Broadcasting Multiculturalism: Migrant Representation and Participation in Irish Radio

Kathleen Moylan
Dublin Institute of Technology

Follow this and additional works at: http://arrow.dit.ie/appadoc
Part of the Film and Media Studies Commons

Recommended Citation

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 3.0 License
Broadcasting Multiculturalism: 
Migrant Representation and Participation 
in Irish Radio

Kathleen Moylan, M.A., M.A.
Submitted for the Award of Doctor of Philosophy
Dublin Institute of Technology

Supervisors: Brian O’Neill, Alan Grossman
School of Media
December 2009
DECLARATION

I certify that this thesis which I now submit for examination for the award of Doctor of Philosophy, is entirely my own work and has not been taken from the work of others, save and to the extent that such work has been cited and acknowledged within the text of my work.

This thesis was prepared according to the regulations for postgraduate study by research of the Dublin Institute of Technology and has not been submitted in whole or in part for another award in any Institute.

The work reported on in this thesis conforms to the principles and requirements of the Institute's guidelines for ethics in research.

The Institute has permission to keep, lend or copy this thesis in whole or in part, on condition that any such use of the material of the thesis be duly acknowledged.

Signature 

Date 16.12.09
Broadcasting Multiculturalism
Migrant Representation and Participation in Irish Radio

In the cultural context of recent inward migration to Ireland, this research focuses on migrant representation on Irish radio. Employing diverse approaches drawn from cultural studies and public sphere theory, this study examines radio programmes produced by and about new Irish migrant communities, and the ways in which ‘diversity’ is framed and managed by national and EU broadcast policy. This work incorporates analyses of programme content and broadcast policy in relation to Irish national public service broadcasting (Radio Telefís Éireann) and Dublin community radio.

In this research I identify the ways in which new migrant communities are represented in public service and community radio, considering both the representation of such communities and the production of programming by them. I focus on programme content, including strategies of delivery and articulation, topic selection and the use of ‘experts’ on diversity to frame a programme item. This research is additionally and centrally directed by critical avenues of enquiry drawn from approaches critiquing multiculturalism, the transnational public sphere and transcultural production.

The study is further framed by an examination of those Irish and European broadcasting policies in both the public service and community sectors informing the institutional remit of RTÉ and Dublin community radio. Close reading of selected programme content alongside policy developments comprises an in-depth study of the ways in which migrant communities are represented by Radio Telefís Éireann and the strategies through which Dublin community radio has facilitated opportunities for migrant self-representation. This scrutiny of informing broadcast policies, particularly at a moment of considerable change in definitions of both public service media and community radio at European policy levels, situates readings of ethnic and migrant representation within larger concerns about how these representations can or should continue to be effected.

Drawing, therefore, from several theoretical areas of enquiry and upon practitioner interviews, qualitative programme readings and policy analysis, this study contributes to a comprehensive and current analysis of how ethnic and migrant communities are represented across Irish radio.
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Introduction

Multietnic Ireland and the Possibilities of Transcultural Radio:

Re-framing the Irish National Imaginary

In order to come close to enabling participatory parity, in however rough and ready a fashion, “proto-cosmopolitan public spheres” would have to be completely transformed. To give just some examples: there would have to be a change of media agenda, from a focus on events that happen to wealthy and powerful figures and nations to detailed explorations of the interdependencies of people’s lives in the North and South; there would need to be representation from the perspectives of those most disadvantaged by the global political economy, and translation across languages and cultures of the concerns of all those involved; if grassroots perspectives are to be heard and taken seriously, [and] greater openness to debate in repressive states would be necessary.

(Nash 2007: 56)

Cultural Context: The Persistence of Whiteness in the Irish Media

In autumn 2006, I attended a public debate held in Dublin organised to explore the opportunities for migrant participation in Irish media. The debate topic, ‘Is the Irish Media Hideously White?’ recognised that the mainstream Irish media was overwhelmingly represented by white Irish voices, and the stated purpose of the debate was consequently to facilitate discussion on ways in which migrants could be incorporated into the Irish mainstream media environment. However, three years on Irish mainstream broadcast media remains primarily populated by white Irish producers as well as presenters, suggesting that despite such discursive initiatives little has changed. This research investigates how migrants are represented, and provided with opportunities for self-representation, across Irish radio within this cultural context.
The continuing polarisation of white Irish and migrant publics could be heard and observed during the debate. ‘Is the Irish Media Hideously White?’ was sponsored by Suas Educational Development in conjunction with Concern, and held in September 2006. An all white panel featured three media practitioners, a union representative, a representative of the Irish national broadcaster and an academic and was thus comprised of a combination of elites (an academic, a broadcaster from commercial station Newstalk and a columnist from the Independent newspaper) and those more aware of the margins occupied by migrant communities (a Polish cable television broadcaster and the representative of the National Union of Journalists). The audience for this debate, by my observation, included representatives from migrant communities and white Irish speakers from grassroots and state funded agencies promoting diversity. ‘Is the Irish Media Hideously White?’ primarily provided a mainstream media practitioner perspective, and thus most panellists spoke from a position of relative privilege in terms of their regular participation in mainstream media.

At the start, the panel’s Chair, a programme host and reporter for commercial radio, stated the aim of the discussion was to discover ‘how to incorporate more people from different nationalities into the Irish media.’ The academic contributor problematised the question:

Is the Irish media open and porous and are there routes of access to people who are coming to live in Ireland who are maybe keen to have a future here and who may want to address their own issues, or have some level of monitoring the accuracy of the ways they are represented, and who also want to have careers?

(Titley, 28 September 2006)
A representative of the Irish branch of the National Union of Journalists (NUJ) observed that the NUJ supports migrants ‘getting into media’, and describes migrant participation in the Irish media: ‘It’s very much niche broadcasting, niche publications. For instance, there is no mainstream broadcaster who is black’ (Brady, 28 September 2006). The Polish presenter for City Channel, a cable television station with restricted audience access, argued digital media can provide space for migrant programming where the national broadcaster does not:

I think it [the Irish media] is white. That’s my answer. But it is going into the right direction, right? .... A national broadcaster has to provide for a general audience, so, you know, there is not that much space for the niche market. However, maybe there is a future with a digital TV station where they actually can provide for those niche audiences.’

(Chudwicka, 28 September 2006)

The Chair then suggested that migrant communities should demonstrate more ‘proactivity’ in approaching the media:

I think there needs to be more proactivity from people within these communities, to get in touch with the media as well, to tell us what’s going on... but to know their ways into that, how to do that, which can be a really challenging barrier.

(Coleman, 28 September 2006)

The Chair next introduced the panellist representing the Irish national broadcaster, stating: ‘Clearly [national broadcaster] RTÉ should be the organisation that should be pushing this agenda...moving us forward in this direction’ (Coleman, 28 September 2006). The representative’s response emphasised the importance of addressing ‘a reasonably sized audience’:
We want to bring the issues not just to an audience but to a reasonably sized audience, the maximum audience that RTÉ can reach. So I think it’s important to have that style of programming that will bring people to the programme.

(McMahon, 28 September 2006)

In response, the Chair asked: ‘What about… putting in front of a camera somebody who is not Irish, somebody who may come from a different ethnic background, maybe getting them on air as well?’, adding ‘If you really want to connect with different nationalities in your country, do you not need people at the cutting edge, being producers, who have that connection?’ (Coleman, 28 September 2006). The representative replied that it took time ‘to develop people into these kinds of roles’ and stated he was working on a proposal for programmes which would ‘select people who would make programmes about people who have come to this country with multicultural backgrounds and make programmes about their experiences here’. His vague and repeated use of ‘people’ left it unclear as to whether he was referring to migrants as potential producers or simply as programme subjects, yet he was not asked for further clarification.

For the most part, the debate served to reinforce a status quo in which the majority of the Irish media is comprised of white Irish practitioners, rather than to challenge it. Recurring questions during the debate focused on the possibilities for regulation of the representation of diversity in the Irish media, the proposed development of migrant language programming and the expansion of national broadcaster’s role in facilitating greater migrant representation; all questions which remain open today.
Why Radio?

This research was first conceived of as an investigation into the ways in which migrants are represented in the Irish public sphere and to uncover what avenues, if any, exist for migrant self-representation. Increased inward migration into Ireland has been a significant consequence of the Irish economic boom commonly referred to as the Celtic Tiger, following the substantial increase in employment opportunities provided by economic growth.\(^3\) For the first time in Irish history, there has been more inward migration than emigration. Thus this study began with the question: how are migrants represented in the Irish media, and specifically how is that representation effected within a cultural context posited as historically homogenous? Essential studies have been conducted on migrant representation on Irish television and in Irish film and print media.\(^4\)

Radio, with its potential to function as a forum facilitating two-way, reciprocal discussion, is a medium ideally positioned to explore and give voice to the diverse experiences of members of migrant communities and settled white Irish alike in the context of a sizeable and previously unprecedented inward migration.\(^5\) By identifying and scrutinising the divergent ways in which migrants are represented on Irish radio, I undertook to explore the ways in which migrant experience was articulated in one area of Irish media. This research therefore takes radio as its object and subject, in an interdisciplinary attempt to examine the representation of migrant communities as both subjects of and speakers on Irish radio programmes.

While Ireland has become multiracial in the last decade, with a substantial growth in inward migration to the country beginning even earlier, Irish mainstream airwaves remain
primarily vocalised by settled white Irish voices. The national broadcaster RTÉ, as well as commercial radio, largely broadcasts radio programmes produced as well as presented by settled white Irish people. It quickly became clear during my initial research into multicultural programming on RTÉ Radio that migrants were represented by the public broadcaster primarily in relation to their difference or their ‘otherness’; as will be argued, these representations celebrated their difference and coded it as exotic. Migrant contributors were generally asked about the food, clothing, music or rituals they retained from their sending countries, instead of asked about their opinions on everyday issues, such as transport, health or other aspects of everyday life. While there was some coverage of infrastructural issues directly affecting or involving migrant communities, these programmes mainly served to passively depict contributors’ perspectives. Crucially, neither of the selected programmes from the two series produced by RTÉ under discussion substantially challenged institutional racism. RTÉ’s multicultural programmes were produced with a white settled Irish audience in mind (interview with RTÉ radio producer Aonghus MacAnally, 16 December 2005).

