Taming distraction: The second-screen assemblage, television and the classroom

Stauff, M.

Published in:
Media and Communication

DOI:
10.17645/mac.v4i3.538

Link to publication

Creative Commons License (see https://creativecommons.org/use-remix/cc-licenses):
CC BY

Citation for published version (APA):

General rights
It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations
If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.
Article

**Taming Distraction: The Second Screen Assemblage, Television and the Classroom**

Markus Stauff

Media Studies Department, University of Amsterdam, 1012 XT, Amsterdam, The Netherlands; E-Mail: m.stauff@uva.nl

Submitted: 19 December 2015 | Accepted: 18 April 2016 | Published: 14 July 2016

Abstract

This article argues that television’s resilience in the current media landscape can best be understood by analyzing its role in a broader quest to organize attention across different media. For quite a while, the mobile phone was considered to be a disturbance both for watching television and for classroom teaching. In recent years, however, strategies have been developed to turn the second screen’s distractive potential into a source for intensified, personalized and social attention. This has consequences for television’s position in a multimedia assemblage: television’s alleged specificities (e.g. liveness) become mouldable features, which are selectively applied to guide the attention of users across different devices and platforms. Television does not end, but some of its traditional features do only persist because of its strategic complementarity with other media; others are re-adapted by new technologies thereby spreading televisural modes of attention across multiple screens. The article delineates the historical development of simultaneous media use as a ‘problematization’—from alternating (and competitive) media use to multitasking and finally complementary use of different media. Additionally, it shows how similar strategies of managing attention are applied in the ‘digital classroom’. While deliberately avoiding to pin down, what television is, the analysis of the problem of attention allows for tracing how old and new media features are constantly reshuffled. This article combines three arguments: (1) the second screen is conceived of as both a danger to attention and a tool to manage attention. (2) To organize attention, the second screen assemblage modulates the specific qualities of television and all the other devices involved. (3) While being a fragile and often inconsistent assemblage, the second screen spreads its dynamics—and especially the problem of attention—far beyond television, e.g. into the realm of teaching.
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1. Introduction

Television, like all media today, has become one of many possible objects of attention in a layered assemblage of platforms and devices. Especially the entanglement of mobile devices into television practices—what I will call second screen assemblages—organizes attention across several media, not least through harvesting, modulating, and combining the specific forms of attention characterizing different devices or different forms of content. Television’s resilience in the current media landscape, I want to argue, can best be described with respect to a broader ‘problem of attention’. The increasing interrelation between television and other media, on the one hand, provokes new ways of thinking about and dealing with attention; the strategies to create, organize and harvest attention, on the other hand, shape the media assemblage and grant particular, and often transitional, functions to one or the other device or cultural form. Television does not end, but its traditional features are re-adapted by new technologies thereby spreading televisural modes of attention across multiple screens.

The main aim of this article therefore is not to de-
scribe the details of actual existing applications or forms of use but to analyze the ‘problematizations’ (Castel, 1994; Deacon, 2000) of attention: what are the conceptual and actual re-definitions of attention emerging across popular, industrial and academic debates? What strategies and instruments are imagined and realized to deal with attention (and distraction)? What happens to television’s traditional modes of attention and how do other devices and practices appropriate them? While deliberately avoiding the attempt to pin down what television is and what it will become, such an approach allows for tracing how old and new features are constantly reshuffled. Thereby it also touches on more general media theoretical questions: is it still possible—and does it still make sense—to distinguish individual media? Can we actually identify affordances specific to one medium? Some traditional temporal characteristics of television—e.g. flow or liveness—are partly re-animated and transformed in a cross-media landscape, but they also get partly dissociated from television. This makes it increasingly difficult to isolate a particular medium in order to describe its features and affordances. This article focuses on the question of attention to show how television’s loss of familiarity is negotiated. ‘Problematizations’ react to uncertainty and develop ‘the conditions in which possible responses can be given’ (Foucault, 1997, p. 118).

Analyzing debates and strategies (instead of a given medium) also allows us to see the extent to which television shares dynamics with other media practices. The second screen use in teaching for example, which doesn’t include TV-sets or TV-programs, shows interesting similarities with television’s second screen assemblage and thereby delivers insights into the broader interdependencies of the medium’s current developments.

In the following I will focus on the emergence of the second screen to analyze how television got integrated in a cross-media assemblage that appropriates the medium’s features as strategies among others to create and modulate attention. The growing research on the topic has mainly discussed how the second screen gets applied to integrate the more volatile use of mobile devices into the commercial strategies of the media industry (Lee & Andrejevic, 2014; Tussey, 2014) and how it creates moments of participation and liveness (van Es, 2015; Walsh, 2014). Other research has focused on the social circumstances of second screen use (Wilson, 2016), the spatial transformation of TV (Stauff, 2015), on the changing relationships between producers and audiences (Bennett, 2012), and on the second screen’s potential to heighten a sense of citizenship (Selva, 2016). Dan Hassoun’s rich work has shown how the second screen is policed in the cinema (Hassoun, 2016) and in the classroom (Hassoun, 2015) and how it relates to broader concerns of simultaneous media use (Hassoun, 2012, 2014). Adding to this growing body of research I want to focus more on the conceptual and theoretical implications of the second screen. First I will show how ‘complementary simultaneous media use’ (Nee & Dozier, 2015) became a plausible and manageable concept for the media industry. To achieve that, the different media’s competition for attention and the simultaneous but unrelated use of several media (multitasking) had to be transformed into an assemblage that frames and tames attention. Second, I will use the example of liveness to show how television’s alleged specificities are re-articulated and dispersed in that process—television rather becomes an occasional phenomenon than an individual medium. Finally, to show how television’s transformation is entangled with a broader problematization of attention, I will extend the analysis to the field of teaching. Second screens are used in classrooms too to transform distraction into attention and the respective debates and strategies are insightful for understanding television’s changing role in the cross-media assemblage.

