AARHUS UNIVERSITY

Coversheet

This is the accepted manuscript (post-print version) of the article.

Contentwise, the accepted manuscript version is identical to the final published version, but there may be differences in typography and layout.

How to cite this publication

Please cite the final published version:

Michelsen, M., & Krogh, M. (2017). Music, radio, and mediatization. *Media, Culture & Society*, 39(4), 520-535. DOI: 10.1177/0163443716648494

Publication metadata

Title:	Music, radio, and mediatization
Author(s):	Morten Michelsen & Mads Krogh
Journal:	Media, Culture & Society
DOI/Link:	https://doi.org/10.1177/0163443716648494
Document version:	Accepted manuscript (post-print)

General Rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognize and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

If the document is published under a Creative Commons license, this applies instead of the general rights.

Music, Radio, and Mediatization

Morten Michelsen, University of Copenhagen

Mads Krogh, University of Aarhus

Abstract:

Mediatization has become a key concept for understanding the relations between media and other cultural and social fields. Contributing to the discussions related to the concept of mediatization this article discusses how practices of radio and music(al life) influence each other. We follow Deacon's and Stanyer's advice to supplement the concept of mediatization with 'a series of additional concepts at lower levels of abstraction' (2014: 1040), and suggest, in this respect, the notion of heterogeneous *milieus of music-radio*. Hereby we turn away from the all-encompassing perspectives related to the concept of mediatization where media as such seems to be ascribed agency. Instead, we consider historical accounts of music radio in order to address the complex non-linearity of concrete processes of mediatization as they take place in the multiple meetings between a decentred notion of radio and musical life.

Consider two situations: First, at 8 pm a family sits in their comfortable chairs listening to their radio set. The light has been lowered just like the Danish Broadcasting Corporation recommends when listening. The children have learned to remain silent during the concert broadcast. They listen to a symphonic concert broadcast in the mid-1930s via a huge, modern, walnut-cased radio placed in their carpeted living room. The concert is part of a series of Thursday evening concerts broadcast since 1933, and it reminds the parents of their youth when they attended the subscription concerts of the Philharmonic Society. Even though many of the live concert organisations have closed down by now, it has in many ways become much easier to listen to good music: They do not have to leave their house, the radio license is much cheaper than the subscription (and records), and they do not have to pay for a baby sitter. As an extra, they think that the quality of orchestral playing has improved. If they do not like the music played they can turn to foreign stations several of which broadcast similar concerts at this hour. After

the concert the children go to bed, and mom and dad may dance a few dances accompanied by the late night dance music transmission from a posh restaurant.

Second, a present day creative labourer, immersed in her MacBook, ‘ear plugged’ into a personalized flow of internet radio – *Rdio* or *Last.fm* – detached from her immediate surroundings while simultaneously connected to social media friends and to past listening experiences by way of algorithms configuring her current playlist. The internet radio accompanies her after hours work which she needs to hand in next morning, and the soft music, the soft light, and the softness of the huge sofa all contribute to her favourite work atmosphere and a sense of being at ease. The music contrasts with her preferred social music, the EDM of the club and the occasional opera performances. In recent years it has become much easier to find radio-based music to suit the large variety of moods and situations she passes through during the day. The music is partly self-curated which she prefers to old school radio hosts curating it for her. And it is free – apart from the media licence fee she has to pay every six months.

These are two situations of everyday radio listening, though what counts as radio, as listening, and as a listening situation has changed: from broadcast to personalized radio, from live transmission to programmed flow, from collective to individual and from attentive to distracted listening. Concurrently, music now appears as a thoroughly media saturated, formatted flow of radio edits, acting as soundtrack to work or leisure, as a means for concentration on other matters, energy or relaxation. What happened in between the two situations is an interrelated development in media and musical life, which may be described as a process of mediatization – in so far as media and in particular radio is regarded as the driving force.

In this article we will ask in what ways we may analyse how practices of radio and music(al life) have influenced and influence each other in intricate ways. We conduct this investigation on the basis of mediatization theories, especially as suggested by Andreas Hepp (2013) on the one hand and Stig Hjarvard (2013) on the other. In addition, we follow Deacon’s and Stanyer’s advice to supplement the concept of mediatization with ‘a series of additional concepts at lower levels of abstraction’ (2014: 1040), and suggest, in this respect, the notion of heterogeneous milieus of music-radio. With this notion we wish to strengthen the awareness of non-linearity and contingency within theories of mediatization as an aspect of media saturated practices. We also wish to counter a tendency towards explanations of media use from a macro-level of (musico-)social analysis and we elaborate in particular on the heterogeneity inherent in the notion of

media claimed by mediatization theories and, hence, the relation between media and other areas of social practice. As a further perspective we indicate how understandings of mediation as a macro-structuring ‘meta-process’ may be maintained without a presupposition of linearity or clear-cut notions of media and their effects.

We refer to a few examples taken from a Danish context but consider them transferrable to music-radio milieus in most European countries. Despite its many concrete differences musical cultures in Europe were and are organized along the same basic lines and values. This goes for media as well as the basic structure with public service broadcasting corporations at its historical center and the increasing challenges from commercial media especially since the 1980s are common to most European countries (see Poulsen 1997 and Jauert 2003 for accounts of radio’s development in the Danish context).