In contrast, I soon discovered that migrant-produced programmes produced by Dublin community radio provide opportunities for migrant self-representation. The selected community radio programme under scrutiny in this research incorporates a critique of racism in media representation and at the level of legislation, with reference to newspaper coverage of migrants and a comparison between immigration legislation for Irish citizens in the US and legislation for new migrants in Ireland. Because the programme is migrant-produced, the two African migrants who produce and present the show choose what
stories they want to focus on so can feature stories of migrant interest, or exercise a right of reply in relation to reductive media coverage of migrants through critiquing such coverage on the programme.

Programme content is explored through several intersecting lines of enquiry. The representation of race is examined and critiqued using theories of critical multiculturalism, which situate reductive representations of diversity in a simplistic, celebratory multiculturalism which provides limited space for migrant articulation. Analysis of the broadcast spaces (institutional and ideological) within which these programmes are produced draws from theories of the public sphere which identify alternative locations for migrant self-representation in counterpublics and an emerging transnational public sphere, the possibilities of which are outlined by Nash (2007), above. The cultural context within which these programmes are created and broadcasted is introduced and explored here, with a view to introducing a conceptualisation of an Irish national imaginary which further informs my analysis of programmes content alongside the theoretical frameworks noted above. As scholarship on radio remains a relatively small area of academic study (Lewis 2000), I approach analysis of selected radio programme content through this interdisciplinary critical and methodological framework, focusing on the ways in which ‘difference’ is represented in relation to new migrant communities and identifying and exploring the aural avenues for migrant self-representation on Irish radio. An interdisciplinary approach is predicated here on my perceptions of the demands of the object itself, as in Hall’s (1990) description of a cultural studies approach to research, where he argues that cultural studies is and has been
‘an adaptation to its terrain; it has been a conjunctural practice. It has always developed from a different matrix of interdisciplinary studies and disciplines’ (Hall 1990: 11).

The arguments in this thesis are framed by two further critical perspectives comprising a meta-theory which takes the representation of an Irish imaginary as its object. Robins (2006) charts current and future broadcasting territory in the context of European cultural policy in relation to the representation, and self-representation, of migrant communities within his analysis of the current European media landscape and his recommendations for future directions in European cultural policy. Robins’ look forward is balanced by a historical and cultural analysis located in Anderson’s (1991) critique of the evolution of imagined communities in the European cultural context, which charts the ways in which ‘imagined communities’ developed and the ideological impetus behind their inception and growth. Anderson thus provides an ideological critique for this research’s suggestion of an Irish national imaginary located particularly in those programmes under scrutiny which were produced by the Irish national broadcaster. The concept of a national imaginary is identified by Appadurai (1996) as embodying ‘a new role for the imagination in social life’ (Appadurai 1996: 31), which he develops as follows:

To grasp this new role, we need to bring together the old idea of images, especially mechanically produced images (in the Frankfurt School sense); the idea of the imagined community (in Anderson’s sense); and the French idea of the imaginary (imaginaire) as a constructed landscape of collective aspirations.

(ibid.)

It is this sense of conceiving of an imaginary located in and reinforced by a nation’s constructed idea of itself that I draw from here in employing the critical term ‘national
imaginary'. Against this national imaginary and explored in more detail below, Robins' (2006) exploration of the functions of transcultural media production serves as a theoretical framework for discussion of transcultural articulation and the forms this can take in Irish radio programme content.

I attempt, however, to move beyond a simple dichotomy between a problematised conception of nationhood, as explored by both Anderson and Robins in different ways, and the evolution of transcultural media production which transcends earlier conceptions of a nation state. Instead, following Robins and to a lesser degree Anderson, I attempt to suggest a dialectical relationship incorporating strategies of the national imaginary and of migrant articulation facilitated by transcultural production, as they are located in the diverse forms of migrant representation and participation in Irish radio. In particular, the arguments of Anderson and Robins have suggested to me tangible ways to widen a critical reading of locally produced radio programmes by locating them within overarching structures of nationalising narratives, while Robins, in his discussion of migrant and ethnic media use, additionally provides a map of sorts for identifying avenues for transcultural articulation.

**Interrogating a White Irish identity**

To situate this study’s key concerns of the multicultural framing of migrant representation on the one hand, and the potential offered by alternative spheres for migrant production on the other, I briefly explore here the problematic construction of an Irish settled white identity which continues to inform the public sphere within which the
programmes under scrutiny were broadcast. Lentin and McVeigh (2002) argue that Irishness, that is, those qualities seen as constituting an Irish subject position and characterising the national imaginary, must be closely scrutinised in order to make sense of Irish responses to recent inward migration. They write:

We start from the premise that the emergence of the current phase in Irish racism is neither “natural” nor inevitable. It has to be explained and linked to broader ideas about the very concept of Irishness itself. This develops the notion of the specificities of Irish racism. Racism is not a given; its existence in Irish society (as elsewhere) needs to be situated. In particular, we have to make sense of the contradictory location of Ireland in racialised discourses.

(Lentin and McVeigh 2002: 7)

Lentin and McVeigh assert that ‘we see Ireland and Irishness racialised in different and contradictory ways’ (ibid.: 8). Irish history has been one of colonisation over centuries, typified by slavery, war, starvation and forced emigration and latterly manifested as anti-Irish racism in cities where the Irish diaspora has settled. Yet at the same time, ‘Ireland is empowered by its whiteness, by its Europeaness and by the advancement of Irish blocs in other countries such as the USA’ (ibid.). These dual historical constructions have resulted in Ireland being both ‘a perpetuator and survivor of racism’ (ibid.).

Dyer (1997) observes that whiteness is represented in the public sphere as normative; hence its ‘invisibility’ as a raced or subject position, as he argues: ‘The invisibility of whiteness as a racial position in white (which is to say dominant) discourse is of a piece with its ubiquity’ (Dyer 1997: 3). Dyer’s description of how whiteness functions is pertinent here: ‘For those in power in the West, as long as whiteness is felt to be the human condition, then it alone both defines normality and fully inhabits it’ (ibid.: 9).
Frankenburg (1993) argues for the importance of ‘naming’ whiteness, noting that the resulting recognition of whiteness as itself a construction makes it effectively ‘visible’: ‘Naming “whiteness” displaces it from the unmarked, unnamed status that is itself an effect of its dominance. Among the effects on white people both of race privilege and of the dominance of whiteness are their seeming normativity, their structured invisibility.’ (Frankenburg 1993: 6). I suggest that a settled white Irish identity position occupies this normative place in the national imaginary. While a culturally specific ‘Irishness’ retains a strong cultural and historical currency in the Irish diaspora, signifying a diverse range of qualities which persist in the public imagination even while they are recognized as stereotypical, within Ireland itself white settled Irishness remains fully the norm in the mainstream public sphere. This is tangibly evidenced in the above analysis of the debate on the prevalence of whiteness in the Irish mainstream media.

Dyer’s analysis of a constructed, pervasive and hence ‘invisible’ whiteness is predicated on a historically and culturally specific whiteness; he describes ‘the notion that some whites are whiter than others, with the Anglo-Saxons, Germans and Scandinavians usually providing the apex of whiteness under British imperialism, US development and Nazism’ (Dyer 1997: 19). Within a hierarchy of whiteness, then, Latino and Jewish peoples, as well as the Irish, are represented as ethnically white but also occupying their own disparate, cultural and historically delineated category. Thus within this normative whiteness, the Irish emerge as culturally distinct, consciously retaining and reinforcing a cultural capital from the Celtic Revival onwards. The schism that emerges when reading Dyer’s critique in relation to Irishness introduces a duality inherent to a normative Irish
identity which can be contradictory, remains problematic, and continues to be evident in the representation of a white settled Irishness in the public sphere.

Ignatiev (1995) argues for a commonality between the Irish and black communities in the US from the time of the Civil War. His book title, ‘How the Irish became White’, itself signifies a conscious change in public perception of Irishness in US cultural (and economic) consciousness, while Ignatiev suggests a deliberate disavowal of a certain Irish cultural heritage by stating: ‘in becoming white the Irish ceased to be green’ (Ignatiev 1995: 3). Ignatiev’s study, broadly speaking, charts the movement by the Irish in the US from one of ‘otherness’, derived from their subject position of being migrants, to the occupation of a position of relative privilege, acquiring elements of a normative whiteness. It is this capacity for movement between ‘otherness’, characterised by empathy for other members of postcolonial states, to state one example, to normative whiteness and the occupation of a position of relative power, that I characterise as ‘duality’ here and attempt to explore below. This fluidity of Irish identity is often characterised as, but is not necessarily limited to, a seemingly contradictory duality typified by Irish political and historical sympathy with other postcolonial subjects on the one hand and an alignment with the dominant culture and political position of western European white identity on the other. This latter alignment became increasingly apparent with the emergence of a successful economy in the mid to late 1990s.
Symptoms of Duality: The Look Backwards and the Emergence of Enterprise Ireland

As Ireland’s national imaginary, the ways in which it is represented and how those representations are reinforced centrally informs my arguments in this research, I explore here elements of its construction. Ireland’s history as a postcolonial nation has contributed to what has been described as a ‘Third World’ empathy, a commonality of experience between the Irish and other members of postcolonial countries (Gibbons 2002). At the same time, Ireland’s identity as a postcolonial nation centrally informed how Ireland represented itself to itself. Fanning (2002) recognises a duality in the conscious construction of Irishness in the nineteenth century. On the one hand, this construction was a response to anti-Irish racism perpetuated in the service of British colonisation of Ireland. As Fanning argues:

The rhetoric of Catholic nationalism was in many ways a response to racism within Victorian representations of the Irish. The racial construct of the idealised Gael provided an ideological mechanism for the expression of anti-Protestant sectarianism within cultural movements. It served a similar nation-building purpose as colonial racisms which depicted the Catholic Irish and other colonised people as inferior within Britishness.

