



# Public Service Media and Diversity in the Digital Media Landscape: Opportunities and Limitations for Social Justice

AYA YADLIN

Bar-Ilan University, Israel

ORANIT KLEIN-SHAGRIR

Hadassah Academic College, Israel

**ABSTRACT** *This essay reviews the place and role of Public Service Media (PSM) in promoting social justice in the changing digital media landscape through the ethos of diversity. Media diversity – the value and practice of including varied viewpoints, social groups, voices, and channels or outlets in media – has long been a declared pillar of PSM organizations worldwide. However, current changes in the digital media landscape and the growing extension of PSM organizations to digital platforms require re-reading the premise of promoting media diversity as a tool for social justice. This essay identifies a paradox. On one hand, online media appear to accommodate a greater range of diverse voices and players, particularly in the PSM ecosystem. At the same time, these very same online spaces jeopardize diversity, as the increasing practices of personalization, algorithmic curation, and platformization often reduce diversity of representations, voices, and exposure to content, thereby hindering opportunities for social justice and equality. This essay shines a spotlight on this nexus of conflicting mechanisms.*

*The essay begins with in-depth definitions of the two somewhat convoluted terms diversity and social justice. This section includes a review of global perspectives on PSM organizations, and the long-standing value of diversity promoted through them for decades. We then review the impact and changes identified in PSM platforms worldwide in light of the digital turn in the media field. This is followed by an in-depth discussion of the inherent tension between mechanisms that promote and hinder diversity online. Throughout this discussion, we raise questions about the practical dimensions of using online media to promote social justice through diversity. It provides a useful starting point for considering the intersection of Public Service Media, online platforms, diversity, and social justice. Thus, the essay will serve academic scholars studying social justice on a conceptual level as well as practitioners and stakeholders in the media industry at large, and PSM in particular, seeking to practically promote social justice.*

*Correspondence Address:* Aya Yadlin, School of Communication, Bar-Ilan University, Ramat-Gan, 5290002 Israel; email: [aya.yadlin@biu.ac.il](mailto:aya.yadlin@biu.ac.il)

ISSN: 1911-4788



**KEYWORDS** public service media; diversity; digital media; recommendation systems, algorithms; participatory culture

### **Defining Diversity as a Core Value of Public Service Media**

Diversity remains difficult to define in the academic context; scholars have long voiced concern about the ambiguity of the concept and the lack of a clear-cut definition in academic works. One of the problems in this context, as McLeod and Pan (2005) argue, is that diversity has become a “mega-concept,” one that is entangled in academic research with several other concepts such as inclusion, pluralism, and serendipity, without a clear meaning or boundaries, and is hence difficult to explore (Loecherbach et al., 2020). A possible solution to this issue is to concretize the term by addressing one specific media system. Here we suggest doing so by looking at diversity through the lens of Public Service Media (PSM) systems. Thus, while the term “diversity” is often used with high levels of ambiguity, we maintain that it is agreed in media studies that diversity is describing “wide range” media ecosystems. What we describe as wide range means, ideally, holding an inclusive, or embracing system of outlet ownership, workforce and employment, program-type, demographic representations within the programs, and viewpoints in broadcasted content (Loecherbach et al., 2020; Napoli, 1999). Hence, scholars suggest, media diversity should be understood as an intersection (Wahl-Jorgensen, 1999) of sources, channels, messages, and audiences (McQuail, 1992).

The tradition of diversity as a worldwide PSM value and ethos is well established. The term PSM refers to media systems that are generally funded by the public in service of the public (McQuail, 2007) and which have over the years embraced and implemented the manifold aspects of a diversified media system as a fundamental tenet. To retain legitimacy and relevance, PSM organizations have had to acknowledge the wish of diverse groups to be catered to, represented, heard, and included in social, cultural, and political discussions both on and off screen (Helberger, 2015; Just et al., 2017; Sørensen & Hutchinson, 2017).

In this context, media organizations overall, and PSM organizations in particular, make efforts to invite audience participation (Griffen-Foley, 2004, Keinonen & Klein-Shagrir, 2017). This becomes a crucial role in a media landscape that is characterized by the expansion from communication as transmission (sender to receiver) to communication as participation through complex dynamics of media creation, consumption, remixing, and disseminating online (Aslama, 2010). Aslama-Horowitz (2015) reminds us that “not only the institution, the national government and regulator, but also audiences play a crucial role in creating and monitoring of PSM” (p. 84). Given the relative freedom from commercial pressures of consolidation, PSM makers have greater leeway to test new platforms and experiment with participatory

forms of content programming (Stavitsky & Huntsberger, 2010) in a diversity-driven digital mediascape (European Broadcasting Union, 2012).