Definitions of mediatization

Today, many consider mediatization not only a term but an emergent paradigm within media studies (Hepp et al. 2015: 315). This development has been described by many (for example Hjarvard 2008: 106-12, Hepp 2013: 29-54). Couldry and Hepp distinguish between two main traditions, an institutionalist and a social-constructivist. The first tradition understands media as an independent institution governed by its own rules – ‘[m]ediatization here refers to the adaption of different social fields or systems (for example, politics or religion) to these institutionalized rules’. In the second tradition ‘[m]ediatization [...] refers to the process of a communicative construction of socio cultural reality and analyses the status of various media within that process [...]’ (Couldry and Hepp 2013: 196).

Stig Hjarvard, one of the most important proponents of the institutionalist tradition, has proposed an overarching media-sociological theory of media’s influence on society and culture. A central point in this theory is his definition of mediatization:

Mediatization is to be considered a double-sided process of high modernity in which the media on the one hand emerge as an independent institution with a logic of its own that other social institutions have to accommodate to. On the other hand, media simultaneously become an integrated part of other institutions like politics, work,

family, and religion as more and more of these institutional activities are performed through both interactive and mass media. (Hjarvard 2008: 113)

This definition places the objects of analysis – the media institution and the social institutions – at a macro level. This leads to interesting analyses of the mediatization of several cultural fields including toys, religion, and language (Hjarvard 2013) and Hjarvard does to a certain extent open up for analyses on a meso level to supplement his macro analyses, while micro levels of analysis are left out. A reason for this might be that the media is just the media *in toto*. Singular media institutions may be used as examples, but Hjarvard always returns to the general processes, to the macro level. We think it is necessary to develop analytical strategies at lower levels of abstraction as well in order to develop a more detailed understanding of the mediatization processes as they unfold. This will demonstrate the heterogeneity of the processes and the unclear borders among media and between non-media and media. Because of his favouring of the macro level Hjarvard's detailed theory of mediatization needs to be supplemented in this respect.

The broader and less specific definitions proposed by the so-called social-constructivists offer a better framework for our focus on practices. For example, Couldry and Hepp argue that the basic question in mediatization-related research is that of consequences (some would say the effects) of media. An example would be the consequences of 'media's embedding in everyday life' (Couldry and Hepp 2013: 195). They avoid building a comprehensive theory. Instead they suggest a very basic definition which catches well the concept's comparative nature by stressing the comparison between two 'systems' or fields:

[...] mediatization is a concept used to analyze critically the interrelation between changes in media and communications on the one hand, and changes in culture and society on the other. (Couldry and Hepp 2013: 197; see also Hepp 2013: 38 for a similar formulation)

Adding to this, Friedrich Krotz regards mediatization as a meta-process. To him the concept grasps long-lasting, broadly based cultural changes along the lines of other meta-processual concepts like globalisation, individualisation, and commercialisation (Krotz 2009: 24-25). In many instances such meta-processes intermingle with mediatization

processes. Taking the idea of comparison and the idea of generality Hepp suggests that the concept remains open:

[...] the concept of mediatization does not involve a finished theory of media transformation, but it is more open, opening a particular panorama, a particular all-encompassing vision of the treatment of the reciprocal relationship between media-communicative change and socio-cultural change. (Hepp 2013: 46)

To Krotz formalized definitions stand in the way of such openings. Instead, mediatization must always be understood in relation to historical, social and cultural contexts in which it takes place, '[t]here are quite possibly also specific processes of mediatization that only apply to individual population groups [...]' (Krotz 2007: 39 quoted in Hepp 2013: 51). Within this intentionally vague framework there is room for researching specific media's consequences for other socio-cultural fields.

Questions of power, historiography and discrimination

These definitions and the theoretical and analytical texts related to them avoid addressing a series of problematics which we think are necessary to develop the field of mediatization studies further, especially those problematics which could lead to increased analytic activity in and between specific fields.

The first series of problematics we would like to point to concerns the relations between two fields set up for comparison in most studies. None of the definitions addresses directly the two-way, even if asymmetrical, distribution of power between the analytical components in question. When reading texts on mediatization it seems that most researchers presuppose that the stronger media/communication component dominates the other, weaker component in some way or another. This is integral to Hjarvard's definition, while Hepp, Krotz, and Couldry seem to ignore questions of power by talking about relations instead. In other places the powerfulness of media are stressed, for example when Hepp remarks that '[mediatization] will make it possible to deal with the various issues of [media] omnipresence, moulding, constitution of reality and the role of technology [...]' (2013: 29). It would be important to ask if the weaker part influences the stronger despite its weakness and maybe even ask if it makes sense to

presuppose that the weak part is indeed the weak part. This question arises because, despite the uneven power balance between the two, the relations between the parts are reciprocal in some way and because, even though the balance is uneven, it has not tipped completely in favour of one. One might also consider if there are concrete situations where it would in fact be more precise to speak of relations (i.e., a relation where the power balance is *not* decided on from the analytical beginning). Stewart Hoover even suggests that meetings between media and other fields could result in ‘something new and different [...] being formed and shaped through this interaction’ (2009: 127). Here, the influence is a two-way relation, and maybe it is even relevant to talk about integration instead of influence. In such integrations the first part is not necessarily placed as purely instrumental to the changing relations of the other, and in analysis the integrations might be extremely hard to disentangle – to state what elements ‘originally’ belonged to what fields.