(Fanning 2002: 33)

On the other hand, the form of that construction and the descriptors it drew on was itself, at least in part, informed by British Protestant conceptions of Irishness:

Irish-Ireland cultural nationalism owed much to Protestant formulations of Gaelic culture in its rejection of urban secularism and opposition the imported mass culture. It also evoked an idealised ruralism which embodied values which were seen as distinct from British culture.

(ibid.: 34)
At the same time, Irish Catholicism was being challenged within a wider European context in which Protestantism was dominant (Cleary 2006). The nation-building project of the Celtic Revival of the nineteenth century served a key purpose: to reinstate a focus on a historically rich Irish culture as a response to established British colonialism (Dewey 1974).

Roddy Doyle’s frequently quoted line from his novel The Commitments,7 naming the Irish as ‘the niggers of Europe’ had in the late 1980s a pervasive cultural relevance. If the Irish could empathise with those in postcolonial countries on the basis of shared broad experiences of colonialism in the past, Ireland in the 1980s could also empathise with poorer countries in Europe, if not in Africa or Asia, bypassed by the First World economic boom of the 1980s. Gibbons (2002) both explains the use of this line (and the scene it comes from) and problematises that usage: while the film went on release at the start of the 1990s, the source novel was written in the mid- to late 1980s, a time of economic depression and emigration in Ireland. Rather than referencing a new, global brand of Irishness (which would have been premature in 1991 in any case), the scene both documents that acute economic depression and references a specific, postcolonial theoretical position, as Gibbons argues: ‘[t]he legitimacy of the claim that the Irish are the ‘niggers of Europe’, and so on, only makes sense by reconnecting with a colonial legacy in which Ireland was indeed a Third World at the back door of Europe’ (Gibbons 2002: 94).
Yet historically, as recognised by Lentin and McVeigh (2002, 2006), the Irish have also practiced and perpetuated racism. Fanning argues that the project of nation-building in Ireland was characterised in the nineteenth century by consciously exclusionist conceptions of Irish identity, which manifested in recurring racist practices, characterised by a ‘sociogenesis of homogeneity linked to nationalism’:

A process of nation-building which has contributed to contemporary Irish society and the development of the Irish state has been accompanied by a politics of national identity within which claims of social membership of various minority groups were discounted through racialised discourses which distinguished these from the “true” Irish.

(Fanning 2002: 30)

Additionally, in a wider context of colonisation, Irish migrants to America often found work in slave plantations in the nineteenth century, yet during the same period, the Irish staged a protest against slavery in 1841 (Ignatiev 1995: 1) calling upon Irish-Americans to support them.

At the time of the economic boom in the mid-1990s, the Irish national imaginary was steeped in a foregrounded sense of its culture, characterised by an Irish brand of Catholicism historically linked with nationalism; the stereotypical legacy of the island of saints and scholars, and a strong sense of local community, further inflected by the conflict in the North. McLoone (2007) argues that in the Irish context,

...the essentialist notions that underlie dominant conceptions of “Irishness” can be seen on the one hand as ideologically conservative and analytically restrictive, privileging “nature” over culture and alluding to a deep essence of Irishness that withstands historical change.

(McLoone 2007: 145)
Cleary depicts the conflict in the North as 'a strange late colonial war' which has become 'an even stranger and still-unsettled "peace"' (Cleary 2006: 1). He identifies several areas of cultural consequence: 'the failed revolution; in the deep internal divisions and self-contradictions within both communities at a time of shock and loss; in the deadlock or stalemate of a blocked and apparently static period; in the difficulty of reconciling equal and yet antithetical rights' (Cleary 2006: 259). These diverse effects of the conflict were explored through cultural forms and expression in Northern Ireland including theatre (Cleary 2006) and community television (Nolan 1997).

The newfound public prosperity resulting from the economic boom led to a sense that a historical background characterised by poverty and typified by a rural sensibility could be relegated firmly to the past. Cleary (2006) describes the ways in which a former Ireland, characterised as 'de Valera’s Ireland' has been superseded:

[I]n the parlance of much contemporary cultural debate “de Valera’s Ireland” now serves as a reflex shorthand for everything from economic austerity to sexual Puritanism, from cultural philistinism to the abuse of women and children.

(Cleary 2006: 7)

Cleary goes to make the point that ‘for contemporary” Ireland to emerge….it had first to create the “de Valera’s Ireland” that would be its repudiated antithesis’ (Cleary 2006: 8). Additionally, Catholicism’s appropriation by Irish nationalism was superseded, according to Cleary (2006) by consumer culture:

What has emerged in the wake of the old Catholic-nationalist order is best understood perhaps not simply as “secularization” but, more comprehensively, as a wholesale reconstruction of Irish middle-class subjectivity, now decreasingly
defined in terms of participatory citizenship or of adherence to communal Church practices, and articulated instead in terms of individual capacity to participate in various modes of consumer lifestyle.

(Cleary 2006: 95)

One symptom of this perceived ‘break’ or rupture with ‘the past’ has been an apparent superseding of ‘the local’ in Ireland, historically located in rural Ireland and comprised of established networks of ‘family and friends in small communities bounded by geography, by ‘the global’, characterised abstractly by flows of capital and culture, manifested most tangibly in urban Dublin, which had reinvented itself as a ‘global’ cosmopolitan city often at the expense of its intensely localised cultural resonances.

Another symptom was an ideological movement away from a recognised cultural and political empathy between Ireland and other poorer, disadvantaged nations in the 1980s (Gibbons 2002). Instead, Ireland’s shiny new prosperity signalled a rupture in empathy with poorer nations and their concerns. Yet both symptoms masked the effects of globalisation and its local as well as international effects. Gibbons, arguing against the existence of a perceived cultural ‘break’, suggests:

In this configuration, the local is no longer outside but is a point within the system - and at certain junctures, a stress point that connects new “Third World” alignments with the memories of one’s own “Third World” past. Thus, while critics denigrate the establishment of historical affinities between Irish society and developing nations, the reality of globalisation is that Ireland is coming into far greater contact with outlying regions of the world economy - and, as immigration shows, with the casualties as well as the beneficiaries of the new world order.

(Gibbons 2002: 101)

Gibbons problematises a self-referential cultural critique inherent in Irish cultural production, arguing this emerged as a version of national therapy; his arguments are
particularly reflexive in that his work often contributes to this project. Gibbons identifies 'one of the key features of the Irish situation being the early role assumed by nationalism in arresting, if not entirely reversing, the annexation of a culture - an example followed on a worldwide scale by the wave of decolonisation after the Second World War' (Gibbons 2002: 94). Anderson (1991) further describes a cultural 'amnesia' which emerges at times of social and/or political change: 'All profound changes in consciousness, by their very nature, bring with them characteristic amnesias. Out of such oblivions, in specific historical circumstances, spring narratives' (Anderson 1991: 204). The 'normalising narrative' (Gibbons 2002: 91) which emerged following the first flush of the newly successful economy took the form of a break between an antiquated, impoverished, rural Ireland and the gleaming new cosmopolitan Ireland which materialised, apparently in the wake (or at the wake) of the old.

Part of Ireland's movement into public prosperity was marked by the further commodification of 'Irishness' abroad. In addition to an established reputation for producing 'saints and scholars' as well as for producing Guinness, modern Ireland began promoting cultural exports in the 1990s, from The Commitments movie to 'Riverdance' to the international success of Limerick band The Cranberries to recurring Eurovision victories.11 Meanwhile, the romanticised nostalgia of an idealised Ireland, characterised by the 'backward look' in cultural production from film to theatre to literature and located within a sentimentalised, intensely rural landscape, functioned less and less as a mode of critique and more and more as a product of Bord Fáilte, the Irish tourism board; a calling card of Irishness for the Irish diaspora as well as for settled white Irish wistfully
reinforcing a national identity characterised by rich history and saints and scholars, located firmly in a hermetically sealed past and reinforced in Irish cultural production. More crucially, the postcolonial empathy previously located in an Irish identity subject position was in danger of being superseded by a wave of cultural products aimed at ‘selling’ Irishness and Ireland abroad.

Peillon (2002) describes the emergence of the economic boom as ‘only one moment, however dramatic and paradoxical, in the longstanding project of integrating the Irish economy more centrally into world capitalism’ (Peillon 2002: 38), a project which began with Taoiseach Sean Lemass’ introduction and facilitation of the conditions for international investment in Ireland in the 1950s (Gibbons 1996; Peillon 2002). Peillon defines culture in this context:

This anthropological definition of culture, so extended, includes practices and institutions as well as ideas and beliefs, and this equation of culture and society simply renders it impossible to analyse the relationship between culture and other aspects of society. By culture, I will simply refer to the way people represent the world in which they live: the beliefs they embrace, the ideas they hold, the feelings they express, and the meaning according to which they act.

(Peillon 2002: 39)

Peillon’s (2002) working definition of culture supports his assertion that the economic boom and the resultant celebration of apparently widespread fiscal prosperity brought about a seismic conflation of two forces previously separate in Ireland: the economic and the cultural. Peillon identifies a progressive cultural critique located in Irish literature and reinforced by authors and critics alike. Yet this critique, according to Peillon, didn’t circulate beyond the cultural realm: ultimately it lacked the power to effect and sustain
change. Thus this form of culture and cultural expression ‘formed the basis of an exemplary critique and proved utterly impotent’ (ibid.: 46).