As such, at its core, diversity in PSM reflects a sentiment towards social justice. As Schejter and Tirosh (2015) argue, the meeting place of public interests, public service, and diversity became a mechanism for understanding the promotion of collective good in public systems (media and otherwise). Given that social justice concerns the degree to which societal institutions promote the tools, conditions, and values necessary for equitable social participation of all groups in society (Allison, 2000), diversity in PSM systems becomes a means for promoting social justice. In 2012, the general assembly of the European Broadcasting Union (EBU) officially adopted diversity as a core value of PSM, formally anchoring the long-standing goal (Bardoel & d’Haenens, 2008) as a declared pillar in PSM wide-range production and content (European Broadcasting Union, 2012).

From ownership and governance, through workforce and employment, all the way to program-type, content accessibility, and demographic representations, PSM diversity legislation and policy have sought to maintain the idealized “wide range” approach mentioned above. This approach can be found globally; in the following paragraphs we present several examples that highlight such wide range consideration of diversity.

In Germany’s PSM (ZDF), for example, the Television Council, which supervises PSM programming and operation, is guaranteed to hold members of different social groups, representative of the diversity of Germany’s 16 federal states. Similarly, in Israel, parliamentary legislation ensures reserved positions for minority representatives in the governing council of the local PSM corporation KAN. Other examples can be articulated in terms of diverse and accessible content. In this case, Japan’s public media NHK designed and implemented an automated, simultaneous sign language commentary on its content (platform for computer-generated real-time sign language interpretation/augmentation of text/audio broadcast), whereas Britain’s BBC initiated the 50:50 project aiming for gender, ethnicity, and disability parity within content production. In Thailand, the Thai Public Broadcasting Service Act came into force in January 2008, creating the Thai Public Broadcasting Service (Thai PBS). Sections 7-9 of the Act stipulate that programming must promote a national Thai identity focusing on the concept of a multicultural society, as well as allowing disadvantaged persons to present their views.

Some additional examples could be found in systems that ensure addressing the different needs of different age groups with designated channels or variety programs. During COVID-19 national lockdowns, the Czech public broadcaster operated a channel (CT3) specifically designed for the needs and interests of senior audiences who were most vulnerable during the pandemic. Georgia’s public broadcaster (GEPB) regulates the production and airing of multiple programs in languages of national minority groups, such as people of Azerbaijani and Armenian ancestry. Similarly, the public service mandate of South Africa’s SABC requires the organization to provide an extensive range

of quality services in all 11 official languages to reflect the country's unity, diversity, and multilingualism.<sup>1</sup>

In some cases, local-oriented issues, such as government intervention, market commercialization, and privatization pressures, challenge the delicate labor of maintaining diversity across the PSM landscape. Every county holds its own unique set of socio-political difficulties that jeopardize important PSM diversity initiatives, and as such requires a unique, localized examination of the opportunities and limitations for diversity as well as social justice. Yet, one shared challenge that affects PSM organizations' journey for diversity across the globe is the technical challenge of expanding media systems into online platforms. Counterintuitively, the same digital platforms promising enhanced diversity and access also put diversity at risk.

### **Re-thinking PSM Diversity in the Online Landscape**

While the promotion of diversity, as presented above, was a well-established expectation for Public Service Broadcasting (PSB) organizations, transformation processes into Public Service Media (PSM) organizations in the digital age rendered ensuring diversity a challenge. Traditionally, PSB organizations focused on "legacy" media outlets such as television and radio. Over the last 15 years or so these organizations gradually became Public Service Media (PSM) organizations focused on online multi-platform presence (Bardoel & Lowe, 2007; Fuchs & Unterberger, 2021; Sørensen & Hutchinson, 2018; Van den Bulck & Moe, 2018).

This shift from legacy media-focused PSB organizations to multi-platform PSM organizations includes an ongoing expansion of the content produced and revised means of dissemination. PSM organizations include more of their regularly produced content in online platforms (such as YouTube and Facebook) and digital-only produced content for the purpose of greater exposure, as well as two-way communication with audiences via online engagement (Dorot, 2020; Klein-Shagrir, 2019). In today's digital landscape, online platforms have shifted audience attention and screen time towards social media use, multiple screens use, and easily accessible on-demand video content (rather than traditional scheduled television programs). They have also created lower barriers to content production and circulation by audiences (Yadlin-Segal, 2019). It is suggested in this context that audiences' media consumption changes as new media forms are introduced. In some cases, new delivery system forms displace older media generations. In other cases, older and newer forms of delivery systems and content platforms coexist, being used by users simultaneously and interchangeably. Either way, digitization and the

---

<sup>1</sup> For more on diversity initiatives visit, for example, EBU's Diversity and Public Service Media reviews: <https://www.ebu.ch/publications/research/membersonly/report/diversity-and-public-service-media>.

expansion to online spaces have drastically changed the ratio of media supply to media attention, where the amount of attention that individual media outlets receive is falling (Thurman & Fletcher, 2020).