A second set of problematics concerns the chronological dimension of mediatization studies. Nearly everybody acknowledge the processual nature of mediatization thus accepting that a historical perspective is necessary. Some claim that these historical processes began almost at the dawn of early modern times (Hepp 2013: 52) while others tend to explain it as a recent phenomenon (Hjarvard 2008: 105). No matter when mediatization processes began they beg the question, what was before and how did supposedly non-mediatized cultures function? Answers to such questions are important in order to emphasize the changes. Hjarvard proposes a model based on the changing institutional character of media (2008: 120), but such analyses are not that common. The question of what comes after mediatization processes is relevant as well. What happens when mediatization processes stop? Sooner or later technological or institutional developments become conventionalized and thus not active as motors for change. In a brief article Deacon and Stanyer present an important critique of the concept based on the observation that mediatization is used in very different situations. Their aim is not to abolish the term but to qualify it and only use it when necessary, and they raise the question, how well does mediatization research actually capture the changes that the concept was intended to grasp. They continue our historical line of thought and call for a more ‘systematic research of historical change’, ‘a more precise historiography of mediatization’ and temporal comparison (2014: 1037). This could lead to acceptance that mediatization is not necessarily a linear process, but one which has its rushes and halts.

And it could lead to realizing that mediatization processes might be historically continuous as well.

Continuing Deacon and Stanier's line of thought one could ask what happens when an 'old' medium like radio is influenced by internet-based media and must adapt its practices to web 2.0 and individualized listening? Are radio and the internet two distinct processes or just the media? A related question concerns two simultaneous mediatization processes, for example radio and recording. Many listeners may perceive them as one and in many ways they are related (recordings constitute much of radio's content), and in some ways they are not (recording as the 'sculpturing' of sound versus radio as talk between music). This leads to the question if a recording in a radio program is an example of double mediatization? Or, if cultures had been through one mediatizing process related to a specific medium, how did this culture function in relation to later processes (from printed to recorded music, mass-circulated print media in relation to electronic media)?

Deacon and Stanier raise a third set of problematics concerning the concept's discriminatory power (2014: 1039), i.e., that mediatization should not be a catch-all term and that the definitions should be sufficiently sharp to be able to exclude phenomena which do not belong under the mediatization umbrella. They also advise to let mediatization remain a macro level concept and instead 'develop a series of additional concepts at lower levels of abstraction' (2014: 1040) in order to make each concept clearer. Another argument is that media as such seem to play an active part in the cultural changes, but the concept becomes anthropomorphised when media act in such and such ways 'as causal historical agents' (2014: 1034). When positing media as causal agents researchers tend to forget other actors which might contribute to the changes, for example national media policies or advertising industries. Last is the question of non-mediatization. In such meta-processes some areas might be left relatively untouched by media. For example, the media still draw upon musical content which has not necessarily become mediatized (yet), and this goes for music-social practices as well.

These problematics and questions will be used to propose a theoretical perspective for the cultural practices taking place as part of a general mediatization process. We would like to reserve mediatization for general media changes and suggest the notion of heterogeneous milieus of music-radio to grasp the meetings and negotiations between music(al life) and radio.

Practice and mediation

So far we have stressed those parts of mediatization theory that open up towards the analysis of collections of cultural practices as heterogeneous and non-linear. We will qualify this below. The interdependency of radio and music(al life) plays out in everyday decisions and actions concerning what you play and how you listen. Not only because radio is the medium of everyday music per excellence (Frith 2012) and constitute modern listeners' sense of 'dailiness' (Scannell 1996), but also because, disregarding whether (or how) mediatization may be regarded as a general phenomenon transcending individual situations of production or listening, processes of mediatization would still have to be present within such situations.

Explaining macro-phenomena by reference to local, situated practices is in line with a range of practice-theories (cf. Schatzki et al. 2001), some of which are implicit in the theories of mediatization already mentioned. Thus, when Hjarvard presents mediatization as an institutional phenomenon (2008) by reference to Antony Giddens' structuration theory, this implies an emphasis on the structuring role of practice (Giddens 1984: 2). Likewise, when Couldry presents mediatization as distributing a sort of meta-capital (2014: 59-60) he implicitly invokes the Bourdieuan notion of practice on which field analysis rests – a 'praxeology' which:

[...] presupposes a break with the objectivist form of knowledge, that is, it presupposes investigation into the conditions of possibility and, consequently, into the limits of the objectivistic viewpoint which grasps practices from the outside as a *fait accompli*, rather than construct their generative principle by placing itself inside the process of their accomplishment. (Bourdieu 1973: 53-54)

In this line of thinking practices are understood as recurrent instances of structuration, and the notion of mediation may denominate the manifestation of certain technological infrastructures facilitating 'the concrete act of communication by means of a medium in a specific social context' (Hjarvard 2008: 14). However, when it comes to the analysis of specific situations and even when concerned with the role(s) of specific technologies it may be difficult to distinguish what is means and what is deployments of these, i.e. what are structural conditions and what are instances of agency.

Couldry points this out when talking about mediation as a non-linear process: ‘a process of environmental transformation which in turn transforms the conditions under which any future media can be produced and understood’ (2008: 8). And we suggest, as a consequence, that mediation be treated on par with other processes *in situ* which transport, transform and produce difference. In this respect mediation illustrates a sort of (non-human) media agency and a contribution to practices which appear as distributed rather than (merely) structuring or structured. This would also be in line with the inspirations from actor-network theory that Couldry suggests in his presentation of a practice theoretical paradigm for media studies (2004: 128).