The economic boom signalled a movement in Ireland from a reflexive, internal cultural critique with limited efficacy to a re-invention of culture as commodity, apparent even in the moniker of ‘Celtic Tiger’ subsequently attached to Ireland’s emergent prosperity. Where cultural capital and the consequent framing of the activity of consumption as a cultural endeavour was explored widely in the context of theories of postmodernism in cultural studies, the reality of culture’s commodifying turn only emerged in Ireland with the onset of the economic boom. Where previously the economic and the cultural occupied mainly disparate spheres of influence in Ireland, Peillon argues the economic boom and prosperity of the mid-1990s resulted in a paradigm characterised by the collapse, or conflation, of the one into the other, resulting into a lessening of the efficacy of cultural critique as culture becomes increasingly in service of promoting a now successful economy:

The implosion of economy and culture eliminates the critical distance between these two spheres of activity. It follows that a critique of the socio-economic order, which in Ireland was largely rooted in the cultural sphere, is losing its institutional basis. Most aspects of cultural activity and production are now so integrated into the post-industrial economy, either as a means of production or as a means of consumption, that the very possibility of a critical stance is suppressed or, more simply, not entertained or even imagined.

(ibid.: 52)

This ‘implosion’ of the cultural and economic spheres means the rich and deep cultural critique identified by Peillon and Gibbons is flattened and simplified; cultural expression becomes more accessible but possibly loses its critical efficacy. The cultural circulates
alongside the economic increasingly as a mechanism to bolster and support the celebratory discourses of economic prosperity.

Dyer’s (1997) examination of the ‘invisibility’ of whiteness further informs a reading of the new culture of enterprise which characterized the ‘Celtic Tiger’. Within his analysis of a whiteness typified in part by an entrepreneurial energy and drive, he describes the ‘spirit of enterprise’ as follows:

“Enterprise” is an aspect of both spirit itself - energy, will, ambition, the ability to think and see things through - and of its effect - discovery, science, business, wealth creation, the building of nations, the organization of labour (carried out by racially lesser humans). . . . Enterprise as an aspect of spirit is associated with the concept of will - the control of self and the control of others.

(Dyer 1997: 31)

Unsurprisingly, Dyer links this enterprising spirit with imperialist practices. Yet the above depiction of enterprise, in particular in relation to nation-building and the organization of labour carried out in Ireland in the service and construction industries by migrants, can be read as an apt description of Irish social and political practice during and since the peak of the economic boom. This enterprising spirit is not new to Ireland; Lemass publicly introduced a ‘spirit of enterprise’ in the 1950s by encouraging direct foreign investment in Ireland, effectively representing Ireland as a global brand. Enterprising Ireland during the economic boom built on these investments but also began to incorporate a new approach to buying in and organizing migrant workers for service and manual labour industries in particular. In the public sphere, then, as well as in the economy, migrants were situated as workers in these industries.
In Ireland one effect of the ‘Celtic Tiger’s’ project of commodifying culture has been the packaging of diversity and difference within the project of multiculturalism, as that project and its capacity for commodifying the ‘exotic’ is understood and unpacked by Gordon and Newfield (1996). While the conflation of the cultural and the economic identified by Peillon resulted in the above identified processes of cultural production contributing to and reinforcing the commodifying project of multiculturalism, this collapsed economic/cultural paradigm also functioned to lessen the capacity for political and social critique, of Ireland and its infrastructures in general and of institutional and social obstacles and inequities facing new migrants in particular.

Framing ‘Cultural Diversity’ Beyond the National Imaginary

Devereux et al (2004) recognise how ‘othering discourses’ serve to reinforce an idea of a homogenous Ireland in the media. They argue:

[D]espite the particularity of Irish identity formation in a first world context, the perception of the “other” as a threat to an (we would argue) imagined national or local integrity is not unique to Ireland, nor is the racialisation of that imagined us; this frame encompasses narrative [sic] which portrays the presence of the “other” as a cause of racial conflict, even in countries with much more official recognition of their diversity than Ireland.

(Devereux et al 2004: 9)

Sizeable inward migration to Ireland has been a recent experience. The 2006 Census reported the number of non-Irish resident in Ireland was 419,733, or just under half one million people. As Ireland’s total combined population, again as reported by the 2006 Census, stands at 4,172,013 people, the number of non-Irish resident in Ireland indicated by the Census represents a significant proportion of the country’s population. In her
comprehensive identification and analysis of the characteristics of what she calls a 'global city', Sassen (2001) describes what constitutes a global city: 'The global city represents a strategic space where global processes materialize in national territories and global dynamics run through national institutional arrangements (Sassen 2001: 347). She argues that:

[G]lobalisation is not simply something that is exogenous. It comes partly from the inside of national corporate structures and elites, a dynamic I conceive of as incipient de-nationalisation. There are sites where global processes are indeed experienced as an invasion, as coming from the outside, but the global city is precisely the site where global processes can get activated inside a country with the participation of some of its national actors.

(ibid.)

Sassen's depiction of the circumstances contributing to the creation of a global city can be usefully read in reference to Ireland's economic boom and transnationality. A significant contributing factor to Ireland's economic boom was the provisions made for international investment in the country, encouraging transnational companies to base their headquarters here.

Robins' (2006) critique of the national imaginary in his contribution to the European report, The Challenge of Transcultural Diversities, inevitably introduces a further critique of identity formation within an emerging transnational paradigm. In the introduction to the report, Grossman (2006) argues that, 'while conceding the historical importance of the national framework in fixing and guiding diversity policy, the issues are no longer simply national, but transnational in their nature', and recognises that '[g]lobal mobility, which often occurs without acculturation to existing cultural frameworks, creates new and radical cultural juxtapositions, encounters, exchanges and mixings' (Grossman 2006: 36).
5). Her point regarding a lack of acculturation is an important one; without acculturation migrants may be more likely to rely on their acquired processes of negotiation in the host country, which in turn can lead to those ‘new and radical’ interactions which Grossman describes here. Grossman further encapsulates Robins’ central argument in the report as follows:

The challenge, at the beginning of the twenty-first century, is to respond creatively to this potentially productive, European transcultural landscape. The report insists, however, that one should not construct a false polarisation between this transnational, or global, perspective, on the one hand, and the national perspective, on the other.

(ibid.)

Grossman’s observation here echoes a recurring concern of this study; an impetus to resist relying upon a potentially simplistic binary construct locating ‘the national public sphere’ in opposition to ‘the migrant public sphere’. The European ‘transcultural landscape’ posited potentially supersedes such a dichotomy, particularly if it increases the potential for increased and multifaceted creativity across cultural practices and production.

Robins (2006) asserts that diversity remains framed within a national structure, as part of an overarching understanding of culture as itself framed within a national project. He argues for the necessity to shift public perceptions of culture as inherent to the nation towards a recognition of cultural diversity as inherently multifaceted. Where ‘cultural diversity’ has been acknowledged within a national imaginary, it has functioned as the location of otherness, which in turn (echoing Dyer) serves to reinforce the dominant
national paradigm. Robins describes the implications of this framing on the formation of cultural policy:

For the most part, the agenda for minority policies and politics has tended to be addressed in a strictly national context. The issue has been framed almost exclusively in terms of the relation between national minorities and the national majority population: in terms of the assertion of minority rights to recognition, that is to say, along with the associated responsibilities of national majorities to implement inclusive social and cultural policies.

(Robins 2006: 12)

However, Robins identifies a new discursive context for framing cultural diversity within an emerging transnational paradigm. He argues this new discursive context moves ‘beyond the simplistic “minority/majority” opposition’ in three key ways:

First, in the new discursive context “cultural diversity” has come to be regarded, not any longer in the limited - and problematical - terms of the otherness resented by minorities, but as a constitutive aspect of all cultural orders and spaces. Second, the concept of “diversity” has made it possible to expand mental and imaginative horizons beyond ethnic categorisation, to include other kinds of difference (such as gender, age or sexual orientation). It has worked towards the de-ethnicisation of difference. And, third, it has made it possible to see difference and complexity, no longer as problematical phenomena, but actually as a positive asset and resource for any cultural order. It has validated difference.

(ibid.)

If the ways in which concepts of ‘cultural diversity’ are circulated and understood are changing and evolving, so too is the overarching concept of the national imaginary within a paradigm of globalisation. Robins argues there are two points to be made about the national paradigm: the first is in relation to the way in which the role of culture is envisaged within it and the problematic implications drawn from this about how cultural diversity is represented as inherently within a national paradigm; the second is in relation to the hegemonic nature of the national paradigm, ‘the absolutely central, and seemingly
self-evident, sovereignty that it has assumed in social theory and policy, including the
capacity to obscure alternative cultural imaginations’ (ibid.: 20). He identifies the concept
of commonality as construed in this context:

An imagined community is organised around a shared collective identity, an
identity that each person shares with all the other “members” of the community. A
culture in common, a unitary culture, comes to be valued and cultivated as a
mechanism for collective cultural bonding.

(ibid.)

It is this hegemonic commonality that can be seen in public service broadcasting’s
historical project of reinforcing a singular national culture predicated on a predetermined,
majority national identity, as will be explored further. Robins goes on to examine the
implications of this reinforced ‘unitary’ identity for those who are ‘other’ within it:

There is consequently an inherent resistance to those who do not have things in
common, who do not belong - “them”, meaning both outsiders and diverse
populations within. Those within are marginalised, or minoritised, in order not to
compromise the “clarity” of the imagined community. And with respect to the
others outside, the national community seeks to differentiate itself, to maintain its
fundamental discreteness, protecting its borders and asserting its sovereignty; to
belong to the community is to be contained within a bounded culture.

(ibid.)

Instead, Robins suggests a fundamentally different way of conceiving of the national
frame which allows progression from the binary structure which facilitates the
minoritising practices outlined above. The relationship between the processes of
globalisation and the nation state have been structured in oppositional terms representing
the forces of globalisation as ultimately stronger and more resilient than those of the
nation state, contributing to a reading of globalisation as the newest form of capitalism
(Smith 1997). The movement from the era of the nation state to that of a globalised
economy is drawn from a historicised perspective: thus the shift is simply from one era to
the next, along a Hegelian trajectory of history. To adequately represent the transnational
paradigm, Robins suggests instead a geological metaphor which tangibly allows the
nation state, and its attendant persistent resonance, to sit alongside a conceptualisation of
the transnational, rather than being supplanted by it:

Alternatively, we might adopt a geological metaphor, to suggest the idea of
historical accretion and layering. Globalisation would then be seen in terms of
process whereby transnational geographies settle over national geographies. In
this case, the national order is not displaced of left behind, but rather covered over
by the new global configuration, the two different kinds of social and cultural
space coexisting as distinct strata. We are never living, then, in discrete or
successive ages or eras.