2. TV, Digital Media and the Zero-Sum Game of Attention

Already before the rise of mass media like film and television, media technologies have aimed to modify, increase, and manage attention (Crary, 2001, 2014). Early on in this development, attention became re-conceived as a complex and temporal process: distraction was now considered to be a constitutive part of an unavoidably distributed form of attention (Löffler, 2013, 2014). This ambivalent relationship between attention and distraction got thereby established as one of the key concepts for the evaluation and application of new media technologies, especially in the context of industrialization and urbanization since the mid-19th century: what looks like the danger of distraction at one moment, becomes a new form of attention at the next. The contemporary multiplication of screens and gadgets, and especially the second screen-assemblage, can be considered as yet another decisive turning point in this history. The simultaneous use of different media with allegedly each specific forms of temporality intensifies both the menace of constant distraction and the promise of micro-managed attention.

The dangers of mobile screens’ distinctive potential are most dramatically expressed in the context of driving. Many countries have enacted laws prohibiting the use of mobile phones while driving a car. Additionally, public awareness campaigns—with taglines such as ‘don’t text and drive’ or ‘keep your eyes on the road’—often sponsored by car manufacturers, aim to convince drivers not to be tempted to use their smartphones behind the wheel (e.g. “KeepYourEyesOnTheRoad.org.au,” n.d.). Interestingly, a spot by car manufacturer VW fuses movie-going and driving: in a Hong Kong cinema, watching a film shot from the
point-of-view of a driver, audience members all simultaneously receive a text message. Grabbing their phones to read the message, they miss the moment in the movie where the driver has an accident—looking up from their mobile screens, all they see is a shattered windshield on the big screen (adsoftheworldvideos, 2014). For driving as for movie-going, the mobile screen is depicted as a problem of distraction—annoying at best, life threatening at worst.

While in fact many cinemas (or concert halls and theatre venues) do ask the audience to switch off their mobile devices before the start of the show (Hassoun, 2016), the case of multiple-screen use here has become much more ambivalent (and therefore productive) in recent years. Movies, theatre shows, and particularly television have begun to harness rather than ban the second screen—both to safeguard attention and to augment the experience.1 Tellingly, one of television’s early second screen apps was called GetGlue as if promising that the second screen intensifies rather than undermines the viewer’s attachment to the screen. Before ’complementary simultaneous media use’ (Nee & Dozier, 2015, p. 2) could become a plausible concept, however, the alternating use of media and the mere accidental simultaneous use (multitasking) had to be molded into a densely interrelated and manageable assemblage.

Compared to cinema, television is notorious for affording a less focused but also more ambivalent mode of perception. Partly passively following the ‘single irresponsible flow of images and feelings’ (Williams, 1990, p. 92), partly distractedly zapping between channels or between watching television and other domestic activities, the viewer’s attitude towards TV has been described as working through ‘glance’ rather than cinema’s ‘gaze’ (e.g. Ellis, 1992). Ever since television’s beginnings, people have read the newspaper, cooked dinner, or played board games while watching (or at least sometimes glancing at) a television.2 Applying a somewhat more extended concept of media, the distraction of the second screen is thus nothing new. The industry constantly had to develop strategies to guarantee that the audience would at least pay attention to the commercials; the soundtrack of television—which can more easily be followed while doing other things—was e.g. adapted to the need to ‘call the intermittent spectator back to the set’ (Altman, 1986, p. 50). Characteristically, the growing presence of digital media in the domestic space during the 1990s was also considered both as a heightened danger to the already fragile attention levels the TV industry had to contend with and as an opportunity for more attentive TV-consumption.

On the one hand, it was far from clear in the 1990s whether television would survive the competition of digital media. The success of the personal computer and the first signs of the Internet’s popularization were conceived of as instigating a ‘war for eyeballs’—the established TV industry and the growing IT industry fighting over consumers’ attention. Until this day, the more radical proponents of the debate still consider television—notwithstanding all its digital transformations—a waste of time, and argue for its replacement by new media. In a blog post from 2008, for instance, new media scholar and consultant Clay Shirky calculated all the hours spent watching sitcoms and argued that this constitutes a waste of cognitive surplus that would be much better spent on writing blogs and editing Wikipedia entries, concluding: ‘it’s better to do something than to do nothing.’ (Shirky, 2008) The underlying assumptions of such a dichotomy between television and new media are (1) that each medium is characterized by its specific form of attention and (2) that media consumption is a zero-sum game: the time spent with digital media will be taken out of the time previously spent watching television.

On the other hand, however, it became a plausible invocation to use new technologies to improve television’s attention management. Already in 1986, a commercial for a (pre-digital) Panasonic VCR showed that a ringing phone is much less of an unwelcome distraction (and rather a temporary switch of attention) if you can voluntarily pause your viewing and continue where you stopped right after the call (mycommercials, 2007). This and similar situations (e.g. a decisive moment in a sports game while the postman rings or a dog that desperately asks to be taken out) have become staples of DVR advertising, promising that the upgraded medium can cope with the distractions of other media and life itself (Stauff, 2005, p. 215f). Increasingly, the inattentive consumption of scheduled (and thus not viewer-determined) television was portrayed as a waste of time (as in Shirky’s blog); yet the new, digitized forms of TV (video on demand, digital video recorders, streaming services) promised to “rationalize” the act of watching television (Dawson, 2014, p. 223). They allow for organizing the amount, time, and speed of reception and thereby for adapting television more closely to the patterns of a flexible, neoliberal work- and lifestyle (Dawson, 2014). Television and its multiple supplements thus got entangled with the ‘attention economy’, which re-introduced scarcity to the infor-

1 Disney brought a re-vamped, second screen-version of some of its movies to the cinemas (Lawler, 2013); examples of second screen use in the opera are described by Kozinn (2014).