As a consequence media and their effects should not be delimited in advance of examination. This would be to obey the ‘objectivistic viewpoint’ renounced by Bourdieu, and this concerns not only media (in a traditional sense) but any entity occurring in practice. Music may, thus, be considered: ‘[a] multiply-mediated, immaterial and material, fluid quasi-object, in which subjects and objects collide and intermingle. It favours associations or assemblages between musicians and instruments, composers and scores, listeners and sound systems’ (Born 2005: 7). And in a similar vein, Kate Lacey calls for radio studies to radically decentre radio – to refuse ‘to treat radio as a discrete object, but to accommodate its porous and shifting boundaries, be that in terms of its technologies, its institutions, its texts or its listeners’ (Lacey 2008: 22-23). Likewise, Andrew Dubber states that:

[r]adio consists of shows, stations, schedules, studios, managers, sales reps, presenters, producers and technicians. It includes and connects with political economies, legislation, a broad range of technologies, the physical properties of radiation in the electromagnetic spectrum (or our ability to harness those waveforms), promotional cultures, music industry integration, local and regional as well as national characteristics and manifestations, brands, celebrities and real people’s lives (audiences, interviewees and radio workers alike) and – importantly – other media. It is different in different places, at different times, and within different contexts. More importantly, it is often different from one instance to another, even within the precise same geographic locale, legal framework, political climate and period in history. (2014: 13)

Such decentred, heterogeneous understandings of music and radio were already hinted at in the introduction's imagined listening situations. Importantly, the consequence of this multiply-mediated character of both radio and music (not to mention institutions of media and musical life such as national broadcasting corporations) is, however, that it becomes veritably impossible to distinguish which of the two is being determined and which is determining. That is, if music has been mediatized by radio (or vice versa) in the development leading from the first situation to the second. This harks back to the critique of the notion of media *in toto* implicit in mediatization theory, while it is consistent with the idea of practice as a distributed phenomenon.

Milieus of music-radio

In order to substantiate this idea further we look to assemblage theory. According to Gilles Deleuze an assemblage is a multiplicity 'which is made up of [...] heterogeneous terms and which establishes liaisons, relations between them, across ages, sexes and reigns – different natures' (Deleuze and Parnet 2002: 69). Considering radio through this conceptual lens means to embrace the heterogeneity of the range of factors implicit in the phenomenon and to regard (effects of) radio as (the preliminary result of) a co-functioning, i.e. an emergent effect of assemblage, which can never be fully explained by reference to its elements respectively. Furthermore, assemblages hold an ever-present potential for adaption, translation, de- and re-territorialization etc. and the phenomenon of radio should thus be regarded as contingent – which does not, however, prevent a relative closure or stability.

Deleuze and Guattari develop the notion of assemblage in a context of territories and processes of de- and re-territorialization. Territories emerge when a component in a milieu becomes expressive, i.e. with the emergence of qualities (1987: 314). Milieus are marked by rhythm, i.e. a state of process and a preliminary order, which may be assembled into refrains. Thus, when for instance birds sing they sound a refrain in a milieu assembling their territory and, in turn, their own identity as territorial creatures (1987: 312). Similarly, in a musical context, the refrain may be considered as 'a special discursive act that is capable of structuring vast soundscapes with deliberate and definite meaning' (Hall and Zukic 2013: 105). The refrain is, however, also always momentary, it establishes "planes of consistency' or places of stability and security that reproduce sonic

territories. But it also initiates energies of acoustic chaos that counteracts these very tendencies' (ibid.: 106). In this respect, territorialization and de-territorialization go hand in hand, confirming the potentiality already ascribed to the notion of assemblages.

Considering radio as constitutive of rhythms in everyday life has been a commonplace in radio research just as the construction of radio audiences through radio formats should, according to Jody Berland, be regarded as 'not simply an abstract (though quantifiable) assemblage of listeners with similar tastes, but also a ritualized transformation of people's relationships to (and in) space and time' (1990: 188). Radio plays a role in this respect at an over-individual level of society which indicates the macro-perspective of mediatization. Simultaneously, it is striking how Berland comes close to an understanding of radio as a refrain of daily life, i.e. a territorial assemblage of programs, broadcast technology, listeners, everyday routines etc. In this interpretation, conventional divides between production and consumption, text and context, media technology and institution should be considered an effect of assemblage and only preliminary stable or 'contingently obligatory' (DeLanda 2006: 12). We think Couldry expresses a similar view when talking about mediation as a non-linear process. And in a similar vein we suggest to consider everyday music-radio engagements as processes of assemblage within heterogeneous milieus of music-radio.

The notion of milieus is not merely part of the Deleuze-Guattarian parlance of assemblage theory. It entails in its French origin a triple meaning of environment, media and middle (Massumi in Deleuze and Guattari 1987: xvii) that seems suitable for our present purposes. The decentred view of radio and the broadened view of mediation prescribe that media be regarded as environmental phenomena; the intimate link between mediation and practice prefigures a distribution of the latter within environments of mediation, i.e. milieus; and considering processes of assemblage within such milieus implies a potential infinity of elements which may be taken into account. In this respect it is important to regard both the notion of assemblage and milieu not merely as ontological descriptors but rather as indicative of an orientation towards a state of in-betweenness – a 'middle' from where movements, differences and connections, de- and re-territorializations emerge and may be traced. Assemblage theory thus inspires a mode of engagement which challenges ideas of origin, causalities, and reduction without pretending to be final or exhaustive (Anderson and McFarlane 2011: 126).