(Stidworthy: 23)

Transcultural Production in Ireland

While the Irish capacity for critique through cultural expression as discussed above may
have attenuated somewhat during the economic boom, it may be that an emergent
transnational public sphere can provide the location for a more widely informed cultural
critique. If the object of cultural and scholarly analysis and critique is to effect change,
this research, in its focus on how migrants in Ireland are variously represented on Irish
radio, attempts to scrutinise and map a small, selected aspect of a dominant culture and
society still fundamentally subject to an ongoing transition caused primarily by the recent
economic boom.

Robins (2006) recognises migrant practices of negotiation and networking as methods by
which migrants situate themselves in their hosting country as migrants. Moving away
from an earlier integrationist model, migrants locate themselves as part of their migrant community but also reflexively examine and locate themselves and their experiences within the hosting country as valid in themselves, thus reifying their increasingly complex identities as migrants. These negotiating practices directly inform cultural production practices, which themselves are inherently reflexive. These migrant modes of production practice can be incorporated into an evolving public sphere no longer exclusively informed by a settled white Irish identity, but instead pooling the resources of diverse Irish and migrant perspectives. As Gibbons argues:

Rather than reverting to the inward gaze of old-fashioned nationalism (itself a caricature of the past), the post-colonial turn in Irish criticism - not least by its questioning of many of the dominant paradigms of post-colonialism itself - represents an attempt to extend the horizons of the local to distant and often very different cultures, beyond the comforting cosmopolitanism of the West.

(Gibbons 2002: 105)

Further, migrants operate across transnational spaces rather than functioning primarily from within a host nation state. Without a historical affinity to the hosting country, as in earlier waves of migration, migrants identify less as potential ‘returned subjects’ of a nation state. Without that in-built ‘acculturation’, migrant practices are predicated on ‘transnational connectivity and connectedness’ (Robins 2006: 29). Thus ‘[m]igrant populations are connected to each other, and commonly also in close connection to their country of origin’ (ibid.: 25). One way in which this manifests is through the emergence of migrant-led transnational businesses, ‘operating on the basis of transnational economic and social networks’ (ibid.). As will be shown, Sunrise FM, discussed in Chapter Five, was developed as a business, complete with branding across station ‘idents’ which were broadcast regularly on the station. Sunrise FM embodied a transnational ethos,
incorporating advertising by local, migrant-owned businesses on air. In the ‘enterprising spirit’ facilitated in Ireland by the ‘Celtic Tiger’, these migrant-led businesses can be represented alongside those built by settled white Irish.

Migrant production practices emerge from migrant practices of negotiation in their hosting country, and the ways these manifest in everyday life. Robins’ identification of multiple migrant, transcultural identities can be usefully read alongside Lentin and McVeigh’s recognition of the inherent complexities of ethnic identities:

“Race” or ethnicity cannot be “known” in the same way as class or gender. In this sense ethnicity is quintessentially dialectical because it never is except when it simultaneously is not. In other words, ethnicity is about constantly (re-)negotiating and maintaining boundaries, and about inclusion and exclusion, where inclusion always excludes and differentiates between who is allowed and who is not allowed to belong to the collectivity.

(Lentin and McVeigh 2002: 5, emphasis in original)

Lentin and McVeigh’s reading of overlapping identities incorporates recognition of the attendant practices of negotiation. The practice of negotiation, of observing, creating and maintaining boundaries or negotiating across them, can be identified in Naficy’s (2001) modes of producing accented cinema, Grossman and O’Brien’s (2007) interrogations of migrant transcultural production practices and Robins’ analysis of migrant media.

This research suggests the recognised plurality increasingly inherent in migrant identities demands forms of cultural production which acknowledge those pluralities (see also Cunningham and Sinclair 2001; Cunningham 2003; Karim 2006; Dietz and Stammen 2009). Cunningham and Sinclair assert the importance of recognising ‘that hybrid
cultural expression is a struggle for survival, identity and assertion, and that it can be a struggle as much enforced by the necessities of coming to terms with the dominant culture as it is freely assumed' (Cunningham and Sinclair 2001: 20). Where dominant modes of cultural production in the North are predicated on an articulation of a singular subject position, migrant modes of cultural production take a sense of multiple, overlapping identity positions as their point of departure. Naficy (2001) argues that a duality emerges in ‘accented’ forms of cultural production which recognises the migrant’s look backwards to their homeland as well as acknowledging their experiences as migrants. Dublin community radio programme *African Scene*, discussed in Chapter Four, features the Nigerian and South African accented delivery of its migrant producer-presenters. Combined with a fluid and interactive presentation style which encourages feedback and participation from migrant communities, *African Scene* in particular can be read as embodying Naficy’s accented mode of cultural production, and its inherent articulation of transnational experience. An accented mode of production incorporates, at the very least, a quality of duality which is characteristic of transnational experience: speaking from a migrant perspective to a migrant community, but also within the communication structures of the receiving country. This quality of duality as defined by Henry Louis Gates Jr. (1988), contains ‘a double voice and a two-toned heritage’ according to Naficy (Naficy 2001: 22), which simultaneously speaks in widely recognizable and circulating languages and within standardized structures, but with a distinct accent which signifies upon black (for Gates) or migrant vernacular which acknowledges and articulates these developing traditions of enunciation. As Naficy argues: ‘This double consciousness constitutes the accented style that not only signifies
upon exile and other cinemas but also upon the condition of exile itself" (ibid.). *African Scene* thus functions at the local level, speaking not only to the African community but also to other Dublin migrant communities (Interview with Joseph, 23 May 2006), and also from a transnational perspective, which in the act of articulation creates and reinforces a transcultural mode of production - one which must become inherent to a public sphere itself becoming transnational.

**Research Framework**

Chapter One introduces the diverse theoretical and methodological approaches which centrally inform and frame this research, exploring the homogenising capacity of public service radio and, in contrast, the potential of the radio medium for migrant self-representation and participation. Through the examination of radio’s capacity for producing locality and of talk radio’s formal strategies of articulation, I argue that the medium of radio is well located to facilitate and ideally to encourage migrant participation in the public sphere. The chapter additionally outlines the theoretical approaches which frame the analysis of selected radio programme content, incorporating theories of critical multiculturalism employed in my scrutiny of the ways in which RTÉ represents migrant communities and frames diversity, and theories of an emergent transnational public sphere and of transcultural production utilised in the exploration of the ways in which community radio facilitates migrant-produced programming. Chapter One unites these avenues of theoretical enquiry within an overview of research methodologies employed, incorporating the processes of programme selection and practitioner interviews relating to radio programme content.
Chapter Two examines Irish and European broadcasting policies in reference to the representation of diversity and charts their evolution within public service broadcasting (PSB) and community media in an attempt to identify and situate those policy frameworks which shape institutional, station and production practice. The chapter’s focus on broadcast policy frameworks draws from media scholarship on PSB and community media as well as from selected policy reports, and charts recent shifts in conceptions of PSB and recent changes in cultural policy in relation to community media.

Chapters Three and Four each focus on selected radio programmes and related contexts of production, with reference to radio programmes produced by the national broadcaster RTÉ and from Dublin community radio. Through analysis of programming from both sectors or ‘publics’, I hope to locate and examine the ways in which ‘diversity’ is perceived, produced and performed across two disparate areas within the Irish public sphere.

Chapter Three focuses on two RTÉ programmes self-defined as ‘multicultural’: *Different Voices* and *Spectrum*. This chapter examines how migrant representation is framed in the national broadcaster’s dedicated multicultural radio programmes and analyses the ways in which migrant communities are depicted, incorporating an exploration of how that representation is performed and textually framed in a production context wherein migrant participation in programme-making remains limited. Theories of critical multiculturalism are employed in Chapter Three’s analysis of ‘multicultural’ programmes and in
interrogating a multicultural project which can reduce the representation of diversity to a celebration of difference.

Chapter Four focuses on Dublin community radio, where opportunities for producing programmes by and for migrant communities are created and facilitated, leading to the continuing broadcasting of translocal programmes which are usefully situated to articulate transcultural experience. This chapter examines the processes through which two Dublin community stations facilitate migrant-produced programming, perceived as inherent to their community license remit of community representation. This chapter's analysis takes as its central object *African Scene*, produced and presented by two members of different African migrant communities, and analyses the programme’s strategies for migrant articulation embodied in transcultural production and circulating in a transnational public sphere. Conceptualisations of the counterpublic drawn from public sphere theory and theories of an emergent transnational public sphere are developed here as a means of situating migrant-produced programmes broadcast by community radio, and for exploring strategies of migrant participation and articulation.

Chapter Five serves as a case study of a temporary Dublin community radio station representing itself as ‘multiethnic’, Sunrise FM, which is additionally framed by an analysis of the Broadcasting Commission of Ireland (BCI) license application process for a dedicated multicultural radio station, thus returning to the territory and examination of those policy frameworks and institutional contexts introduced in Chapter Two. Through an in-depth examination of two applications for the multicultural radio service advertised
by the BCI in 2004, Chapter Five identifies the stated criteria for a new multicultural service provided by the BCI in the application documentation and investigates applicant consortia responses, drawing from these ideas of what a multicultural radio service should include. This chapter then turns to explore how Sunrise FM, provided with a temporary license for a dedicated multiethnic service, marketed itself as a viable multiethnic radio station.