2 This goes back to Raymond Williams’ analysis of how television’s flow fits into the broader development of ‘mobile privatization’ and was especially highlighted in the early feminist approaches to TV Studies, e.g. Modleski (1983). An extensive literature review is offered by Hassoun (2014).

3 In 1996, Andy Grove, then president of chip producer Intel, introduced this notion (Grove, 1996).
mation economy’s apparent abundance in the 1990s (Terranova, 2012).

The second screen assemblage partly builds on this promise of more flexible use of television. Yet it is also epitomizes a new concept of the interrelation between television and new media, namely increasing satura-
tion instead of competition or efficiency (Greer & Fer-
guson, 2015). Attention is now conceived of as some-
thing that can be spread (and can be managed to
spread) across different media, which are establishing
a veritable ‘attention ecology’ (Pettman, 2016). This im-
plies that quite different modes of attention become
combined, which also dissolves the idea that each medi-
um is characterized by one specific mode of attention.

3. Simultaneous Media Use: From Multitasking to
Second Screen Assemblage

It was in the late 1990s and early 2000s that the pro-
ductive interrelations between different media were
discovered as well as manufactured—first in the form
of alternating and only later in the form of simultane-
ous media use. A telling anecdote of accidental discov-
ery springs from the Big Brother brand. The first season
of the reality show in 1999 already made innovative
use of new media and allowed the audience to follow
online live streams 24/7. The producer and co-inventor
of the program, Paul Römer, however, revealed that in
the beginning his team was wary of ‘giving away’ the
most spectacular scenes online. In fact, they had a red
button that could prevent specific juicy situations from
live streaming, based on the assumption that other-
wise no one would watch the daily summaries screen-
ing every night on TV. When quite early on a somewhat
lurid interaction between participants was live-
streamed by accident, the ratings of the evening show
were very high, contrary to all expectations. The inter-
net turned out not to act as a competitor or mere sup-
plement, but as a teaser for watching more TV. The
manufacturing of such productive interrelations be-
tween television and new media got traction with ‘sec-
ond shift aesthetics’ (Caldwell, 2003) and ‘overflow’-strategies (Brooker, 2001), as the television industry
tried to get a grip on the time users spend with media

4 Paul Römer told this anecdote during a guest lecture at the
University of Amsterdam’s Media Studies department on 7
January 2015. Early research on the BBC version of Big Brother
argues that there was no strong interrelation between internet
use and watching the show on TV (Hill, 2002). More generally,
Big Brother is considered to be a turning point in cross-media
relationships: ‘while interactive websites, phone services, text-
ing and email were initially seen as supplementary media
forms attached to pre-existing television programmes, in Big
Brother it can be argued that the programme shifts from being
the centre of a media ensemble to being one component in a
wider mediascape whose title becomes a familiar brand.’
(Bignell, 2005, p. 146)

other than television by offering online content that is
related to (and refers back to) television shows.

The second screen undermines and complicates
these forms of cross-media flow since it transforms the
alternation between different media into simultaneity.
To achieve this, the habit of multitasking—the simulta-
neous but unconnected use of different media—has to
be continuously transformed into the complementary
use of distinct media infrastructures and devices. This
is very much where television at the moment overlaps
with broader problematizations of media culture: the
specificities of media have to be arranged into an as-
semblage that allows for interconnection and interde-
pendency, translating the always menacing threat of
distraction into intensified attention.

At least since the start of the 21st century, multi-
tasking has become one of the predominant ideas to
corporateize the problem of attention in a heteroge-
neous media landscape (Hassoun, 2012). For some,
media-supported multitasking promises to equip hu-
mans with new powers—a scenario for which depic-
tions of octopus-like humans managing different tasks
and several media with their eight arms has become
the corresponding ‘meme’ (Rieger, 2012). More often,
however, the multiplication of media and the ‘process
of context switching’ (Ellis, Daniels, & Jauregui, 2010),
characterizing their simultaneous use, is supposed to
undermine any longer-term or in-depth attention. At
times, these concerns even provoke ‘moral panics’
around (especially children’s) capacity to achieve and
to have intense social, face-to-face communication
(Bennett, Maton, & Kervin, 2008; Cellan-Jones, 2010).
More generally, the worries and promises around mul-
titasking systematically interrelate the reflection on the
limits of human capabilities with the (quantifiable)
analysis of technological capacities and the discussion
of appropriate application of different media (Rieger,
2012, p. 16). Multitasking questions the quantity as
well as the intensity of attention received by any single
medium or individual cultural product, thereby also
problematizing the specificities of media. With the
evolving second screen assemblage, the much older
concerns about multitasking while watching television
could be translated into systematic industrial strategies.

In workplace ergonomics, multiple monitors are
considered supportive to multitasking, since switching
from one program (or task) to another no longer
means that the first program (or task) disappears from
sight (Manjoo, 2009). Such a multiplication of screens
is aptly satirized in David Eggers’ novel The Circle,
in which the protagonist, who just got a job at a fictional
new-media company, gets a new screen on her desk
for each new task she is responsible for. Her desk be-
comes a veritable dashboard constantly reminding her
of the parallel processes she is supposed to optimize
(Eggers, 2014).

Until around 2007, the term ‘second screen’ was
most often used in such specialized contexts, e.g. for
the use of an additional computer monitor in desktop
publishing. Since then, however, ‘second screen’ has
started to signify the awkward and hybrid combination
of considerably different kinds of screens, especially
the screen of a domestic TV set with a mobile screen,
thereby also combining linear and pre-structured con-
tent on one screen with individually accessible, ‘inter-
active’ forms on the other. Of course, the second
screen might mainly be used to keep busy with other
things while watching television and thus to multitask:
answering emails, playing games, sorting photographs
everything. As such, it constitutes a threat to the TV industry
since people are thought to be more likely to pick up
their second screens during commercial breaks (just as
VCR and the DVR were used to skip or fast-forward
through commercials).