The two situations which were sketched at the introduction of the article illustrate instances of assemblage within such heterogeneous milieus of music-radio. The

individualized musical workflow or the attentive family participation in a transmitted concert event, i.e. the listening experience and phenomenon of music-radio, is caused by a wide range of elements: shows, stations, schedules, studios (cf. Dubber above, 2014: 13) – but also the family, the setting of their living room (dimmed lights, comfortable furniture), their everyday routines, the compositions, performing artists and setting of the transmitted concerts etc. To distinguish in the first example whether the attentive listening behaviour of the family is due to 1) radios' technological potential for transmission, and the possibility of listening in on otherwise inaccessible concert events; 2) the institutionally sanctioned prescriptions for listening (lowered lights etc.) distributed by the Danish Broadcasting Corporation (DBC); 3) the radio set's stationary and central placement in the arrangement of the living room (i.e. an arrangement which affords attention to the apparatus); 4) the parents' habit of attending concerts and, thus, an awareness of concert hall rituals; or 5) simply the ravishing, attention-grabbing quality of the symphonic work – this would require a disassembling of the present assemblage.

To speak of milieus of music-radio is, on the one hand, to indicate the specific focus of our analytic enquiry – i.e. the assemblage of specific phenomena: music and radio; on the other hand, to emphasize how the identity and relation of these phenomena are contingent due to their emergence (territorialization and de-territorialization) 'in between' an array of elements. Both music and radio are the non-reducible and non-linear effects of a co-functioning of these elements: radio set, transmission, living room arrangement, musical composition, family and so forth. And while the prominence of particular factors could perhaps seem to be explainable by reference to prior situations, e.g. as a matter of pre-established conditions – concert hall conventions conditioning DBC recommendations for listening or prior radio formats conditioning present programming – such explanations erect a hinterland (Law 2004: 13) of situations no less complex and contingent in their assemblage. In fact, such acts of explanation could be regarded as merely a spatio-temporal expansion of the milieu considered. Following this line of thought any changes from the first situation to the second should not be regarded as driven by media logics (institutional, technological, or otherwise) but by changes within or across milieus.

Music-radio stabilities and changes

Let us look closer at the interplay of stability and change in the assemblage of music and radio during the period designated by our introductory examples – with a special eye to developments presumably indicative of mediatization. It has often been argued that radio has reconfigured music and musical life. This point is valid, but musical life has shaped radio as well – delivering about 50 % of the content during the last 90 years. Furthermore, it has been far from a linear development, but rather a mesh of stabilities and movements within music-radio milieus marked by rhythms (or refrains) but also a basic contingency due to shifts in power between institutions, single actors, and political and aesthetic agendas.

The first example concerns radio as a secondary medium. Many analysts have explained radio as something which you do not really concentrate on, as something which at its most intense only distracts you, as ‘the mental image of wallpaper’ (Berland 1990: 179-80). Historically, radio has established tap listening, music as background, as a practice common to most households from the 1930s onwards. To the chagrin of radio heads this function became one of radio’s primary functions when it became domesticated, and radio has worked that way ever since: as a signal you could focus on or not according to whim or context. This could serve as a very clear example of mediatization, but the process has a history, and although tap listening is dominant it is not pervasive. In Copenhagen 17th century Rosenborg Castle is famous for its contraption leading piped-in music from the servants’ quarters into the king’s living rooms. 19th century opera audiences only slowly began to concentrate on the show going on on stage. Being café guests the bourgeoisie heard huge amounts of background music played by piano trios – early radio’s preferred ensemble sound. These examples indicate that radio – contrary to many mass media critics – did not introduce background listening as such, only within a new milieu, assembling a new sense of place, the home, while catering to a new demographic, those who began to have a little extra money and a little free time. Radio took the phenomenon of background music from the aristocracy and bourgeoisie and turned it into an element of daily life for the middle and working classes (cf. Frith 1983/88).

At the same time, radio’s affordance of tap listening has never been exhaustive. The family in the first example brought the norms of the concert hall and opera house into their home. Such norms were not that old, but they certainly were the official norms of most broadcasting corporations. The family might have had an intense experience, and millions of tales recalling music-radio epiphanies support the fact that radio is also a

medium that affords being transfixed, -formed, and -posed. 1950s' US teenagers listening across racial borders and UK teenagers listening across national borders for Radio Luxembourg are one type of examples. Another is the personal epiphany when *the* song suddenly appeared in the steady flow of music. The de-territorialization of listening as a domestic activity by transportable transistor radios, car radios, and mobile phones would also seem to go against tap listening as a norm, but the purpose of these technologies has not been to return the listener to a utopian past of concentrated listening. They afford sound tracks to modern travelers be they commuters, *flaneurs*, or backpackers. In this way radio and its music continually contribute to an overarching assemblage of everyday life.

Radio is just one actor delivering to a broader, invisible, and unconnected community. Other contributors to the sonic assemblage of everyday life have learnt from radio and deliver business 'solutions' to a broad variety of work spaces and public spaces (malls, stations, flights, restaurants, sports events, etc.). Music (and speech and sound) has always offered a variety of listening experiences stretching from background over soundtracks to epiphanies. And different radio apparatuses afford all these and other possibilities even though the background function may be the most widespread.