This research additionally incorporates an audio CD with selected extracts from the programmes under discussion. The audio tracks included herein are examples of migrant representation and self-representation and serve to illustrate the arguments made within this research. These audio excerpts additionally function to document the ways in which contrasting modes of migrant representation, participation and production have been broadcast within the public service and community sectors. Thus combined, the audio tracks function as an archive of sorts. Audio programme extracts are signposted within the textual discussion at points where the track indicated usefully highlights the arguments being made. However, the audio tracks included are not intended to simply reflect transcriptions reproduced in this study, but instead to serve as audio illustrations or commentary on the discussion. Thus several of the audio tracks consist of a longer segment from which a transcription used may be extracted, giving the reader the opportunity to listen to the excerpt discussed in context. Where sections of an audio extract are transcribed, the times (in seconds) relating to the transcribed material are given directly below the transcriptions in the text.
The programme excerpts selected in most cases are those examined in detail in Chapters Three, Four and Five. The contrast between programmes from the public broadcaster and community radio explored in the following chapters can also be immediately heard and perceived by listening to excerpts in turn, when the difference in representation of migrants for the RTÉ audience and the self-representation of migrants to their local, linguistic and cultural communities is instantly evident. Production values, necessarily, for reasons which will be further examined in Chapter Two and in Chapter Four, also vary between the RTÉ programmes and community radio programmes, illustrating the different production contexts of nationally funded and community radio in Ireland. This contrast results in a difference in the quality of sound depending on the strength of the signal, as all community programmes analysed in this research were recorded live from radio broadcasts.

As will be argued, if the mainstream Irish public sphere remains primarily informed by an often contradictory settled white Irish subject position, those alternate spheres dedicated, or self-dedicated, to transcultural expression and articulation remain necessarily multiple - and largely remain outside the mainstream. Migrant cultural production practices emerge from migrant practices of negotiating their hosting country. As such, they are organic, reflexive and consequently self-questioning, as is the media they produce. In increasingly multiethnic countries such as Ireland, incorporating cultural intersections, juxtapositions and exchanges, these transcultural media may well have the fullest capacity to explore migrant and settled white Irish experiences alike.

Chairied by Newstalk FM broadcaster Karen Coleman, the panel included Gavan Titley, Lecturer in Media Studies at NUIM; National Union of Journalists (NUJ) representative Ronan Brady; RTÉ representative and then Education Editor, John McMahon; Polish presenter for Irish cable television Izabella Chudzicka and Irish Independent newspaper columnist Ian O'Doherty. The panellists thus represented various Irish media or academic institutions.

The name ‘Celtic Tiger’ was used to describe Ireland’s economic boom with reference to the East Asian ‘Tiger’ economies. The term ‘Celtic Tiger’ was first coined in a Morgan Stanley report by economist Kevin Gardiner in 1994. (http://www.businessweek.com/archives/1994/b339226.arc.htm, accessed 3 March 2009.)


Throughout this research, I use the term white settled Irish to denote the normative subject represented across Irish public and mainstream broadcasting. While ‘white’ and ‘Irish’ are normative because white Irish was the majority (and hence dominant) cultural and ethnic community in Ireland, I use ‘settled’ here to differentiate from the long established Irish Traveller community, which in 2002 numbered about 30,000 across the island of Ireland (Lentin and McVeigh 2002). Irish Travellers have historically been discriminated against; one form this discrimination has taken is through a lack of recognition or respect for Traveller nomadism (see Fanning 2002 for a historical discussion of this). The Irish Travelling community remains marginalised in the Irish public sphere, as are new migrant communities.

Although Irish Travellers are Irish and white, they are not ‘settled’: hence my use of and reference to the normative white Irish subject position needs also to reflect the settled element of that position. ‘Settled’ is the term most commonly used to describe non-Traveller Irish, although ‘sedentary’ is also invoked (Lentin and McVeigh 2002; Fanning 2002; O’Connell 2002).

‘Enterprise Ireland’ is an Irish government agency ‘responsible for the development and promotion of the indigenous business sector’, from http://www.enterprise-ireland.com/AboutUs/ (accessed 3 March 2009). I use the term here, as will be explained, to connote an enterprising spirit perceived to inform the Irish national imaginary at the time of the economic boom.


The reference is to the former Taoiseach and finally President of Ireland, Eamon de Valera (1919 – 1922 Príomh Aire/President of the Republic; 1937 – 1948 Taoiseach; 1951 – 1954 Taoiseach; 1957 – 1959 Taoiseach; 1959 – 1973 President).

The dominance of Catholicism in relation to how the nation posits itself in the cultural context can be compared to how inward migration has been framed in the Italian context, where ‘opposition to Islam
among Italian Catholics can be found at all levels, including the hierarchy' (Grillo 2004 in Vertovec and Wessendorf 2004: 12). Grillo notes how Cardinal Archbishop of Bolonga Biffi, in 2000 urged that only Catholic immigrants be admitted to the country, in order to ‘safeguard national identity’ (Grillo 2004).

10 Gibbons (1996) argues that ‘the rural’ was idealised following modernisation in Ireland as a response to social upheavals caused by the modernisation process.


13 Figure provided by the Central Statistics Office website, http://www.cso.ie/statistics/nationalityagegroup.htm (accessed 27 October 2008).
Chapter One

Reading Ethnicity on Radio

In this chapter, I suggest that the medium of radio is uniquely situated for facilitating ethnic and migrant representation and participation, and examine avenues for analysis of the ways these manifest in radio programming. I then locate my analysis of multicultural and migrant-produced programmes within critical frameworks which problematise multiculturalism and introduce theories of a transnational public sphere. Finally, I hope to unite these two lines of enquiry, radio scholarship and a critique of representations of diversity, within an overview of my methodological practice, in which I introduce my suggestion that a critical reading of selected radio programme content can effectively contribute to an understanding of the ways in which multiethnic diversity is represented in the Irish public sphere.

Part One of this chapter examines the cultural and representational functions of radio and identifies the ways in which radio is written about critically within media scholarship. This section explores the recognised potential for radio technology in producing locality, alongside an investigation into radio’s capacity for facilitating active community participation, with reference to existing radio scholarship in relation to the representation of diversity. Part Two introduces those theoretical approaches which critique a multiculturalist project and which frame my analysis of multicultural programmes produced by RTÉ, and outlines those theories of a transnational public sphere and of transcultural production which frame my analysis of migrant-produced radio programmes.
on Dublin community radio. Serving as an overview of methodologies employed, Part Three unites the examination of radio’s capacity for local community participation alongside its capacity for reinforcing homogenous cultural representation, introduced in Part One, with the possibilities for critique offered by theories of critical multiculturalism, the transnational public sphere and transcultural production introduced in Part Two, before identifying how the central questions of this research are addressed and examined through my methodological practice. Part Three develops those methodologies employed in the selection and analysis of multicultural and migrant-produced programmes alongside analysis and location of my experience as both a media practitioner and migrant in Ireland in relation to the ways in which these elements of my subject position informed my access to and interviews with those radio practitioners involved in the production of the programmes under discussion.

Part One: Radio Study and Radio Form

Radio Scholarship

The medium of radio retains an established cultural currency predicated in part on its continuing widespread usage across the globe. Crucially for the concerns of this research, in a transnational world the medium of radio is increasingly of cultural and political significance because of its inherent capacity for producing, and re-producing, locality. Radio technology from its beginnings embodied a facility for ‘community-building’ (Hartley 2000: 155). Hartley identifies two competing functions of radio broadcasting: its potential role as a two-way forum, recognised at its inception by Brecht (1930), as against its currently dominant function as a one-way broadcaster of significant political and
social events (Scannell 1989). Both functions embody very different attempts at community or identity-building; the one through providing an aural avenue for two way communication across communities, the other in establishing and reinforcing national identity through a one-way transmission of national culture, located in the transmission of those same political and social events. Hartley argues ‘The eventual dominance of commercial broadcasting, as opposed to other cultural forms, was not inherent in radio technology’ (Hartley 2000: 156). Instead, that technology, as Brecht recognised, provided the opportunity for two-way communication on air, at least initially. Short wave radio has been used to broadcast internationally, serving to re-create ‘locality’ even to those far from home. Podcasts and live streaming via the internet fulfil the same function for those with access to the internet. It is this inexpensive, relatively simple media technology which has become so useful to community radio stations and broadcasters.

Lewis notes the relative ‘invisibility’ of radio research in media scholarship, suggesting that ‘radio is everyone’s private possession, yet no-one recognises it in public’ (Lewis 2000: 161). I would argue that he means this in two senses: as a description of individual habits of listening to the radio, literally a less visible medium than television but also more personal and intimate, due in part to a technology which produced the portable transistor radio and now allows people to listen to the radio through small, portable, ubiquitous technologies such as MP3 players or mobile phones equipped for broadcasting radio; and, more directly, in public contexts ranging from policy making to media coverage to academia. Of radio, he observes:
Radio’s public status is negotiated by a circle, virtuous if you will but certainly mutually interdependent, of academia, policy-makers, the media and all of us, the public (or publics) - for the moment allow this as an entity - in our capacity as readers of signs and consumers of culture.

( ibid. )

Lewis thus notes a disjuncture between a shared public perception and framing of radio and the private, daily consumption of radio and of discussions about its functions, in conversation and anecdote as well as within policy or scholarship. In much of media scholarship, radio remains a relatively ignored or marginalised medium, historically bypassed by media researchers focused on film, television, print or increasingly online media texts. Yet radio persists as a resilient medium on its own terms, one which attracts and retains the staunch loyalty of its listeners, not least in Ireland, where radio retains a respected place in the national consciousness as providing a genuine forum for debate and the exchange of ideas (Gorham 1967; Gibbons 1995; O’Sullivan 1997; Ó Tuathaigh 1984). Television arrived in Ireland in 1960 (Corcoran 2004), notably later than in Britain; hence the Irish historically have a longer established attachment to their radios. Consequently radio warrants further examination as a culturally mediated form in the Irish context which is still widely used and consumed. Despite radio’s continuing widespread popularity, even compared with other media such as print media, cinema, television, and new media platforms, it has attracted considerably less critical attention than might be expected from a historically successful and widely consumed medium.