As we discuss in-depth in the following section, platforms and delivery systems managed by algorithmic and other digital personalization options may further reduce universality and diversity even on digital PSM platforms (Van den Bulck & Moe, 2018). Many PSM organizations are currently engaged in reconsidering what to offer to audiences in the multiplatform, local-national environment, and how to address audiences' rapidly shifting needs, tastes, and practices. This can be done, as Kant (2014) shows, both in terms of *voice* (who is heard in a discussion) and *choice* (the breadth of content from which consumers can choose and the features of the delivery system).

To understand the positioning of diversity as social justice within this online expansion, we present a discussion of two factors requiring a renewed evaluation of diversity as a PSM ethos and as a means for promoting social justice – content and platform. We address the content layer through questions about representation and opportunities for user engagement in online platforms, and the platform layer as demonstrated through algorithms in online delivery systems. Why focus on these two specific aspects? Literature in PSM studies suggests that media diversity is traditionally examined through the mix of media content and diverse sources, that is, the means, platforms, and channels through which they are delivered (Just et al., 2017). In addressing the first component – content production for online platforms – we build on the existing discussion within diversity studies of exposure to content and expand it to contemplate the characteristics of exposure in an online environment. In comparison, algorithmic and online recommendation systems are a relatively new realm of study, particularly with regards to PSM, which is prompting scholars to call for a reevaluation of PSM's mission of diversity in this context (Helberger, 2015; Mazzoli, 2020; Sørensen & Hutchinson, 2018). We argue that this twofold prism – content and platform, or voice and choice – allows us to reflect on both established and new elements in PSM diversity, and demonstrate the tension between the expected promotion of social justice in online spaces versus the hindering of diversity that is in fact experienced online.

### **Understanding Diversity through Content: Questions of Accessibility, Voice, and Participation**

The first challenge with which PSM organizations deal is that of content variety. As we unpack in this section, in an era of robust competition, multiplicity of channels, and on-demand programming, PSM organizations maintain lower barriers of entry to public debates, thereby ensuring diversity and variety of content, channels, and participants. In this section we highlight an inherent paradox to this participation: it simultaneously allows more and

less diversity in online spaces and thus simultaneously promotes and hinders social justice.

In a way, online and on-demand platforms allow for providing more niche content via thematic channels as well as extending participatory and interactive contents in which audience members take an active role as participants (Bardoel & d'Haenens, 2008; Enli & Ihlebæk, 2011). This approach is compatible with what Jenkins (2006) called “Participatory Culture,” with relatively low barriers to civic expression and engagement online with specified niche interest. In this approach to digital culture, internet-based media allow, more than any medium before, low barriers to participation. PSM organizations expanded their reach and connection with audiences by inviting “ordinary citizens,” members of the general public, to interact and even participate in the creation of media content via online means (Aslama, 2010; Baldini et al., 2021; Bardoel & Lowe, 2007; Stollfuß, 2019).

As we show in the following passages, with emphasis on marginalized groups and social justice, disseminating content specifically designed to include and address disenfranchised groups gives the audience a voice and includes them in the content production. This can occur through social media, video content sharing online, user comments, and the like. The narrow intersection of PSM, user generated content, and diversity as social justice is not fully developed yet. The valuable literature that does exist in the field stresses that online platforms do indeed help, to some extent, propel the mission of inclusion and diversity.

Existing literature on participation in online content production can inform assessments of PSM diversity and social justice. Participatory models stress the re-configuration of power relations and agency in our current digital media ecology (even if these occur alongside negative aspects of online media use such as monetization of user information). In this context, the involvement of marginalized communities in content production is theorized as a means for socio-political inclusion and empowerment. Participatory media models can facilitate an effective vehicle for minority community-building outside of mainstream representation (Yadlin-Segal, 2019) and may promote respect toward otherness of “voiceless” individuals and communities (Servaes & Malikhao, 2005).

This was argued by scholars studying varied contexts, identity markers, and social groups: from race and ethnicity (Williams, 2017), through immigration (Bernal, 2010; Ponzanesi, 2020), all the way to disability (Hadley, 2016; Pearson & Trevisan, 2015; Yadlin-Segal, 2019). However, as Yadlin-Segal (2019, p. 38) suggests,

This is not to say that all online participatory communication platforms are free of regulation, power structures, dominant considerations of revenue, and the like, but rather, that participatory online media allow marginalized groups an entry point

to social discourses that have been fairly closed to them thus far, facilitating the creation and circulation of cultural meanings of minorities.

In the realm of PSM, organizations worldwide adopted online platforms on varying levels to promote user participation in content creation. Websites, Facebook, YouTube, and Twitter, but also mobile apps such as Snapchat, Instagram, and WhatsApp are being used to include users in the PSM ecology in meaningful ways (Sehl et al., 2017). In Australia ABC opened a youth network (Triple J Unearthed) for original music sharing by users, a source for reviews and exposure. This was joined by a website for user content sharing, whether original content or through interaction with archival PSB content to upload as videos, texts, and audio segments. These were often incorporated in PSM news (Dwyer, 2014). Similarly, Germany's ZDF online solicits user comments for incorporation into news segments. These seem like esoteric acts, but given the lack of representation of minorities in positive and meaningful ways in mainstream media, they became important for promoting diversity and inclusion.