A second example concerns live performance. It is basic to music (just as recording is), and live transmissions of events are basic to radio (just as taped radio montages are). In the early days practically all radio was live radio. It was hard to record parts of it for later broadcasting, and using commercial records was out of the question. Nevertheless, during the 1960s the balance slowly tipped in most countries' music programming as the music played came to consist of more than 50 % records. This figure has increased ever since, partly because recorded music culture (popular music) has become still more dominant, partly because in some genres the music *is* the recordings and it does not make sense to have other musicians play it, partly because it is cheaper to play records than to have live musicians play. Going against immediate assumptions about radio's mediatization this means that due to basic changes in the music industry and changes in the status of mechanical music (which radio had helped change) musical life, *in casu* the industry, had an enormous effect on the milieu of music-radio and not least the assemblage of radio as a means for education and increasingly entertainment.

Another aspect of live music is that it has become still less radio-friendly because of the still more prohibitive costs. Symphony orchestras and big bands are not easy targets for rationalization experts. The number of musicians can hardly be reduced due to fixed repertoires, and salaries follow collective agreements. Live music still seems necessary,

though, if the corporations want to preserve the temporal nerve of radio (Scannell 1996: 153-4). If not, jukebox radio seems to be the solution like some of the more economically and rationally inclined commentators argue for. Such a programming policy does not sit well with most listeners. Once again, music practices territorialize the milieu.

A third example concerns different ways of interaction between radio and (music) audiences. This pivotal 'in-between' within the music-radio milieu consists of multiple relations. Radio has always 'conversed' with listeners through readers' letters in radio magazines, through telephones and social media, and through audience research. There is seemingly no doubt on whose terms the conversations have taken place: radio's terms, which imply processes of mediatization – e.g. in terms education, nation building and the cultivation of audience segments designed along scientific rationales by the institution. But audiences have continuously 'talked back' using the discourses made available to them, and sometimes strange circulars have emerged even within corporations' attempts to facilitate communications demonstrating, in turn, the contingency of changes within the milieu.

One such circular concerns broadcasting corporations' wish to offer a certain programming to specific segments of listeners. Sociological theory, surveys and focus groups are used to assemble groups of listeners, specified, by age, demographics, lifestyles etc. with a range of music genres, relegating each segment to a channel of its own. Ideally, instead of wanting to educate the corporations in this instance want to offer what the listeners demand. Here the circular begins in earnest: as radio assembles audience research, media politics, music genre cultures, and so forth in program formats according to the demands noticed in the surveys etc. each single format is simultaneously reified to present procedures for programming and a steady playlist of what the institutions think listeners want. The list may be corrected at certain intervals by new surveys, but it works somewhat like a closed system where two mirrors (audience research and programming procedures) reflect each other. The paternalistic ideology of old has long since disappeared. Despite claims about listener involvement a reified format radio assemblage regulates music programming. An assemblage, whose stability and accountability relies on a self-sufficiency regarding notions of the listeners as constructed by the corporation or – to phrase it differently – a closure with regard to influences from musical life. In this way, even though steering mechanisms have changed, radio has kept its strong hold on repertoires and the right to interpret what 'the listeners' want, and maybe even stopping that specific mediatization process by short-circuiting it.

On the production of mediatization as a 'meta-process'

Having argued for the importance of considering changing relations between music and radio within milieus marked by contingency, we return, in closing, to the notion of mediatization as a meta-process. As noted, Friedrich Krotz uses the notion to denominate a process on par with other long-lasting, broadly based cultural changes. Adding to this, Couldry compares media institutions' societal role with Bourdieu's idea of the state as 'the site of struggles, whose stake is the setting of the rules that govern the different social games (fields) and in particular, the rules of reproduction of those games' (Bourdieu quoted in Couldry 2014: 59). Couldry suggests that media institutions play a similar role, exercising 'power over other forms of capital' (60) via the distribution of a sort of media 'meta-capital'. Hence, the (re-)interpretation of mediatization as a meta-process – a process which conditions other processes.

As a slightly different take we suggest that mediatization be considered a meta-process in the sense that it requires abstraction or a sort of reflexive distancing, which establish a meta-level of consideration of the significance of media to society at large. Mediatization may in this respect be a process which actors are fully aware of and they may work to create and distribute that awareness. Reflexivity can be found in media institutions' self-narration. An example is DBC's accounts of its importance to Danish musical life. When issuing policies emphasizing its role as a provider of public service, DBC refers not only to its law-based tasks. It also reassures politicians and other recipients of its capability for assembling a stable community – it provides (or 'serves') a public sphere to politicians, companies, citizens etc. According to its recent corporate strategy DBC has 'a range of particular qualifications for fulfilling [... its] public service mission':

DBC is a significant and visible cultural institution in Danish society – it gives us the opportunity to put into perspective and deepen the understanding of the lives of all citizens. DBC is present in the entire country – this gives us the opportunity to create relationships across geographic, demographic, ethnic, and cultural boundaries. (DBC 2015, authors' translation)

These claims are made on the DBC website under the heading 'Facts about DBC'. This alleged matter-of-factness is transferred to statements of a more forward-looking kind – as when DBC claims that its most recent strategy for live music activities 'creates a[n ...] open, flexible and inviting space that involves the audience in the world of music and conveys music widely and in an intelligent way within DBC and across the country' (DBC 2014, authors' translation). Again, politicians and others are told what to expect regarding the importance of the media institution for society and more specifically musical life. A similar process of narration may be pointed out in everyday broadcast activities. The DBC pop channel, P3 has for many years used the slogan 'what you hear is what you are' [Det man hører er man selv]. The slogan instructs listeners to identify with what they hear (on the radio) and implies that DBC knows listeners' preferences (by way of audience research). And though listeners may be aware that substantial efforts are in fact made to acquire such knowledge, this awareness would simply add to the 'matter-of-factual' presentation of the claim. Again, the significance or effectiveness of the media institution is asserted.