Despite the fact that radio remains the primary communications medium, Hilmes (2002) argues it has been marginalised both by the broadcasting industry and within media
studies scholarship (Hilmes 2002), in her exploration of the paradox of radio’s inherent suitability for representing the local as one of the factors that contributed to its marginalisation. The inception of television also contributed to this marginalisation, with networks routing advertising away from radio and into television to promote the new medium. Compared with television stations broadcasting nationally, radio became further localised and fragmented, but in targeting listenerships outside mainstream audiences now served by television, ‘radio became the place where those culturally excluded from television’s address could regroup and find a new identity’ (Hilmes 2002: 4). Radio’s predilection towards (re-)producing locality, perceived as a weakness in its marginalising tendencies, has arguably, and certainly in the context of the concerns of this thesis, become a strength.

The proposed development of radio studies as a potentially emergent self-contained area of scholarship is encouraged by the British-based Radio Studies Network, an international group of academics, radio broadcasters and community radio activists who chart, discuss and write about new developments across radio, in addition to facilitating ongoing academic research into radio more generally. Radio programme content has also been analysed within an informing framework which explores how sound functions as cultural expression; the auditory domain provides an area within which radio scholarship has been maintained. Speaking into the Air (Peters 1999), and the anthology The Auditory Culture Reader (Back and Bull 2004) each include examples of this type of analysis. The Auditory Culture Reader specifically calls for a focus on sound culture; in their Introduction, Back and Bull argue that studies predicated on an analysis of the visual...
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have dominated much of cultural scholarship, despite the fact that ‘the experience of
everyday life is increasingly mediated by a multitude of mechanically reproduced
sounds’ (Back and Bull 2004: 1). In this context, they situate the central concerns of the
anthology:

The aim of this volume is to put the study of the auditory soundly on the agenda
of these academic disciplines and at the same time provide an integrated picture
of what sound studies should “look” like; just as sound is no respecter of space, so
sound studies transgress academic divisions.

(ibid.: 3)

Yet, again radio scholarship curiously occupies a relatively small place within this
volume. However Back and Bull’s identification and location of the role of sound studies
provides a crucial avenue for understanding radio from an aesthetic analytical
perspective. Later discussion in this research on the role and meaning of accents in radio,
in Chapter Four in particular, draws in part from this aesthetic approach. In Speaking into
the Air Peters begins with the historicity of communication and incorporates analysis of
the polemic communication tradition and the aim of connection through communication.
As with other texts investigating sound culture more generally, Peters’ approach can be
abstract. However, as with Back and Bull, Peters usefully provides an additional lens
through which to analyse and examine radio sound as sound. If talk is the signifier and
the signified is the aspect of society that heard discourse represents, sound is the avenue
via which broadcast talk is formed. Lewis (2000) argues radio’s harnessing of sound is
itself an activity derived from older cultural practices: ‘Radio and sound...connect with
an older oral, and aural, tradition whose contemporary traces have been until recently
virtually unexplored academically’ (Lewis 2000: 163). Because radio’s output is
exclusively auditory, audiences focus on what is said, but also how it is said and who is saying it. Radio broadcasting is effective because it establishes an intimacy with the listener through the exclusive medium of sound. Radio thus occupies an important, recognised place in the domestic sphere largely due to this created intimacy, and listeners have developed correspondingly strong habits of use and consumption of radio programmes.

If critical writing on radio increasingly includes discussion of the representation of diverse cultures on radio, often located in studies of community radio, critical academic writing on radio has itself also been informed by diverse disciplines. As an object of scholarly study, radio has been scrutinised within several disciplinary frameworks, including but not limited to communications and media studies, sociology, cultural anthropology and cultural studies. While the context of critical writing on radio remains multidisciplinary, much of radio scholarship has focused on historical studies of past radio programmes, reading these texts against the social and historical contexts which produced them. At time of writing, current critical work on radio represents a subset of media scholarship, much of which is undertaken by those with direct experience as radio practitioners who speak from an informed position as previous broadcasters themselves. Whether or not radio research eventually emerges as a recognised stand-alone academic discipline or remains situated primarily within broadcast and production studies and histories, it is clear that radio as an object of study has an essential place in cultural theory.
Broadly speaking, radio can be understood as an object of analysis in four distinct senses: as a technological medium, as an institution (as in, public service broadcaster, commercial radio station or community radio station; but also with reference to policy frameworks), in terms of programme content and with reference to radio audiences. Often radio scholarship will explore aspects of more than one understanding of radio. Within this evolving interdisciplinary framework, this research focuses on radio programme content with reference to how the institutional structures (including the broadcasters and policy frameworks) inform and shape this content.

‘Liveness’ and Radio Form

While several of the programmes selected for this study occasionally feature music, it is the talk and discussion taking place in the programmes which are the focus of scrutiny. ‘Liveness’ is the essential characteristic of the talk radio text, and has been widely explored conceptually within critical writing about radio. The trust and intimacy created and sustained by effective talk radio programmes, as well as the appeal of live broadcasting for its capacity (actual or suggested) for listener participation, contribute to radio’s potential as a democratising force within media. Talk radio remains an important as well as popular broadcasting format. The ‘liveness’ of talk radio provides a powerful sense of immediacy, carrying the connotation that anything at all could be said next. Such ‘liveness’ both creates suspense for the listener and the sense that s/he could also participate in what is heard as an ongoing discussion. These effects of talk radio are explored in Scannell’s (1989, 1991) and others’ arguments for the democratising capacity of radio, particularly talk radio and especially live talk radio, in those circumstances.
where a live talk radio programme can be framed as a forum for public participation, effectively functioning as a component of Habermas' (1989) conception of the public sphere. In her analysis of a popular Irish radio call-in programme, O'Sullivan (1997) explores the ways in which the programme’s framing of the live contributions from callers corresponds to Habermas’ (1989) conception of the public sphere. She acknowledges the possibilities offered by the programme for comprising a public forum for debate, in accordance with the criteria envisaged by Habermas, but suggests that the show more often functions simply as entertainment due to editorial control over the commentators: ‘as entertainment is the producers’ top priority, the value of this forum is somewhat limited’ (O’Sullivan 1997: 184).

In a foundational essay for the field of radio studies, ‘Public Service Broadcasting and Modern Life’, Scannell (1989) contends that broadcasting is a democratising force, locating his argument in a historicised analysis tracing the changes in talk radio delivery in Britain from the inception of the BBC. His argument draws from a deep understanding of the broadcasting form as well as of the structures informing programme content and the evolution of performative styles. His analysis focuses on media formats and is predicated on what he argues is a relative, unmediated autonomy contributing to the pivotal role of the media practitioner. In Broadcast Talk (1991), Scannell identifies and further examines the nature of what he calls ‘broadcast talk’, focusing on ‘liveness’ in particular:

[T]he liveness of broadcasting, its sense of existing in real time - the time of the programme corresponding to the time of its reception - is a pervasive effect of the medium. The talk that goes out on radio and television is recognizably produced
in actual institutional settings and intended for and addressed to actual listeners and viewers, listening and viewing in real-world circumstances.

(Scannell 1991: 1)

This assertion pithily encapsulates the thematic link between radio production processes and listener response. Scannell proceeds to further define radio and television talk as ‘public, institutional talk’ (Scannell 1991: 7): the appropriate form of discourse for the expression of political, social and cultural concerns. Scannell notes the timbre/texture or ‘grain’ (from Barthes 1978) of the voice, calling it the ‘irreducible mark of the spoken’ and insisting on its importance for radio listeners.

Hendy (2000) too provides a useful analysis of talk radio, which he comprehensively supports with case studies. He describes talk radio as the main object of most studies of radio communication: ‘the “primary code” of radio, which contextualises all other sounds’ (Hendy 2000: 155). Hendy’s reading of ‘broadcast talk’ breaks down its structures of meaning, thus showing how meanings are created and reinforced in talk radio programming. In his overview of the components of what comprises radio content, Hendy explores the function and efficacy of ‘liveness’. The notion of ‘live’ broadcasting remains central to public understanding of radio and is still a key factor of its appeal to listeners. Hendy argues for the importance of liveness, saying:

Liveness…. defines the main competitive edge broadcasting has over print media, which can only capture events already a day old, and even the Internet, which still usually takes a matter of minutes and sometimes hours to circulate its material around the globe. Radio and television can offer us access to events “as they happen.”

(Hendy 2000: 87)
Hendy insists that radio has a further competitive edge over television in its production of liveness, because radio’s technical simplicity compared to television means that it is far easier and cheaper to produce live radio than live television (ibid.). The quality of liveness remains inherent (ideologically and empirically) to radio broadcasting, contributing to a perceived sense of intimacy for the listener, often via a seemingly unmediated and informal conversational format. Further, in a media environment where podcasts are listened to hours, days or even weeks after they were recorded, liveness perhaps achieves a new cachet of immediacy, as in when a programme is streamed ‘live’ from the other side of the globe.

The dialectical relationship between radio’s *accessibility* (inexpensive technology; the potential for participation via phone in shows; identifying and targeting alternative or niche communities) and radio’s *homogenising* tendencies (mass marketing of music; its potential and actual use as a propaganda vehicle; its potential for enforcing biased mediation; its potential for listener manipulation) forms the core of Hendy’s arguments relating to cultural production within radio. He argues that radio posits the representation of a democratic ideal, adopting the language of democracy:

It also employs the rhetoric of two apparently different democratic functions: one in which it claims to “mediate” the views of the listeners on their behalf, thus carving out some form of institutionalised “public sphere” of opinion and debate, and a second in which it claims to be an “alternative” medium representing, not just the voice, but also the active participation of those incapable of expression through other media or public forums. In reality, of course, these functions are often conflated, and sometimes subverted altogether.

(Hendy 2000: 196)
Through his analysis of radio’s role in reinforcing, seeming to reinforce, or potential for reinforcing the project of democracy, Hendy complicates definitions of participatory radio in ways which address the core concerns of this research. Hendy additionally explores radio’s role in creating, sustaining and reinforcing identity formation within a community, providing examples of production practice in multiple stations. Radio’s potential for identity formation as proposed by Hendy can be read alongside its inherent capacity for community-building: both concepts establish radio as a crucial tool for performing and sustaining the sense of locality produced by a community. Hendy’s arguments around identity also have resonance for this study’s concerns about how migrant identities are represented on the airwaves.