In Israel's PSM organization KAN, internet users take part in crafting questions for the TV series *You Can't Ask That* (in Hebrew literally "If You Don't Mind Me Asking") via the organization's website and Facebook page. The show's main objective is to bring to screen, and in turn to public attention, the lives of minorities, marginalized, and disenfranchised groups in society, and allow a safe space to battle common misconceptions and stereotypes through presenting those daunting or taboo questions people usually avoid. Thus, users are invited to not only watch, but actually take part and become partners in breaking down stereotypes and exclusion factors in the lives of these groups by engaging with the topic online. Online information gathering that invites users to take part is also exemplified in Dutch public broadcaster, NPO's news show *The Monitor*. By including audience members' stories in the information gathering phase online, a greater diversity of voices in society is achieved (Vanhaeght, 2019), as traditionally news and production rooms of PSM organization are still less diverse than the general public (European Broadcasting Union, 2021).

But participation is not only achieved in the information gathering phase. Australia's ABC Open involves training of audience members for media literacy and production skills. These members, in turn, create content shared on the organization's website, social media, and regular broadcasting schedule. This project, according to Dwyer (2014), increased diversity of representation, in a context where the societal periphery is not always recognized by media professionals as worthy of covering.

Yet, two important factors should be considered when evaluating whether diversity through participatory content indeed means heightened diversity in reception and engagement, and whether this is an effective vehicle for social justice. First, empirical studies demonstrate that although diversity of supply is a necessary precondition, "on its own... it cannot secure diversity of reception"

(McQuail, 1992, p. 158) or “diversity of choice” (Van der Wurff, 2004). That is, the existence of varied content that might cater to minority groups and reflect diversity in society does not itself ensure diversity of consumption. In fact, it is argued that greater supply of content can result in greater selective exposure on the part of audience members. With the overwhelmingly vast and constantly growing volume of content to choose from via online delivery systems, users choose to be exposed to less diverse content; usually this is content that already fits with their identity and dispositions (Helberger, 2015; Knobloch-Westerwick et al., 2020). This demonstrates that distributing more content that touches on issues of diversity via online spaces, or even producing it specifically for online platforms, must be implemented alongside actions to ensure consumption by relevant audiences. In other words, literature on the issue shows that mere dissemination online is not enough, and actual engagement and participation should be promoted as well.

This leads our discussion to a second important aspect in evaluating diversity as an effective vehicle for social justice. Content diversity online is closely linked to the digital divide, or digital inclusion – meaning the ability, access, motivation, and digital literacy (or lack thereof) needed for effective participation and use of online platforms.

Many times, it is marginalized groups who experience crucial barriers to online participation. Inequity in use is associated with factors such as gender, race, education, age, and life stage, which often also indicate exclusion markers from wider socio-political discussions (Meneses & Mominó, 2010). Barriers in access also characterize online usage in the lives of marginalized groups. Individuals with physical or cognitive disabilities, for example, often find online participation impossible due to inaccessibility of digital platforms (Scanlan, 2022). Similarly, a digital literacy gap hinders the participation of the elderly in online activities (Embarak et al., 2021).

Participatory media models posit both media platforms and society as important players in larger processes of social justice. These models emphasize the dissemination of information and media contents that are otherwise unavailable in mass media. In these instances, the involvement of internet users in the creation of content and messages is emphasized as a means for agency, equity, empowerment, and change towards social justice (Cadiz, 2005; Low et al., 2012; Rogers, 2017; Yadlin-Segal, 2019). But, as exemplified in the paragraphs above, there is an inherent contradiction in the process. Using online spaces to promote diversification of content, audiences, opportunities for consumption, engagement, and participation can in fact prohibit these exact acts for minority groups.

We suggest that in these terms, PSM organizations’ strategy of reaching and engaging wider audiences through online, participatory, and interactive contents might not promote diversity, but rather perpetuate exclusions that identify the life experiences of minority and marginalized groups, migrating offline inequalities to the online sphere. Thus, if social justice (as defined above) means the promotion of tools, conditions, and values necessary for fair

and useful social participation of all groups in society, then PSM diversity through circulation of content in online platforms might not promote social justice. Considering the ways in which online platforms maintain and replicate inequalities originating offline, they may in fact achieve the opposite and hinder diversity and social justice. If so, what might be a solution to this issue? Can we find ways to nudge audiences towards a well-rounded, diversified media diet online? Many PSM organizations turn to online recommendation systems to serve this cause. This practice is further unpacked in the following section.