Turning from DBC broadcast to the individualized radio experience of our second introductory example, a similar strategy of telling may be pointed out. *Last.fm*, for example, claims to supply listeners with music similar to artists, tags and genre labels you have sought for. Tags, charts, prior listening history and friends' listening choices feature as part of the website user interface, whereas the actual criteria for and the algorithms configuring 'your personal stations' are not displayed. In this respect listeners are told to expect a customized listening experience and this expectation may configure their experience. As with the DBC slogan, a certain effect – of personal and social alignment – is prescribed by the media institution.

Similarly, the first introductory example contained traces of such prescription, e.g. in the form of recommendations for optimal listening (lowered lights etc.). In line with early notions of public service, these recommendations partook in a narration of DBC as a source of high culture – of access to events such as the Thursday evening concerts, which 'deserved' effort and attention. Implicitly, listeners were not only told to be attentive to program content (i.e. the musical event) but also to the significance and effectiveness of the medium (technology and institution) as a provider of this content and, thus, as a prerequisite for an introduction to high culture.

What appears from these examples is the distribution of certain notions of radio as an element within the milieus discussed above. Notions which figure *in situ* but which also

add a reflexive layer of identification and expectation regarding the medium to the on-going processes of assemblage. These notions could be said to abstract the medium from its embedding within a heterogeneous milieu. But it would perhaps be more precise to speak of an assemblage of music-radio as determined by the radio or simply a territorialization of the former by the latter.

While contingency remains a basic condition claims about radio's effects may efface this contingency to produce instead a sense of fixed entities and linearity. This could, in the terms of Bruno Latour, be regarded as a process of black boxing, i.e. a process that equals:

[...] the way scientific and technical work is made invisible by its own success. When a machine runs efficiently, when a matter of fact is settled, one need focus only on its inputs and outputs and not on its internal complexity. Thus, paradoxically, the more science and technology succeed, the more opaque and obscure they become. (Latour 1999: 304)

Black boxing entails a settling of something previously unsettled, a translation of matters of concern into matters of fact (Latour 2004). And the emphasis of science and technology is, for the purpose of this article, of particular interest since both are implicated in theories of mediatization – the latter directly, whereas the former features indirectly (e.g. in the form of audience research). In fact, media science could be regarded as particularly significant for the abstraction we have pointed at – as indicated in some of our examples.

In Latour's account, the black boxing of certain entities plays a prominent role in the gradual acquisition of autonomy by different societal fields and institutions throughout modernity (1994). What Latour claims is, however, that we have never been truly modern but rather engaged in a double game of purification and erasure: On the one hand, sorting economic drives from artistic interests, scientific facts from religious beliefs, media from message, nature from culture, and so forth; on the other hand, ignoring the persistent existence and even multiplication of hybrids – of nature-cultures, aesthetic economics, scientific beliefs, media-messages and so forth.

The success of modern institutions such as the media would, in this line of thought, rely on their ability to efface the disputed, decentered and, thus, contingent nature of their areas of interest (their matters of concern) in order to produce them as matters of

fact. While contingency remains, in this respect, a basic condition, a sense of fixed entities and linearity may be claimed through processes of abstraction. We have indicated how this is done in a context of music-radio, and we suggest this production of mediatization as a meta-process be considered as an aspect of mediatization theory – especially in so far mediatization is regarded as integral to modernity (cf. Hjarvard).

Conclusion

Following Deacon and Stanyer we have suggested that the concept of mediatization is primarily useful as a concept pointing to meta-processes. The concept appears to be at its strongest in its generality, though it should – as suggested by Hepp – be considered as a Latourian panorama (Latour 2005), i.e. a concept ‘which opens up a particular panorama of the world’ (Hepp 2013: 50). This leads to a point where mediatization may be a meta- rather than a macro-concept. As a meta-concept it implies abstraction and, thus, the production of meta-levels of consideration regarding long-range historical processes rather than being primarily a descriptive tool denoting pre-given effects of certain media.

In developing this perspective we have stressed historical changes within music radio. This in order to point to concrete examples of stability and change, in order to understand the mesh of practice and processes of mediation taking place, and in order to highlight the heterogeneity and non-linearity of such processes related to very general concepts. It might be viewed as an anchoring of the generality of mediatization in history though it is simultaneously a recognition of the ways in which history is assembled via notions of mediatization.

We have found the Deleuzian concepts of assemblage and milieu appropriate for our considerations of a lower level of abstraction within the mediatization debates. These concepts embrace the complexity inherent in what we investigate. They provide analytical tools for a continued questioning and concrete investigations of the relations of music and radio including the elements, identities and effects of these phenomena within a far-reaching environment of other media, technologies, institutions, users, locations and so forth. Accepting mediatization as a meta-concept at work within milieus of music-radio is, indeed, to accept that protentions of media effects and notions of linearity have to be produced in the face of ever-present contingencies.

