machines in 1992 and not everybody had mobile phones, web cameras and high-speed broadband in 2007. This configures an interactive participating audience affluent not only in terms of access to technology, but also financially so.

These ‘new’ technologies provide more possibilities to interact with viewers live and to represent child viewers on screen, even though child viewers have been visible during all the studies years. Yet, the videos present in the 1992 material provided a change by making it possible for viewers to make recordings of their own. Children interacting with TV are also more visible in 2007 than they were in previous time periods. This can be seen as something positive if it is linked to the argumentation in the beginning of this chapter, which claims that being seen is crucial to existing as a category with rights in society (Casper & Moore, 2009; Rogoff, 2002; Söderlind & Engvall, 2005). The analysis of the TV material also shows that being seen on screen can occasionally lead to children’s issues being heard, which would indicate that there is democratic potential in being seen on TV. Child viewers’ input to programming can also be seen as more valued over time, as viewer contributions more often make up substantial parts of the TV content, which is in line with the broadcasting licences. This can of course also be questioned, as being seen also means making oneself both public and vulnerable. However, on this point, the TV medium’s limitations can be seen as an asset. Because everything shown on screen has been edited and decided upon by adults in programme production, this might be considered a way for children to become visible without risking pranks and unfriendly comments, which becoming visible in online web-forums can sometimes produce (cf. Findahl, 2012; Rydin, 2010). But, as pointed out previously, this editing and ‘security’ also means restricting children’s initiatives and possibilities to be seen.
Drawing on Hart's (1992) participation ladder, interacting with TV renders children non-participants, as there is no way for children to make the decision to participate on screen without being judged and approved by several levels of adult decision-making. Another complexity when applying Hart’s (1992) notions of participation and initiative is that when no interaction is asked for by the TV programmes, the viewers managing to interact with TV anyway come forward as having great levels of participatory initiative. This means that if the TV institution lacks interactive invitations and initiative, which limits the possibilities for most child viewers to interact with the TV institution, this is what results in high scoring on Hart’s (1992) ladder. I would argue that, in terms of TV and child viewer participation, the possibilities the TV institution offers for children to be seen on TV must also be considered as an important part of participation if Hart’s (1992) ladder is also to be useful in a discussion of children’s participation in the TV medium. Thus, invitations may limit the initial initiative on the part of children, but they also enable more viewers to interact without having to discover for themselves how to get in contact with the TV institution.

In line with this, the TV medium must be viewed as incapable of engaging in direct unplanned viewer participation (cf. Allen, 1992; Lind, 2008; Lury, 2005; Örnebring; 2001). When TV is seen as only capable of inviting viewers to partake on TV’s own terms, then what TV can contribute can be studied. What can be traced over the time period under study is that TV for children successively offers more means that allow viewers to interact with and be seen on TV. This is in line with the broadcasting contracts for SVT and UR in 2007. But it must also be recognized that viewers have been invited to interact and participate in TV for children in all the studied years, indicating that TV-viewer interactivity has been an important matter for the TV institution for a long time, and seemingly also for viewers.

What is made visible on screen, such as child viewers, child activities and artefacts related to children make up TV for children’s visual address. The imagined audience configured by this visualization produces the category children as very active. The risk discourse, with its fears of children being passivized by media, is not in any way reproduced visually in TV for children. The imagined child audience comes forward as striving to participate and be seen in TV during all the studied years.

The next chapter will conclude the thesis by discussing the imagined child audience in public service TV for children.
Chapter 7
Concluding discussion

The aim of this thesis has been to study how, in public service TV, the child audience is configured through policy and TV programming targeting children. Underlying this aim is the idea that the TV institution produces and reproduces notions of children, and thereby imagining its child audience. This makes it important to study television, because the ways in which the TV institution imagines its child audience have implication for how children are positioned and viewed in society at large.