### **Understanding Diversity through Choice: Recommendation Systems, Algorithms, and Reaching Diversified Audiences**

Literature on digital culture largely agrees that online spaces allow content providers several cost-effective methods to reach diverse groups of users with specified content relevant to them. In the context of PSM content dissemination online, Debrett (2009) argues that online platforms allow PSM organizations means for optimizing the reach of content, research, and development through “personalizable, interactive, searchable, shareable, mobile and available on-demand... UGC [user generated content] and social networking” (p. 812). As Helberger (2015) shows, the European Parliament and the Council of Europe have explicitly “encouraged the public-service media to not only offer qualitative and diverse content but use technology to engage more directly with individual users” (p. 1327).

Following these encouragements, algorithmic and non-algorithmic recommendation systems have become a tool in use, strategically important for the survival of PSM organizations in an increasingly networked media system (Sørensen & Hutchinson, 2018). However, a prominent concern in this context is the impact of personalization and recommendation systems, which are argued to pose a risk to the PSM ethos of diversity (van Es, 2017). Here too we seek to demonstrate the tension between the expected promotion of diversity in online spaces versus the hindering of diversity that is experienced online.

Greater reach of content online means that people can consume a more diverse media diet. In this sense, “search and recommendation systems can be used to help or even stimulate (nudge) the audience to choose more diverse content” (Helberger, 2015, p. 1329). As the Centre for Media Pluralism and Media Freedom (2022) and Mazzoli (2020) suggest, such prioritization measures for a diverse media diet can be based on a complex and well-informed amalgamation of sources: PSM organizations themselves as content creators, users’ preferences, policy-making and legislation, and delivery system interfaces.

In the context of diverse media diet on PSM, some European organizations broaden the horizons of content and user exposure by curated automated “diversified algorithms” suggestions. These include BBC’s recommendation

system in the UK, NPO's public interest recommendation system in the Netherlands, and Sverige Radio's News Value project in Sweden, to list a few (Centre for Media Pluralism and Media Freedom, 2022). However, as Mazzoli (2022) argues, these are examples of strong PSM organizations that leverage their strong offline brand into online presence. These strong PSM brands maintain autonomy from market-driven private tech companies by launching their own apps and streaming services. In comparison, smaller local PSM organizations and community media organizations must rely on existing third-party social media and content providing platforms such as YouTube, Facebook and Spotify.

As such, a contradiction arises. PSM organizations that seek to maximize their audience reach using commercial online platforms, including their algorithmic recommendation systems, might put diversity of consumption and exposure at risk. In private, market-based platforms, "search and discovery functions [...] are primarily driven by an interest to keep their customers base, rather than ensuring diverse consumption of content by audiences" (Mazzoli, 2020, p. 312). In fact, one of PSM organizations' main challenges is the conflict between their own public character, obligation, and funding which oppose the commercial interest that characterize tech companies' digital platforms and their personalization systems (Moe, 2013; Stollfuß 2019; van Dijck & Poell 2015). When it comes to algorithmic recommendation systems, "algorithms based solely on popularity may lead to a tyranny of the majority that effectively suppresses minority viewpoints" (Munson et al., 2009, p. 130). Similarly, algorithmic recommendation based on personal viewpoints and preferences means that online media users experience a self-confirming feedback loop (a "filter bubble" or an "echo chamber") with very little diversity in ideas, representations, and voices shared online (Dylko, 2016; Pariser, 2011).

With these commercial intermediary recommendation platforms being driven by economic factors, PSM organizations that use third-party platforms to share their contents indeed cannot be assured that the core principle of diversity is being met (Martin, 2021; Mazzoli, 2020). The commercial interest is not compatible with diversity promotion interests, potentially meaning that by using social media, PSM organizations jeopardize diversity and even go against a diverse, embracing, well-rounded media diet that puts social justice at its heart. The motivations for, and numbers behind, algorithmic and non-algorithmic recommendation systems and automated curation in the private market, are not often publicly shared and are not aligned with the aims of the PSM diversity ethos.

In this context, attempts to maintain a division between PSM organizations and platforms' algorithmic recommendation systems are not sufficiently delineated or enacted – either by clear PSM self-regulation or by state-led policy and legislation (van Es & Poell, 2020). Here, again, PSM organizations' wish to provide diverse audiences a diverse media diet via cost-saving online media tools might simultaneously enhance a thin media diet and jeopardize

diversity as social justice due to delivery system and platform features in online culture.

These understandings regarding delivery systems and recommendation platforms might become an important venue for future empirical research on diversity as a vehicle for social justice in PSM. In particular, scholars can probe the implications of these platforms with respect to content strategies for PSM providers and media policy makers with diversity and social justice goals in mind. These inquiries can suggest how to achieve and maintain prominence, how to establish and grow trust, and how to understand the idea of attractiveness of diverse media diet and contents to consumers in online spaces.