References

- Anderson B and McFarlane C (2011) Assemblage and geography. *Area* 43(2): 124–127.
- Berland J (1990) Radio space and industrial time: Music formats, local narratives and technological mediation. *Popular Music* 9(2): 179–192.
- Born G (2005) On musical mediation: ontology, technology and creativity. *Twentieth-Century Music* 2(1): 7–36.
- Bourdieu P (1973) The three forms of theoretical knowledge. *Social Science Information* 12(1): 53–80.
- Couldry N (2004) Theorising media as practice. *Social Semiotics* 14(2): 115–132.
- Couldry N (2008) Mediatization or mediation? Alternative understandings of the emergent space of digital storytelling. *New Media & Society* 10(3): 373–391.
- Couldry N (2014) When mediatization hits the ground. In: Hepp A and Krotz F (eds) *Mediatized Worlds: Culture and Society in a Media Age*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 54–71.
- Couldry N and Hepp A (2013) Conceptualizing mediatization: Contexts, traditions, arguments. *Communication Theory* 23(3): 191–202.
- DBC (2014) DR's Musikplan – levende musik. Available at: www.dr.dk/NR/rdonlyres/D8F466AE-9EFB-4617-B8CD-5737425911FD/6052478/DRs_Musikplan_211214.pdf
- DBC (2015) DRs styrkepositioner. *DRs virksomhedsstrategi 2015-18*. Available at: www.dr.dk/Om_DR/Fakta+om+DR/Vaerd_at_dele/2015/03/31144907.htm
- Deacon D and Stanyer J (2014) Mediatization: key concept or conceptual bandwagon? *Media, Culture & Society* 36(7): 1032–1044.
- DeLanda M (2006) *A New Philosophy of Society: Assemblage Theory and Social Complexity*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Deleuze G and Guattari F (1987) *A Thousand Plateaux – Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.
- Deleuze G and Parnet C (2002) *Dialogues II*. London: Continuum.
- Dubber A (2014) *Radio in the digital age*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Frith S (1983/88) The pleasures of the hearth - The making of BBC Light Entertainment. *Music for Pleasure: Essays in the Sociology of Pop*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 24–44.

- Frith S (2012) Music and everyday life. In: Clayton M, Herbert T and Middleton R (eds) *The Cultural Study of Music: A Critical Introduction*. 2. ed. New York: Routledge, 149-158.
- Giddens A (1984) *The Constitution of Society*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Hall M and Zukic N (2013) The DJ as electronic deterritorializer. In: Attias B, Gavanoas A and Rietveld H (eds) *DJ Culture in the Mix: Power, Technology, and Social Change in Electronic Dance Music*. New York: Bloomsbury, 103-122.
- Hepp A (2013) *Cultures of Mediatization*. Cambridge and Malden, MA: Polity Press.
- Hepp A, Hjarvard S and Lundby K (2015) Mediatization: Theorizing the interplay between media, culture and society. *Media, Culture & Society* 37(2): 314-324.
- Hjarvard S (2008) The mediatization of society: A theory of the media as agents of social and cultural change. *Nordicom Review* 29(2): 105–134.
- Hjarvard S (2013) *The Mediatization of Culture and Society*. London: Taylor and Francis.
- Hoover S (2009) Complexities: The case of religious cultures. In: Lundby K (ed) *Mediatization: Concept, Changes, Consequences*. New York: Peter Lang, 123-138.
- Jauert P (2003) Policy Development in Danish Radio Broadcasting 1980-2002. Layers, Scenarios and the Public Service Remit. In: Lowe G F & Hujanen T (eds.) *Broadcasting & Convergence: New Articulations of the Public Service Remit*. Göteborg: Nordicom, 188-203.
- Krotz F (2007) *Mediatizierung: Fallstudien zum Wandel von Kommunikation*. Wiesbaden: VS.
- Krotz F (2009) Mediatization: A concept with which to grasp media and societal change. In: Lundby K (ed) *Mediatization*. New York: Peter Lang, 21-41.
- Lacey K (2008) Ten years of radio studies: The very idea. *Radio Journal: International Studies in Broadcast & Audio Media* 6(1): 21–32.
- Latour B (1994) *We Have Never Been Modern*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Latour B (1999) *Pandora's Hope*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Latour B (2004) Why has critique run out of steam? From matters of fact to matters of concern. *Critical inquiry* 30(2): 225-248.
- Latour B (2005) *Reassembling the Social – An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Law J (2004) *After Method – Mess in Social Science Research*. London: Routledge.
- Poulsen I (1997) Public Service Radio in Denmark Today. *Nordicom Review* 2, 69-92.
- Scannell P (1996) *Radio, Television, and Modern Life: A Phenomenological Approach*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Schatzki T, Knorr-Cetina K and Savigny E (eds) (2001) *The Practice Turn in Contemporary Theory*. London: Routledge.

Morten Michelsen is associate professor in musicology at the University of Copenhagen. He is head of the research project A Century of Radio and Music In Denmark (www.ramund.ikk.ku.dk), and contributing member to two other research projects concerned with sound and radio.

Mads Krogh is associate professor at Aarhus University, School of Communication and Culture – Musicology. He specializes in issues of practice, mediation and genre in a context of popular music. He is currently a member of the research project A Century of Radio and Music In Denmark.