In previous research several diverse notions of children as an audience have been brought forward, which raises questions about how the child TV audience can be understood. In public service research, it has been argued that, before the abolishment of the broadcasting monopoly, the adult TV audience was treated as an incompetent child by the public service institution and that this audience was not treated as having come of age until the broadcasting market was commercialized (e.g., Ang, 1991; Edin, 2000; Hartley, 1987). In child media research, it has been argued that, over time, children have come to be represented as increasingly competent in television and film targeting them (e.g., Janson, 2007: 147-148; Rydin, 2000: 348). In addition to this, childhood researchers have argued that children as a category are increasingly perceived as having participatory rights in society, a view linked to the ratification of the UN Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC) (e.g., Sandin & Halldén, 2003). However, when TV and children are discussed in the public debate, these discussions draw mostly on notions of risk. This broad complexity of contradicting notions on the research arena as well as on the public arena raises the question of how the public service broadcasting institution imagines its child audience.

To investigate this question, research material has been analysed that combines broadcasting policy, which regulates the Swedish Television Broadcasting Company (SVT) and Educational Broadcasting Company (UR), and TV programming for children broadcast by these companies. This broad focus has enabled investigation of how the public service TV institution as a whole imagines the child audience. In order to understand the relationship between children and television the concept of TV for children has been established, which means that
all public service programmes targeting children up to 18 years of age have been studied. Thus, not only specific programmes or genres have formed the basis for this investigation, but all programmes that have been put forward as targeting children in one way or another in public service TV have been included in the research material. This is made possible by the Swedish National Library’s large collection of TV material, which is accessible to researchers. The idea of *TV for children* has enabled exploration of broad themes in a diverse and large programme material. This has made it possible to analyse contradictions and co-existing notions of children and child TV viewers, thus making the discussion of change and continuity multifaceted and the complexity of the imagined child audience visible.

The research material analysed here comprises broadcasting policy, i.e. broadcasting acts, broadcasting licences and annual reports, and 491 TV programmes for children from 1980, 1992 and 2007. Together these years represent periods before, during and after abolishment of the Swedish public service broadcasting monopoly. The TV programmes in the material were selected from 42 days of broadcasts and make up 179 hours in total. This sample shows how vast the public service TV broadcasts for children are.

In the analysis, the political level establishes and shapes the possibilities for the broadcasting institution to imagine a child audience, and this have motivated the analysis of broadcasting policy. TV programming is the main practice that the public service TV institution engages in. Therefore, the focus on content, talk and visuality as modes of addressing the child audience has made it possible to study in detail how the imagined child audience is configured in the TV programming by the public service TV institution.

The analysis of policy focuses on how the audience and the category ‘children’ are articulated in these texts. It shows that, in the broadcasting legislation, children have only gradually entered into the formulations of the texts, and then foremost as a category that must be protected from the risks associated with messages of consumption. Only later in the research period does the legislation explicitly state that children are entitled to TV programmes. The category ‘children’, however, is mentioned in the broadcasting companies’ annual reports during all the studied years. The articulated notions of children in these texts are diverse and they have remained so over the studied years. This makes clear that the public service TV companies have always viewed children as an integrated part of the group they serve. This is also highlighted by the fact that there have been broadcasts for children in Sweden since 1956.

The analysis of TV content focuses on what the programmes contain and how that content address the child audience. Due to the vast number of programmes
containing nature in the research material, this content was chosen as an example for analysis. A study of the nature content shows that children are viewed as scared, in need of help, in need of teaching but also knowledgeable, capable as well as agentive and that these representations co-exist over time. There are also changes, but these become visible when we focus on the way in which the content is narrated. For example, in the 2007 material, the way stories are told about the environment makes it possible to portray children as individual agents in relation to this issue, a position that was not open to children to the same extent during the other two studied time periods. The analysis thus shows that it is the way of narrating the different strands of the nature content that has changed, which in turn creates opportunities to portray children differently.

Analysis of the nature content also reveals that children are constantly represented outdoors and as showing an interest in nature. By virtue of being targeted by this content, the child TV audience is imagined as one that only occasionally sits indoors in front of the TV; most often children in the audience are just like the children shown on screen – outdoors activating themselves by saving animals, the environment or the like. It is clear that this audience is not to be viewed as being consumed but as being activated by televised nature content.