### **A Paradox of Diversity: Simultaneously Promoting and Hindering Social Justice through PSM Online Presence**

In this essay we have discussed two online features of PSM that help us assess if, and when, diversity is promoted – PSM content participation online, and online recommendation systems for PSM content. We note that scholars have identified additional elements that can shed light on diversity (such as legislation and user-end decision making; see e.g., Helberger, 2015; Mazzoli, 2020). Yet, the two aspects discussed here help us explore the interconnectedness of diversity and social justice through two issues: the most explored one and the most recent one, voice and choice. Both voice and choice are pressing issues.

If we embrace the idea that the intersection of public interests, public service, and diversity is a mechanism for promotion of collective good in public systems (Schejter & Tirosh, 2015), then an accessible and diverse PSM ecosystem translates to social justice (Allison, 2000). When considering PSM online dissemination of content in light of literature on diversity and social justice, then providing “wide range” online content can be understood as social justice in two ways: (1) as a means for ensuring that minority groups and marginalized groups are catered to in larger volumes than in traditional broadcasting, and (2) as a means for ensuring that minority groups and marginalized groups participate, engage, and are more routinely heard, online. Together these mean taking an effective part in society.

In this context, Kant (2014) argues: “this new socio-technical landscape is empowering the viewer with both a voice – mobilized largely through social media networks – and choice – providing a plurality of content and tools that allow viewers to map their own self-directed trajectories through this multi-platform environment” (p. 383). In this sense, the need for diversity is not only met through reaching out to minority groups through content in diverse settings, may it be language, culture, etc., but is rather extended to actual engagement with materials. Online platforms have the potential to enhance diversity factors in PSM systems, materializing social justice via online platforms. Yet, if these online platforms are characterized by barriers for access

and participation (physical and cognitive ability, infrastructure, motivation, and digital literacy or lack thereof, needed for effective participation and use of online platforms), then for many disenfranchised communities, PSM content online means a continuing struggle rather than a nudge towards social justice through inclusion. As such, we argue, PSM online content can mean, simultaneously, more opportunities and fewer opportunities for diversity and social justice.

In terms of recommendation systems, our argument is similar. When used by strong offline PSM brands and when being informed by several factors (not just by market or monetary value of content), then these systems can, indeed, promote diversity as social justice. Otherwise, these are usually not compatible with diversity-promotion interests of PSM organizations, and might mean jeopardizing diversity as social justice. As such, considering the specificities of use in platform, location, and funding, using online tools and systems in PSM organizations might simultaneously cause the promotion and hindering of social justice.

These considerations require that any PSM initiative, legislation, or production of content aimed towards social justice consider diversity online as an inherently conflicting endeavor. The expansion of PSM systems into online realms enables us to ponder the ways in which diversity, in and on its own, is not simply promoted by larger volumes of content availability or by enabling users' engagement with materials. This expansion necessitates an in-depth exploration, by scholars and media practitioners alike, of the mechanisms that might mean greater diversity in one context, but limited diversity in another.

## References

- Allison, M. T. (2000). Leisure, diversity and social justice. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 32(1), 2-6. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00222216.2000.11949876>
- Aslama, M. (2010). Rethinking PSM audiences: Diversity of participation for strategic considerations. In G. F. Lowe (Ed.), *The public in public service media* (pp. 87-100). Nordicom.
- Aslama-Horowitz, M. (2015). Public service media and challenge of crossing borders: Assessing new models. *Media Studies*, 6(12), 80-91.
- Baldini, T. B., Túñez-López, M., & Barrientos Báez, A. (2021). Public service media in the age of platformization of culture and society. In M. Túñez-López, F. Campos-Freire & M. Rodríguez-Castro (Eds.), *The values of public service media in the internet society* (pp. 45-58). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bardoel, J., & d'Haenens, L. (2008). Reinventing public service broadcasting in Europe: Prospects, promises and problems. *Media, culture & society*, 30(3), 337-355. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0163443708088791>
- Bardoel, J., & Lowe, G. F. (2007). From public service broadcasting to public service media: The core challenge. In G. F. Lowe & J. Bardoel (Eds.), *From public service broadcasting to public service media* (pp. 9-26). Nordicom.
- Bernal, V. (2010). Diasporas and cyberspace. In K. Knott & S. McLoughlin (Eds.), *Diasporas: Concepts, intersections, identities* (pp. 167-171). Zed Books.