Yet viewers also take advantage of their second
screens to do TV-related things: searching for additional-
information, starting online conversation about a
show, etc. (Nee & Dozier, 2015) The industry, there-
fore, now envisions the second screen as a tool capable
two things: (1) transformation multitalking into a densely interrelated
assemblage of devices and practices, and thus into a
unified—if not necessarily coherent—experience. ‘Un-
like previous forms of “inattention”, ancillary screens
are seen as increasing cumulative exposure to media
messages rather than detracting from them.’ (Hassoun,
2014, p. 276)

As was the case with the alternating use of tele-
vision and online media in the Big Brother ‘discovery’ re-
layed above, the possibility of a mutual intensification
of simultaneous media use provides its own eye-
opening anecdotes. One of the many telling examples
for the interlocking of television and social media can
be found in the Super Bowl of February 2013. The
match was interrupted by a power outage shortly after
the start of its second half and did not resume for more
than half an hour. Since one team was already far in
the lead when the game was interrupted, broadcasters
worried that people would stop watching. Quite to the
contrary, however, many new viewers learned about
the unexpected development on social media,
switched on their television sets, and shared pictures,
jokes, and opinions online (Carter, 2013). It is now
broadly understood that social-media conversation can
direct attention towards television and television
shows, and television has, in fact, become one of the
most prominent topics of social media ‘buzz’. This sure-
ly impacts the experience of watching television; a re-
cent empirical study finds, e.g., that using a second
screen while watching television adds to the ‘percep-
tion among audience members that they had gained
incidental knowledge.’ (Nee & Dozier, 2015)
The complementary use of media technologies
modulates the divided and unstable attention that
characterizes multitalking into a highly flexible, yet
structured form of attention organized around a cen-
tral topic or event, and framed and tamed by the cen-
tripetal dynamics of technical, textual, social strategies.
Hashtags, specialized second screen apps, ‘appoint-
ment television’, and other means offer distractions to
stretch and heighten attention (as will be discussed
further down, this is also described as ‘continuous par-
tial attention’). If transmedia storytelling has become
one of the core strategies to organize attention across
alternating media use (Jenkins, 2010), ‘liveness’ has
turned out to be one of the most relevant strategies to
transform multitasking into a structured assemblage of
different media and different modes of attention. It
thereby also is a valuable concept to discuss the persis-
tence and transformation of key features of television
in the transforming media landscape.

4. Second Screen-Liveness and The Non-Specificity of
Attention

Ironically, media technologies and media practices that
were introduced as an explicit challenge (if not alterna-
tive) to television’s basic temporal characteristics
(scheduling, liveness, flow), now seem to salvage and
emphasize television’s liveness, which—historically—
had seemed to be in decline due to recording, on-
demand, and streaming technologies. Moreover, the
second screen creates its own, modulated forms of
liveness for different kinds of shows to guarantee
heightened attention. At first sight, big live events—
from presidential addresses to sports events and natu-
ar catastrophes—quite simply combine two things: (1)
they ‘glue’ people to their televisions and produce
shared, synchronized, and focused attention, even in
the era of ‘whenever you want, where you want’; and
(2) they simultaneously provide reasons and topics for
conversations, and guarantee that others (either peo-
ple one knows or perfect strangers) are watching the
same show at the same time and thus are addressable
in online communication.

The connection between liveness and attention is
not a simple given, though. Instead, it is manufactured
by the combination of multiple strategies involving dif-
ferent media. Liveness, as a substantial body of re-
search has shown, always was a highly ambivalent,
strategic, and partly ideological aspect of television. It
comprises (and selectively highlights) the technical live
transmission, the spontaneity of displayed behaviour,
or the uninterrupted flow of images from heterogene-
ous locations (e.g. Caldwell, 2000; Feuer, 1983; White,
2004). In television history more generally, what ap-
ppears to be a specific quality of the medium got con-
tinually re-defined in the assemblage of many different
media. The consequences of video technology, first in
production and later in reception, with the emergence of
‘live on tape’ or ‘tape delayed’-events are proof of that.
Online communication, thus, is not just a productive side effect of live events, it contributes to, and modifies, television’s liveness and the respective attention, e.g., through creating and ‘reaggregating’ a mass audience (Lee & Andrejevic, 2014).

The TV industry strategically boosts the ‘eventfulness’ of its programming with competitions and confrontations to provide repeated incentives for online discussion. Curated forms of participation, such as the possibility to vote or comment, entangle the immediacy of web communication with television’s many forms of liveness (Ytreyberg, 2009). Streaming services like Netflix or Amazon offer a non-scheduled and non-live mode of distribution that affords temporally flexible ways of (binge-) watching. Since such an individualized form of reception makes synchronization with social media difficult (not least because of possible spoilers for the viewers who started somewhat later), second screen use has to be carefully crafted. Netflix organized a ‘live Twitter Q&A’ with the cast of *Orange is the New Black* (Edelsburg, 2013). And for another Netflix show, *House of Cards*, the second screen app Beamly promised to offer ‘a TV room for each episode’ (Dredge, 2014), that is, a space for conversation on one episode, independent from the moment of watching it, thereby compartmentalizing liveness even further. More generally, research has shown that watching TV shows via streaming ‘distributes the articulated social space through time (diachronic) over a longer period than a single temporal (synchronic) event’ (Pittman & Tefertiller, 2015) Even if most of the audience might continue with their own idiosyncratic forms of second screen use and most of the industrial strategies are short-lived they nevertheless feed into the problematizations of attention.