In the analysis of how TV addresses the child audience verbally, the focus is on the ways in which children are allowed to talk to other children and adults, both on and off screen. The specific speech genre of the pretend, direct, face-to-face pedagogical voice is taken as an example. The pretend part of this speech genre simulates that the addressers on screen can in fact see, hear and even smell the viewers at home, which in turn points to how the audience of these programmes is imagined. The analysis shows that characters, both child and adult, are portrayed on screen using different pedagogical voices, and that the ways in which they are permitted to talk to each other establish the hierarchy between children and adults on screen and between the on-screen addressers and the off-screen audience. When the children are portrayed using a pedagogical voice, this does not automatically mean that the voice and/or the learning become more democratic. Instead the most agentive children are also the most authoritarian, depicted just like moralizing adults. The imagined child audience being talked to by the addressers on screen are also almost exclusively placed farthest down in the pecking order, in that they are told what to do by basically everyone on screen. In this way, the fact that children are seen and/or heard does not make the representation of this category liberating per se. The analysis also shows that learning from and being activated by TV are expected of the imagined audience, and this again differs considerably from the notion of passive children in front of the TV set.
The analysis of how the child audience is addressed visually in TV for children focuses on the way in which child viewers are made visible on screen. It shows that they have been interacting with the TV institution during the whole research period, and that opportunities for viewers to be seen on screen have increased. This can be related both to implementation of legislative demands and to the use of new technology, which makes it easier for viewers to participate in TV programmes. Addressing the imagined child audience visually by showing viewers on screen also gives rise to notions of active, interacting, knowledgeable children, which becomes the image of the audience that the TV institution imagines and desires. The analysis also makes it clear that the possibilities of being seen and participating in TV are decided by adults and by the limitations of the TV medium. It is thus up to this institution to decide whether or not the participation offered will pave the way for children to be seen as social actors in society.

Previous research has shown how, over time, children have been portrayed as increasingly competent in Swedish cultural productions targeting them, such as in film and TV (e.g., Janson, 2007; Rydin, 2000). Also in TV for children, the category ‘children’ is portrayed as competent but that is only one of the ways in which it is portrayed, and the TV institution has viewed children as competent during all the studied time periods. The detailed analysis shows how the public service institution draws on notions of, for example, competencies, entertainment, learning, age, participation, and specific child activities when imagining its child audience. Thus, conducting in-depth analyses of diverse material results in a more heterogeneous notion of the category ‘children’ portrayed in television. Also the imagined audience is configured as multifaceted, rather than just as something that transforms linearly over time.

What can also be seen through in-depth analysis of TV programmes for children is that the child audience is not differentiated in terms of gender or ethnicity to any great extent. For example, in TV for children programmes are rarely made in pink or blue colour schemes, and there are no indications that programmes are especially targeting girls or boys. Children of different sexes are also shown engaged in a multitude of different practices, and children of diverse ethnicities are portrayed in the programming, most often without these aspects being an outspoken issue. The imagined child audience is thus diverse in terms of gender and ethnicity in TV for children, and this has been the case during all of the studied time periods. These tendencies have been traced in the present analysis, but require further investigation in the future.

313 The programmes that focus on differences are foremost those in minority languages that differentiate their imagined audiences depending on language skills, and some of the programmes portraying the life of children in countries other than Sweden.
In public service TV programmes, education and learning are linked to the category ‘children’, something that remains quite stable over the studied years. What does change, though, is that some factual programmes are given a fictional and entertaining frame in the more recent material. In terms of entertainment, there are difficulties in defining these programmes. For example, the number of animated programmes increases over the years, which could support the notion that entertainment has become more common. However, when analysed in detail, it turns out that programmes not always focus more on entertainment just because they are animated. In fact, most programmes, especially for the youngest child audience, contain educational elements even if they are classified by the broadcasters as entertainment. Entertainment and education are also issues related to age in *TV for children*: When young people are targeted, entertainment programmes with an educational twist are more rare.

In terms of age, the present study views children as people between 0 and 18 years, in line with the *UNCRC*. This wide categorization makes several issues visible. When studied, age comes forward as an important categorization for both the legislator and the TV institution when defining children as a category. Also when selecting programmes for the study, it turned out that the majority of programmes presenting target groups that fell within the age span 0-18 years were programmes targeting the youngest child audience. Public service broadcasters have long had difficulties reaching young people, but more importantly, the public service TV institution has only occasionally, if ever, produced regular programming for this audience group to the same extent that it has done for younger children (cf. *AR*, SVT, 1992; 2007; Forsman, 2000; Rydin, 2000). Regardless of the demand for producing quality programming for both children and young people made in the broadcasting licence (cf. *BL SVT*, 2007; *BL UR*, 2007), young people are a neglected audience group, and SVT produces very few programmes for this group at all, especially in 2007 as the material selections shows (see also, *AR*, SVT, 2007). UR does more for this group, because its broadcasts are linked to the schooling system.