- Cadiz, M. C. H. (2005). Communication for empowerment: The practice of participatory communication. In O. Hemer & T. Tufte (Eds.), *Media and glocal change: Rethinking communication for development* (pp. 145-158). Publicaciones Cooperativas.
- Centre for Media Pluralism and Media Freedom. (2022). *Study on media plurality and diversity online*. <https://cmpf.eu.eu/media-pluralism-online-project/>
- Debrett, M. (2009). Riding the wave: Public service television in the multi-platform era. *Media, Culture & Society*, 31(5), 807-827. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0163443709339466>
- Dorot, R. (2020). *Media influence matrix: Israel*. CEU Center for Media, Data and Society. <https://cmds.ceu.edu/sites/cmcs.ceu.hu/files/attachment/basicpage/1860/mimisrael/funding.pdf>
- Dwyer, C. (2014). *Thinking outside the box: public service broadcasting, participatory media and local community networks in regional Australia* [Master's thesis, University of Technology Sydney]. OPUS.
- Dylko, I. B. (2016). How technology encourages political selective exposure. *Communication Theory*, 26(4), 389-409. <https://doi.org/10.1111/comt.12089>
- Embarak, F., Ismail, N. A., & Othman, S. (2021). A systematic literature review: The role of assistive technology in supporting elderly social interaction with their online community. *Journal of Ambient Intelligence and Humanized Computing*, 12(7), 7427-7440. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12652-020-02420-1>
- Enli, G. S., & Ihlebæk, K. A. (2011). "Dancing with the audience:" Administrating vote-ins in public and commercial broadcasting. *Media, Culture & Society*, 33(6), 953-962. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0163443711412299>
- European Broadcasting Union. (2012). *Editorial principles and guidelines*. [https://www.ebu.ch/publications/strategic/login\\_only/guide/public-service-values-editorial-principles](https://www.ebu.ch/publications/strategic/login_only/guide/public-service-values-editorial-principles)
- European Broadcasting Union. (2021). *Diversity and public service media*. <https://www.ebu.ch/publications/research/membersonly/report/diversity-and-public-service-media>
- Fuchs, C., & Unterberger, K. (Eds.). (2021). *Public Service Media and Public Service Internet Manifesto*. University of Westminster Press.
- Griffen-Foley, B. (2004). From tit-bits to big brother: A century of audience participation in the media. *Media, Culture & Society*, 26(4), 533-548. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0163443704044216>
- Hadley, B. (2016). Cheats, charity cases and inspirations: Disrupting the circulation of disability-based memes online. *Disability & Society*, 31(5), 676-692. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2016.1199378>
- Helberger, N. (2015). Merely facilitating or actively stimulating diverse media choices? Public service media at the crossroad. *International Journal of Communication*, 9, 1324-1340.
- Jenkins, H. (2006). *Convergence culture: Where old and new media collide*. NYU Press.
- Just, N., Büchi, M., & Latzer, M. (2017). A blind spot in public broadcasters' discovery of the public: How the public values public service. *International Journal of Communication*, 11, 992-1011.
- Kant, T. (2014). Giving the "viewer" a voice? Situating the individual in relation to personalization, narrowcasting, and public service broadcasting. *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media*, 58(3), 381-399. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08838151.2014.935851>
- Keinonen, H., & Klein-Shagrir, O. (2017). From public service broadcasting to soci(et)al TV: Producers' perceptions of interactivity and audience participation in Finland and Israel. *Nordicom Review*, 38(1), 65-79. <https://doi.org/10.1515/nor-2016-0037>
- Klein-Shagrir, O. (2017). *Para-interactivity and the appeal of television in the digital age*. Rowman & Littlefield.
- Klein-Shagrir, O. (2019). Digital first! Reinventing Israeli PSB and manufacturing legitimacy online. *View*, 8(16), 74-87. <http://doi.org/10.18146/2213-0969.2019.jethcl76>
- Knobloch-Westerwick, S., Westerwick, A., & Sude, D. (2020). Media choice and selective exposure. In M. B. Oliver, A. A. Raney, & J. Bryant (Eds.), *Media effects: Advances in theory and research* (4<sup>th</sup> Ed.) (pp. 146-162). Routledge.