In a second screen assemblage, liveness is used to suture (to use a metaphor from film theory)6 the gap between previously opposed forms of temporality—most explicitly, of course, the scheduled temporality of what is now called ‘appointment television’ and the more flexible ‘always-on’ temporality of social and mobile media, which replaces the scheduled liveness of TV with ‘online liveness’ and ‘group liveness’ (Couldry, 2004). TV producers harvest the temporalities of the buoyant social-media communication to strategically equip all kinds of TV content with the attention-binding features of liveness. The second screen additionally aims to combine what Jenkins, Ford and Green (2013) sharply distinguish as ‘stickiness’ vs. ‘spreadability’—simultaneous attention of a mass audience and non-synchronized attention of successive ‘sharing’. It thereby transforms the parallel existence of different modes of perception and especially the threat of multitasking into an assemblage that promises to frame and tame the interplay of distraction and attention.

This is clearly not the end of television, since at least some aspects of the medium are used and intensified by ‘new media’. Nevertheless, the example of the second screen also shows that television has—like any other individual medium—become part of a broader assemblage that selectively appropriates, modulates and re-articulates features of different media to tackle the problem of attention. Here, television’s current development provokes some more general media theoretical questions concerning the specific affordances of different media. While media assemblages are often conceived of as ‘stabilized systems made of elements, actors, and processes that are shaped and ‘fixed’ to “fit” together...in order to produce a culturally stable form of communication’ (Langlois, 2012, p. 93), the second screen’s mixed and changing strategies to organize attention seem rather to create continuously new relations between textual and technical elements familiar from traditional television and emerging from the social-media context (Rizzo, 2015).

The social-media platforms Twitter and Facebook in particular were quite explicitly established as modes of social communication completely different from television. Both platforms, however, have become seminal pillars of the second screen assemblage. Similarly, mobile media, tablets and phones, are characterized by their ability to disconnect the access to content from a pre-determined place (the living room) and from the rigid schedules of television. Nevertheless, in the past few years media development has been shaped by the highly productive overlap between certain aspects and

---

5 Partly due to contractual obligations, Netflix also releases some shows weekly, thereby undermining a too-clear-cut distinction between (‘traditional’) scheduled TV and non-scheduled streaming services (Arnold, 2015).

6 For the debate in film studies, e.g. Miller (1977).
features of social media with certain aspects and features of television. The characteristics that are allegedly specific to individual media have in the process also become highly ambivalent and interdependent.

The individual devices and platforms contributing to the assemblage can be analyzed with respect to each of their specific temporal affordances (e.g. Weltevrede, Helmond, & Gerlitz, 2014). Looked at separately, each has a specific pace of incoming information, of refreshing, and of trending, and therefore each requires different modes of attention. Liveness, as I have shown, persists as a strategy to manufacture productive interconnections and synchronization across devices—thereby affecting and modulating their characteristic temporalities and modes of attention. It ‘has to be understood in the context of the entire multiplatform and interactive mediascape that it is part of, and evolving around, as well as in relation to the dynamics between devices, platforms and content providers’ (Sørensen, 2016, p. 396). Additionally, in a cross-media ensemble, liveness eventually does not so much synchronize but rather strategically ‘hypermodulate’ attention, producing micro-delays, stuttering interrelations and ‘deliberate dissonance’ (Pettman, 2016).

The second screen assemblage undermines any clear-cut identification of one medium with one mode of attention. It frames and tames attention by combining media-event liveness with group liveness, and stickiness with spreadability. It thereby also combines the two modes of attention, identified by Katherine Hayles in comparing print-dominated and online culture—deep attention (characteristic of the practice of ‘close reading’) and hyper attention: ‘hyper attention is characterized by preference for multiple information streams, flexibility in rapidly switching between information streams, sensitivity to environmental stimuli, and a low threshold for boredom, typified, for example, by a video game player.’ (Hayles, 2012) The second screen, on the one hand, does fit most of the characteristics listed here. On the other hand, the abstract classification of ‘hyper attention’ risks obscuring the fact that the ‘multiple information streams’ only get connected because they offer different forms of (manipulating) attention, including (at least the promise of) deep attention.7

After all, the second screen assemblage gets explicitly introduced as a tool to manage (different forms of) attention in social situations. An instructional video for Google’s Chromecast, a small device that enables an easy connection between tablets or smartphones and a TV set, can be taken as quite typical here. It shows a young man sitting down on a couch, where a young woman is already sitting, taking notes in a booklet with a pencil; he touches her, she briefly looks up, but continues focusing on her booklet. He activates Google Chromecast and opens a photo app on his smartphone to display the pictures on the big TV screen. When he chooses a short video clip showing the young woman sitting on a kitchen counter throwing nuts in the air to catch them with her mouth, he finally gets her attention and they start teasing each other (Google Chrome, 2014). Well beyond TV-related liveness, the second screen assembles different forms of attention in competitive interrelation and along the way allows for the redefinition of a social situation by determining a (momentary) shared focus of perception.

Most of the strategies discussed so far can be ascribed to the television industry’s endeavours to tame the disruptive potential of mobile media by connecting them to the entertainment industry’s more traditional and well-proven commercial strategies (Tussey, 2014). The second screen’s entanglement with the problem of attention, however, is feared and harnessed in other contexts as well. In this sense, the second screen can be considered a ‘dispositif’ or an ‘assemblage’ that inserts its particular rationalities and problematizations into a variety of media and into different social practices—including the practices of teaching and lecturing, as I will discuss in the remainder of this article. The analysis of television’s transformation might benefit from such a comparison since it allows us to see more clearly, how particular strategies organize a cross-media assemblage partly independent of individual devices. The second screen, one could argue, imports features and concerns of television—or problematizations related to the current transformation of television—to circumstances in which no TV set and no broadcaster is present.