When studying the configuration of a child audience in public service TV, it becomes clear that the public service TV also configures itself as an institution in this process. When broadcasting for children, this institution must negotiate the discursive notion that children are passive receivers who may be harmed by TV, because if the TV institution does not do so, its legitimacy may be called into question. However, as pointed out above, the TV institution does not manage to imagine an audience of young people and that compromises the institution’s legitimacy as one that works in servicing the public. The young audience has been reported to turn to several other broadcasters and sources, for both information and entertainment, over the studied years (cf. *AR*, SR 1980; *AR*, SVT, 1992; *AR*,...
SVT 2007). Following abolishment of the broadcasting monopoly more options also opened up for this audience.

For young children, however, it is questionable whether abolishment of the public service broadcasting monopoly has really played any major role. SVT still reaches most young children by far, and commercial broadcasters cannot compete when it comes to the youngest child viewers (MMS, 2012; AR, SVT, 2012). The fact that Swedish broadcasting legislation prohibits commercials that target children could render the child audience uninteresting for the commercial broadcasting market. In any case, this audience has not attracted the commercial broadcasters’ attention on the Swedish media market.

So what does studying the configuration of an imagined child audience in public service TV for children say about what it means to be a child in a mediated society? In late 2007, when the selection of material for this study stops, TV for children moved into a new paradigm as all viewers were expected to be able to receive digital transmission and thus also to be able to see the Children’s Channel. The Children’s Channel is now the place where everything that is broadcast for children is supposed to be located. This creates a place for children only, which means that the channel is thought to be safe for child viewers, on the one hand, but this also results in exclusion, on the other. First, this gives young people even less space because it takes away transition slots in the scheduling. Slots in between the children’s programmes and the programming targeting an adult audience that before allowed for targeting young people no longer exist. However, the Children’s Channel also isolates the child audience to this channel (cf. Janson, 2013). As has been shown in this study, programmes for children previously coexisted in the main TV channels, which meant that children were targeted by different programmes and included in other audience groups.

Now children exist in a mediated universe of their own, which has consequences for both visibility and participation. If children are addressed, seen and allowed to participate in confined spaces only, the democratic benefits for this category are reduced, because they are only made visible to the audience that their representation configures. If the paths of the child audience and other audience groups never cross, how children are represented in this part of society becomes an issue for a limited group of people only – those who at the moment are defined as belonging to the category ‘children’, and the adults who have the power over these representations. This can also be linked to the current risk discourse of children and TV. In this confined space, children are supposed to be safe from unsuitable TV content, but the question is whether or not this isolation may put children at risk in a new way, by excluding them from the public debate. The decision to place all programmes for a young child audience in a separate channel seems to follow commercialized media market logic. In line with this, the
public service broadcasting institution is adjusting its views of the child audience to a commercialized norm, and in doing so it is making the borders between children and the rest of the audience difficult to cross.

This investigation of TV for children shows the consequences TV programming and broadcasting policy have for notions of the targeted audience. Studying these notions also highlights that children in TV for children, as well as in broadcasting policy and in the surrounding society, are the products of adult imaginations. Thus, identifying with the address of TV for children means identifying with discursive adult views on what children are supposed to be: active, close to nature and entertained by learning. However, the studied time period also shows that public service TV allowed for a complex and nuanced way of addressing the child audience. This has been true of all the studied years and suggests that the TV institution takes, and has taken, a genuine interest in its child audience. In this way, public service television plays an important role when it comes to letting children participate and making them visible in the mediated society, as no other broadcaster comes close to making the diversity of TV for children a reality. I would argue that it is therefore important that the public service broadcasters do not adjust their notions of the child audience to a commercial norm, as that would most likely diminish the ways in which the child TV audience are addressed.
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