- Loecherbach, F., Moeller, J., Trilling, D., & van Atteveldt, W. (2020). The unified framework of media diversity: A systematic literature review. *Digital Journalism*, 8(5), 605-642. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2020.1764374>
- Low, B., Brushwood Rose, C., Salvio, P., & Palacios, L. (2012). (Re)framing the scholarship on participatory video: From celebration to critical engagement. In E. J. Milne, C. Mitchell & N. de Lange (Eds.), *Handbook of participatory video* (pp. 49-64). AltaMira Press.
- Martin, E. N. (2021). Can public service broadcasting survive Silicon Valley? Synthesizing leadership perspectives at the BBC, PBS, NPR, CPB and local US stations. *Technology in Society*, 64, 101451. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2020.101451>
- Mazzoli, E. M. (2020). Online content governance: Towards a framework for analysis for prominence and discoverability. *Journal of Digital Media & Policy*, 11(3), 301-319. [https://doi.org/10.1386/jdmp\\_00027\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1386/jdmp_00027_1)
- McLeod, J. M., & Pan, Z. (2005). Concept explication and theory construction. In S. Dunwoody, L. Becker, D. McLeod & G. Kosicki (Eds.), *The evolution of key mass communication concepts: Honoring Jack M. McLeod* (pp. 13-76). Hampton Press.
- McQuail, D. (1992). *Media performance: Mass communication and the public interest* (Vol. 144). Sage Publishing.
- McQuail, D. (2007). Revisiting diversity as a media policy goal. In W.A. Meier & J. Trappel (Eds.), *Power, performance and politics* (pp. 41-58). Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft mbH & Co. KG.
- Meneses, J., & Mominó, J. M. (2010). Putting digital literacy in practice: How schools contribute to digital inclusion in the network society. *The Information Society*, 26(3), 197-208. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01972241003712231>
- Moe, H. (2013). Public service broadcasting and social networking sites: The Norwegian broadcasting corporation on Facebook. *Media International Australia*, 146(1), 114-122. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1329878X1314600115>
- Munson, S., Zhou, D., & Resnick, P. (2009). Sidelines: An algorithm for increasing diversity in news and opinion aggregators. *Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*, 3(1), 130-137. <https://doi.org/10.1609/icwsm.v3i1.13950>
- Napoli, P. M. (1999). Deconstructing the diversity principle. *Journal of Communication*, 49(4), 7-34. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1999.tb02815.x>
- Pariser, E. (2011). *The filter bubble: What the internet is hiding from you*. Penguin Press.
- Pearson, C., & Trevisan, F. (2015). Disability activism in the new media ecology: Campaigning strategies in the digital era. *Disability & Society*, 30(6), 924-940. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599.2015.1051516>
- Ponzanesi, S. (2020). Digital diasporas: Postcoloniality, media and affect. *Interventions*, 22(8), 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369801X.2020.1718537>
- Rogers, M. (2017). Participatory filmmaking pedagogies in schools: Tensions between critical representation and perpetuating gendered and heterosexist discourses. *Studies in Social Justice*, 11(2), 195-220. <https://doi.org/10.26522/ssj.v11i2.1522>
- Scanlan, M. (2022). Reassessing the disability divide: Unequal access as the world is pushed online. *Universal Access in the Information Society*, 21(3), 725-735. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10209-021-00803-5>
- Schejter, A. M., & Tirosh, N. (2015). "Seek the meek, seek the just." Social media and social justice. *Telecommunications policy*, 39(9), 796-803. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.telpol.2015.08.002>
- Sehl, A., Cornia, A., & Nielsen, R. K. (2017). *Developing digital news in public service media*. Reuters Institute for the Study of Journalism.
- Servaes, J., & Malikhao, P. (2005). Participatory communication: The new paradigm. In O. Hemer & T. Tufte (Eds.), *Media & glocal change: Rethinking communication for development* (pp. 91-103). CLACSO.
- Sørensen, J. K., & Hutchinson, J. (2018). Algorithms and public service media. In G. F. Lowe, H. van den Bulck & K. Donders (Eds.), *Public service media in the networked society: RIPE@ 2017* (pp. 91-106). Nordicom.

- Stavitsky, A., & Huntsberger, M. (2010). "With the support from listeners like you:" Lessons from U.S. public radio. In G. F. Lowe (Ed.), *The public in public service media* (pp. 257-271). Nordicom.
- Stollfuß, S. (2019). German public television, social media and audience engagement. *View*, 8(16), 98-109. <http://doi.org/10.18146/2213-0969.2019.jethc178>
- Thurman, N., & Fletcher, R. (2020). Effects of a magazine's move to online-only: Post-print audience attention and readership retention revisited. *Journalism Practice*, 14(10), 1225-1243. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17512786.2019.1685903>
- Van den Bulck, H., & Moe, H. (2018). Public service media, universality and personalisation through algorithms: Mapping strategies and exploring dilemmas. *Media, Culture & Society*, 40(6), 875-892. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0163443717734407>
- Van der Wurff, R. (2004). Supplying and viewing diversity: The role of competition and viewer choice in Dutch broadcasting. *European Journal of Communication*, 19(2), 215-237. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0267323104042911>
- van Dijck, J., & Poell, T. (2015). Making public television social? Public service broadcasting and the challenges of social media. *Television & New Media*, 16(2), 148-164. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1527476414527136>
- van Es, K. F. (2017). An impending crisis of imagination: Data driven personalization in public service broadcasters. *Media@LSE Working Paper Series*, (43), 1-18.
- van Es, K. F., & Poell, T. (2020). Platform imaginaries and Dutch public service media. *Social Media + Society*, 6(2), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2056305120933289>
- Vanhaeght, A-S. (2019). Audience participation in PSM from a media-centric to a society-centric approach: The monitor as a best practice of the Dutch public broadcaster NPO. *View*, 8(16), 45-58. <https://doi.org/10.18146/2213-0969.2019.jethc174>
- Wahl-Jorgensen, K. (1999). Ensuring richness and diversity of representation in the public sphere: Mass media as forums for democratic debate. *Journal of the Northwest Communication Association*, 27, 24-52.
- Williams, A. (2017). Fat people of color: Emergent intersectional discourse online. *Social Sciences*, 6(1), 15. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci6010015>
- Yadlin-Segal, A. (2019). What's in a smile? Politicizing disability through selfies and affect. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 24(1), 36-50. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jcmc/zmy023>