5. Managing Attention in the Classroom

If television’s current transformation is being shaped by the way it is integrated into a media assemblage that organizes attention and distraction across several devices and platforms, much the same can be said about transformations in teaching and lecturing. In education, the question of attention is as hot an issue as it is in advertising and the entertainment industry, and here too the emergence of ever new assemblages is organized by the alleged potentials of different media in producing attention/distraction.

For centuries, pedagogy has been struggling with the problem of distracted pupils, and as early as the 1780s the Swiss education reformer Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi, in the context of a more general reassessment of distraction, ‘assigned a value to distraction as a pedagogical tool. He recommended giving pupils two tasks simultaneously so that they have to distribute their attention.’ (Löffler, 2013, p. 14; see also Löffler, 2014, p. 60f). Regularly, media have played a promi-

---

7 While focusing on individual choice, access, and social communication, commercials for second screen use do regularly include images of immersion, absorption, and focused attention.
nent role in such pedagogical efforts to re-organize and intensify the attention of learners. In this context, media were often tweaked and used in alternative forms, thereby adding features and characteristics to media that were otherwise overlooked (for film see e.g. Hedi-
ger & Vonderau, 2009). Even television, so often con-
sidered detrimental to all forms of rational learning (most prominently in Postman, 1986) was praised and appro-
priated for its potential to improve teaching (e.g. Keil-
bach & Stauff, 2013). No wonder then that the sec-
ond screen’s problem of attention is intensely articu-
lated in the field of education: the second screen is
both banned from class for its distracting potential and
intensely appropriated to frame and tame the un-
avoidable allure of its own and other distractions—not
to mention adapting the classroom to the world and
habits of contemporary students. Comparing the appli-
cation of the second screen in education with its appli-
cation in the field of television highlights the extent to
which the problem of attention structures the emer-
gence of media assemblages and thereby changes the
role and function of individual devices.

Media were accused of having a detrimental effect
on children’s capacity to learn long before those media
entered the classroom—television was considered es-
pecially harmful.8 If children were twitchy on Mondays,
this could easily be ascribed to their excessive TV con-
sumption during the weekend.9 More generally, TV is
criticized for taking time from other more beneficia-
activities—reading, exercising, etc. These concerns only
intensify once screens are brought into the classroom
via the rise of mobile media and compete simultane-
ously with the teacher for the students’ attention.
Since individual media use in the classroom has be-
come ubiquitous and nearly unavoidable (Hassoun,
2015), the classroom itself becomes a field of compet-
ing strategies to foster attention. Mirroring the transi-
tion from alternating to simultaneous media use dis-
cussed earlier, the discussion in didactics also seeks to
establish a media assemblage that could tame multi-
tasking and intensify the overall attention.

First of all, individual media in the classroom are
considered a source of distraction from the ‘main
screen’—the teacher and his/her blackboard, white-
board, or presentation screen. The Dutch center of ex-
pertise for media literacy, mediawijzer, recently pub-
lished a survey showing that about 50% of the pupils
use their mobile phones during lessons for private mat-
ters—sending messages to friends, surreptitiously tak-
ing photographs and videos, checking social media, etc.
paper from LSE’s Centre for Economic Performance
more dramatically argues that banning mobile phones
from schools would equal a learning advantage of one
extra week of teaching per year (Beland & Murphy,
2015). Already in 2014, Clay Shirky (who has repeatedly
been criticized as an ‘Internet guru’ (e.g. Morozov,
2011, p. 21)) surprised his audience with a blog post in
which he laid out the reasons for banning laptops from
his classroom: they do not only distract the attention
of users, but also create a distracting atmosphere for
students not using their gadgets (Shirky, 2014). Neuro-
logical and psychological research seems to corrobo-
rate these concerns, showing that students regularly
overestimate their potential for multitasking (Weimer,
2012) and that extensive multitasking results in lower
grades (Ellis et al., 2010). My interest doesn’t lie in
denying or even debating these insights. Rather, I want
to discuss how these problematizations contribute to
the emergence of a media assemblage in which quasi-
televisional and new-media forms of communication are
re-organized.

Eventually, for many, new media have become
tools for getting and keeping the attention of the
younger generation and methods are developed so
that the attention that is unavoidably spent on new
media can be redirected to teaching endeavors. More
hesitant strategies—as for example outlined in a book
with the telling title Teaching Naked (Bowen, 2012)—
still keep the classroom free from media but argue that
media can and should be used to expand teaching (and
attention to the objects of teaching) beyond the time
and space of the classroom. In accordance with the
imperative of ‘lifelong learning’, media create a ‘teaching
environment’ or a ‘teaching ecosystem’ where teach-
ing (similar to what HBO GO and similar initiatives
promise for entertainment media) can be taken with
you ‘wherever you go’ and ‘whenever you have time’
for it.10 The ‘gamification’ movement is likewise based
on such an effort to carefully translate the detrimental
potentials of media into productive strategies. One of
the books introducing the topic argues that the atten-
tion given to, e.g., World of Warcraft could be redi-
ected to more useful and beneficial things—
‘harnessing the characteristics that make them [games] so engaging and applying them to other aspects of lives’ (Penenberg, 2013, p. 11).

The less fearful proponents of the debate actually do urge the use of new media in the classroom simultaneously with, and in augmentation of, the teacher-student relationship. The most pragmatic argument for this strategy is often that for the younger generation multitasking has become the norm (see Bennett et al., 2008, for a critical perspective on this argument). Even if the multiple sources of information might distract from the main focus (i.e., the teacher), this is nevertheless considered the best strategy to keep students interested by at least fostering ‘continuous partial attention’ (Muir, 2012; Yardi, 2006)—a mode of attention that distinguishes itself from the worrisome multitasking since it is organized around one main focus but concedes (or incites) the constant scanning of the environment for additional information (Löffler, 2013, p. 17).

While chatting in the classroom might still be an annoyance, the mediated real-time conversation alongside a common activity (a lecture or a workshop) is considered beneficial for ‘continuous partial attention’, as such ‘backchannel’ communication purportedly transforms students (or ‘the audience’) from passive listeners into participants of an on-going discussion. Additionally, the ‘conspicuous covertness’ (Hassoun, 2015, p. 1686) of students’ private use of social media is overcome by harnessing this media use for the ends of learning. Schools and universities are advised to use social media to enhance the feeling of a learning community. Again in parallel to the recent developments in the TV industry, ‘social’ or ‘community’ are here defined in terms of conversation and interaction, rather than in terms of common listening or watching.11 In both cases this understanding of the social is inseparable from the assumption that social exchange keeps you more active and more attentive.

Quite similarly to the attention problem of commercial television, the teaching context provokes the emergence of strategies and specialized tools with the aim of managing the relation between the (potentially distracting) second screens and the designated main focus of attention. This ranges from low-tech arrangements (e.g. the common agreement on a ‘cell phone etiquette’ in the classroom [Nielsen & Webb, 2011]), to highly specific technical tools offered by a veritable and thriving e-learning industry. The teachers’ roles change in this context—they need to ‘manage’ the classroom and to monitor what the students are actually doing with their phone, thereby transforming ‘the classroom dynamic from lecturing at the front of the room to having no traditional front of the classroom at all’ (Graham, n.d.).

The tensions that have to be navigated here become especially clear with respect to backchannel communication, that is, the use of the second screen for online conversation ‘as a secondary or background complement to an existing frontchannel, which may consist of a professor, teacher, speaker, or lecturer’ (Yardi, 2006, p. 852). The backchannel is always threatening to take over attention from the main focus point and thereby pulling students back into the problematic mode of multitasking—either by going off-topic or by focusing on aspects of the learning situation that do not belong to the content. Exchange that is supposed to augment the frontchannel slips into ‘miscellaneous conversations’ (Du, Rosson, & Carroll, 2012, p. 135), snarking about the manner of presentation, the haircut of the presenter, etc. Often, such ‘[a]ttention issues [are] mentioned in the backchannel itself’ (McCarthy & boyd, 2005, p. 1643).

Extending my selection of examples beyond the classroom to conferences, I want to point to social media researcher danah boyd’s report of a case from her own experience as a presenter. While she gave a talk during the WEB 2.0 Expo in 2009, the attention in the room was overtaken by the backchannel communication where some people commented on boyd’s style of presentation. Reflecting on the experience in a blog post, she states that a Twitter stream ‘forces the audience to pay attention [to] the backchannel. So even audience members who want to focus on the content get distracted’ (boyd, 2009a). Quite similarly to TV shows which are made more eventful in reaction to second screen use, the conference talk (which, ironically, compared broadcast and online modes of attention [boyd 2009b]) needs to adapt to compete (or interrelate) with the attention-sucking backchannel, according to boyd:

‘Had I known about the Twitter stream, I would’ve given a more pop-y talk that would’ve bored anyone who has heard me speak before and provided maybe 3–4 nuggets of information for folks to chew on. It would’ve been funny and quotable but it wouldn’t have been content-wise memorable.’ (boyd, 2009a)

Media use that is supposed to be augmenting an already established communication situation can thus provoke changes in the content and form of teaching, so that multitasking gets modulated into continual partial attention and actually heightens instead of damages the attention. An advice book on backchannel communication has an entire chapter titled ‘Making your ideas Twitter-friendly’ (Atkinson, 2009). Interestingly, another suggestion for disciplining the backchannel is to display it for everybody. Snarking is thus avoided through a form of public monitoring (Yardi, 2006, p. 855). Additionally, the presenter is expected to have an eye on the back-

11 The limitations of this concept of the social are e.g. outlined by Lacey (2013) and Peters (2005).
channel as well—though some authors also warn that the audience might not like it when a speaker pays more attention to backchannel than to the content of the actual presentation (Atkinson, 2009, p. 25).

This tricky balance is the main rationale behind the development and promotion of special appliances that frame and tame distraction or multitasking similarly to the second screen apps of television: quizzes students can take part in during lectures, the results of which can be immediately integrated into the slides of the teachers, etc. If a lecture would not be sufficiently ‘live’, the Polleverywhere app, for instance, aims to integrate a ‘moment of excitement’ into lectures when ‘live results flash on the wall’; a professor’s testimonial on their webpage claims: ‘Poll Everywhere helps me keep my overworked residents awake when I talk!’ For conferences and business meetings, the ‘event software provider’ Lintelus presented its second screen technologies as the ‘best tools for engaging the audience’. They are supposed to transform ‘a simple presentation’ into ‘an attention-grabbing interactive experience for all’ by ‘personalizing the experience for every attendee’ and allowing the participants to ‘chat with other participants’.

We might very well doubt whether chatting with other conference participants during a talk does in fact connect presenter and audiences ‘like never before’ (as is also claimed). Significantly, however, the debate takes for granted that attention for different media is no longer considered a zero-sum game and that only the mix of different media creates liveness, collectively shared focus and continuing engagement. As with television’s second screen assemblage, the interconnection of different forms of perception (e.g. ‘passively’ listening, ‘actively’ texting) promises to harvest different modes of attention and thereby changes the very temporality of the involved activities and technologies. In teaching, as in watching television, the ‘specificities’ of different media are only invoked and addressed to be modulated in the dynamic assemblage that is constantly re-arranged, distributing attention across the multiple screens. The function of teacher / lecturer is not just augmented through the additional media, but it becomes more volatile and strategic—being the main attraction for some moments while functioning as mere inducer and organizer of further activities at others.

12 E-learning company Socrative promises: ‘through the use of real time questioning, instant result aggregation and visualization, teachers can gauge the whole class’ current level of understanding. Socrative saves teachers time so the class can further collaborate, discuss, extend and grow as a community of learners’ (“Socrative,” n.d.).

13 The quotes where retrieved from the webpage of Lintelus (lintelus.com), which is no longer accessible; an instructional video with a similar rhetoric is still available on (Lintelus, 2014).

6. Conclusion

In teaching as in television, what was previously considered to be a dominant center of collective attention is very much re-organized in a multiple-media landscape. Interestingly, this past dominance is questioned and supported by new media which appear as competitors but quickly become supplements—partly reanimating established features, partly creating new ones. The assemblage, television (and teaching) becomes part of, seems neither defined by the affordances of each of the involved devices and platforms, nor by the diagram of their connections and interrelations. It is rather the problematizations that are articulated through the transformation of this assemblage that endow it with particular functions and dynamics; one and the same platform or device—e.g. what we used to call television—at times is strategically harnessed for some of its established characteristics but at other moments becomes transformed beyond recognition. This is not yet the end of television, indeed; some of its traditional features gain a new dynamic in the complementary relationship with new technologies. While it becomes more and more difficult to point at one device or one mode of media use that clearly is television, the contemporary problematizations of the media assemblage re-adapt features that gain all their plausibility from the history and current transformations of television.

The endeavor to convert multitasking into simultaneous and interrelated (or ‘continuous partial’) attention is one of the dominant problematizations of contemporary media assemblages. The second screen’s entanglement with the problem of attention continues a trend that goes back to at least the 19th century: while technical media have long provoked concerns about human attention, they have simultaneously been appropriated to gauge and manage attention (and distraction) so that it can be harvested, sold, and exploited. It is hardly an exaggeration to state that without media, attention wouldn’t exist—neither as epistemic object, nor as an everyday concern of common people. While people might have always paid attention (or not) to things happening, the ‘imperative of a concentrated attentiveness’ (Crary, 2001, p. 1) could only start shaping subjectivities when different media, each with a specific temporal structure, compete for attention at work places and in leisure time. Attention can thus best be conceived of as ‘the contingent product of changing relations between individuals, collectivities, technological conditions, and social habits’ (Read, 2014).

The increasing diversity and ubiquity of media forms and devices provoked by digital and mobile media is often described as a dynamic that divests each individual and society at large of the basic capability to self-determine when to pay attention and to what. Barbara Stafford claims that ‘the proliferation of autopoeitic devices and zombie media’ (Stafford, 2009, p.
289) takes the distinction between what matters and what doesn’t out of our hands (or rather our minds); Giorgio Agamben states that no one captured by television or a cell phone can ‘acquire a new subjectivity’ (Agamben, 2009, p. 21). Jonathan Crary, in his aptly titled book 24/7, argues that television was an important step in adapting our attention and experience to capitalism’s ‘uninterrupted operation of markets, information networks, and other systems.’ (Crary, 2014, p. 9) With ever more media and their respective ‘infinite cafeteria of solicitation and attraction perpetually available, 24/7 disables vision through processes of homogenization, redundancy, and acceleration.’ (Crary, 2014, p. 33) While Crary does not discuss the second screen explicitly, it can easily be understood as one of the strategies of further intensification he hints at: ‘24/7 capitalism is not simply a continuous or sequential capture of attention, but also a dense layering of time, in which multiple operations or attractions can be attended to in near-simultaneity, regardless of where one is or whatever else one might be doing.’ (Crary, 2014, p. 84)

With respect to the examples from the TV industry and from the context of teaching, I would however also like to highlight the heterogeneity and the fragility of the second screen’s modes of attention. The different narrative forms of television each already allow their own specific combination of attention and distraction (Pape, 2014). The second screen additionally exemplifies that attention for a show or a lecture—and even more so attention 24/7—is at the moment considered to be best enabled by entangling different and competing temporalities. This can be understood as yet another overstraining of the individual’s perceptual capabilities characterizing industrial capitalism and urban life since the 19th century. It can, however, also be taken as another example of modernity’s ambivalent constitution of attention, summarized by Crary himself (referring to Sigmund Freud’s description of a public place in Rome): Instead of a seamless regime ‘it will be a patchwork of fluctuating effects in which individuals and groups continually reconstitute themselves—either creatively or reactively’ (Crary, 2001, p. 370). In a similar vein, Tiziana Terranova argues that new media’s capture of attention (and, I would add, the second screen’s combination of TV- and group-likeness) can ably develop new forms of social attention and ‘trigger the emergence of a new collective organization’ (Terranova, 2012, p. 12).

Additionally, I hope my analysis has shown that the second screen assemblage produces as many attention problems and tensions as it offers solutions. Attention, thus, is not something that media quite simply capture, manufacture, or manipulate; rather it is one of several problematizations that structure the assemblage of heterogeneous elements. The idea of the specific affordances of different media, on the one hand, is unavoidable for the management of attention. Television with its rich history of industrial and reformist strategies fighting the worrying distractive or time-wasting affordances of the medium still remains a major reference point here. On the other hand, the distribution of attention across devices and media forms has become one of the key concepts that allow for the entanglement of different media in an assemblage that mediates each of their characteristic qualities. Media studies should not focus on the unlimited capturing capabilities of the increasingly connected media machinery alone, but also on the wider cultural problems that are more articulated than solved by the ongoing transformation of the media assemblage. Here, television figures less as one medium that continues or ceases to exist than as a set of traditions, concerns and strategies that contributes to this transformation.
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