Studies of Ethnic Media and the Public Sphere

This study’s focus on migrant representation and self-representation in the context of broadcasting necessarily incorporates an exploration into how ethnic media circulate within the public sphere, and an investigation into whether ethnic and migrant media in fact comprise a separate counterpublic or sphericule. If Habermas’ (1989) conception of the public sphere incorporates an inherent universality, how does ethnic or migrant media fit into this conception? Cunningham (2003), with reference to Habermas’ concept of the public sphere, offers the following definition of the public sphere as

...a space of open debate standing against the state as a special subset of civil society in which the logic of “democratic equivalence” is cultivated. The concept has been used regularly in the fields of media, cultural and communications studies to theorize the media’s articulation between the state and civil society.

(Cunningham 2003: 151)
Habermas’ conception of a public sphere was singular because inherently universal: a shared commons wherein public debates could take place (Habermas 1989). Yet in response to an increasingly complex, multiethnic and media-saturated world, Gitlin (1998) suggests with some cynicism that public ‘sphericules’ are consequently emerging and replacing that commonly-held ideal of a singular, universal public sphere. Cunningham (2003) takes Gitlin’s suggestion as a point of departure, asserting that power relations continue to inform and direct how the public sphere, or public spheres, are thought of and theorised, and that ‘the metaphor is not simply a series of sphericules, overlapping to a greater or lesser extent’ (Cunningham 2003: 153). Instead, he argues:

...that ethno-specific global mediatized communities display in microcosm elements we would expect to find in “the” public sphere. Such activities may constitute valid and indeed dynamic counter-examples to a discourse of decline and fragmentation, while taking full account of contemporary vectors of communication in a globalizing, commercializing and pluralizing world.

(Cunningham 2003: 153)

In yet another reading, Fraser (2007) proposes a transnational public sphere with the capacity to accommodate multiethnic diversity amongst other marginalised communities. Diverse formulations of the public sphere, public spheres, counterpublics and sphericules are proposed in those theories of ethnic and migrant media discussed below, and it is clear that the space within which this media is created and heard is as worthy of scrutiny as the content thus produced.

In Radio in the Global Age (2000) Hendy examines radio’s role in the reinforcing of or the erosion of cultural differences. Hendy explores the cultural impact of radio and radio content at both the level of production practices and at the macro level of radio as cultural
medium of mass communication. He argues radio functions in three key ways within popular culture: serving and reinforcing an ideal of democratic life; nurturing, or destroying, people’s sense of belonging to communities defined by language, place or (increasingly in the developed world) patterns of consumption; and radio’s role in shaping trends within popular music. Along with Hilmes and others (Wall 1999, for example), he recognises radio’s fragmenting strategies, whereby radio, in the US in particular, is targeted at audiences divided into ever more specific niche groups; but also recognises radio’s powerful homogenising potential, realised in mainstream radio of most developed countries. He queries this apparent paradox: ‘These two trends raise an important question: is radio reinforcing cultural differences, or eroding them?’ (Hendy 2000: 194). This observation reinforces Hendy’s point above noting the tensions between radi’s homogenizing potential as set against its democratic capacity for wider participation. I argue that the RTÉ programmes Different Voices and Spectrum, while attempting the latter project, more often serve to facilitate the former, drawing listener attention to cultural differences rather than effectively reducing them. In comparison, community radio, in its facilitation of migrant-produced programmes serve to reinforce a sense of belonging within the migrant communities represented on these programmes.

The range of topics in studies of ethnic media is diverse, and can include analysis of radio programme content, production practice and broadcast policy (Browne 2005; Robins 2006; Titley 2003, 2008). In these studies, radio often serves as a component of the larger category of ethnic media being examined. Surveying studies of ethnic media provides a useful basis for comparison for my own analysis. Critical writing on ethnic media
identifies patterns and delivery methods commonly expressed and perceived within
different forms of ethnic media. In addition, critical radio analysis can be located in case
studies focused on ethnic or minority media. Browne’s (2005) comprehensive study of
ethnic media around the world, *Ethnic Minorities, Electronic Media and the Public
Sphere*, incorporates an analysis of media formats including radio and the internet and the
ways in which they serve migrant communities. Browne’s areas of concentration range
from programming genres, audience studies and the role of policy and policymaking
surrounding questions of diversity and multiculturalism. He posits his research as a
comparative study, which approach usefully provides international case studies of
migrant community media, including but not limited to the groundbreaking Radio Multi-
Kulti in Berlin, now unfortunately defunct,² community radio in South Africa and Maori
radio in New Zealand.

Langer (2005) usefully interrogates terms used to describe ‘ethnic’ radio, informed by
Canada’s established history of multiculturalism in broadcasting. In Canada, writes
Langer, the official term is ‘ethnic broadcasting’; he identifies other terms: third language
radio, heritage radio, minority media, international programming (Langer 2005). Langer
uses the term ‘third language’ radio most often. I would argue that the term applies
specifically to those programmes broadcast partly or entirely in a language other than that
of the mainstream public sphere of the hosting country. In contrast to ‘third language
radio’, which identifies a ‘third’ language in the form of migrant community languages
broadcast, in addition to Canada’s first and second languages, English and French (which
change order of precedence depending on the province), I coin the term ‘first language
radio' here to describe many of the migrant-targeted radio programmes in Dublin produced entirely or mainly in the ‘first’ language of those communities; whether they are Polish, Russian, Farsi, Mandarin or other languages.

In relation to ethnic media more generally, for Morley and Robins (1995), broadcasting is a mechanism for identity formation in an era of globalisation when forms of broadcasting are themselves continually affected by a fragmentation of public space and the public sphere; an argument in harmony with Hendy’s analysis of radio’s localizing capabilities and Hartley’s assertion of radio’s community-building capacities. Certainly radio broadcasting, at its best, can provide an aural space for participatory debate within the public sphere, while also enabling diverse audiences to reinforce their national identity by their recognition of and identification with the version of nation being articulated. The two central areas of interrogation for Morley and Robins are the changing nature of cultural identities against the background of a federalising Europe, and how these changes can be effectively represented, reconfigured and defined in all (rapidly changing) forms of communications media. Although the social, political and cultural context of *Spaces of Identity* (1995) has attenuated somewhat, Morley and Robins’ arguments remain useful to the project of this research. Robins (2006) moves forward from this earlier analysis in his contribution to the European report on the representation of cultural diversity, *The Challenge of Transcultural Diversities*, which charts the ongoing evolution of migrant-produced media, or transcultural media, in transnational Europe. Cunningham (2003) has identified various uses to which diasporic media can be put:
[T]hey provide a central site for public communication in globally dispersed communities, stage communal difference and discord productively, and work to articulate insider ethno-specific identities—which are by definition ‘multi-national’, even global—to the wider “host” environments.’

(Cunningham 2003: 153)

Multilingual or ‘first language radio’; the ways in which ethnic and migrant media is framed within the public sphere and the ways in which it works at reaching the target communities comprise central areas of interrogation for this research. Back and Bull (2004), in advocating the study of sound, identify the usefulness of this approach in relation to analysis of ethnic or migrant media:

Thinking with sound and music may offer the opportunity for thinking through issues of inclusion, coexistence and multicultural in a more humane way and allow us to think through what a multicultural landscape might sound like in the age of information and global interdependency.

(Back and Bull 2004: 15)

Downing and Husband argue that the process of representation itself, as it is embodied and incorporated into media production, requires further, focused scrutiny in relation to how members of ethnic communities are represented:

In any act of representation there is a necessary interpretative link between the represented and the represented to - between the subject and the audience. Typically those represented by the process of media production have little or no input into the process of representation. And typically the process of production is permeated by an implicit understanding of who is the intended audience.

(Back and Bull 2004: 191)

Here Downing and Husband describe a central preoccupation of this thesis. The ‘interpretative link’ can potentially be the presenter and or written into a programme’s
script, or take the form of a pre-recorded explanatory link. Further, the production process, and the inherently implied audience, each form integral components to a broadcast programme.

Downing and Husband locate their advocacy of the study of production processes and of ‘cultures of production’ inside a larger argument exploring a ‘multi-ethnic public sphere’ and the evolving role of ethnic media within it. They describe an ‘aspirational’ quality to public sphere theory, in its advocacy of an ideal relationship between people, information and the state which, they argue, doesn’t recognise or acknowledge a dominant model which, in their examples, doesn’t in turn recognise ethnic or migrant media as viable (Downing and Husband 2005). They posit the concept of communicative ‘sphericles’, introduced by Gitlin (1998), a concept also interrogated in a different form in Squires’s typology (2002) and by Cunningham (2003), addressing ethnic and migrant communities, potentially, as suggested above, in the first language of those communities. Downing and Husband argue that sphericles, or ‘parallel public spheres’ emerge from a diverse, dense ethnic and migrant environment and constitute ‘semi-autonomous, parallel public spheres, defined by the identities of their audiences (Downing and Husband 2005: 210).

The technological advances which are symptomatic of an evolving public service broadcasting (PSB) environment also facilitate the development of multiple public spheres and sphericles, with user selected content available on demand. This movement towards the development of multiple publics signifies a movement away from a traditional public sphere characterised by a singularity and wholeness and conceptually as well as legislatively linked with the territorial borders of a nation state. Robins (2006)
also makes this argument in the context of formulating European cultural policy to reflect and further facilitate this movement into multiplicity.

The development of smaller, community focused publics additionally reflects material concerns, as Downing and Husband note: ‘Minority-ethnic media are not merely a reflection of shared identity politics, they are also necessarily an expression of a community’s capacity to realize economic and political resources’ (Downing and Husband 2005: 211). In a media climate consisting in part of such sphericules, radio becomes increasingly accessible, for participation as well as for recognisable content, to ethnic and migrant communities, while the homogenising tendencies recognised by Hendy above and by others, recede in a media context where an overarching, homogenous public sphere is not the only option for listeners.

**Writing on Irish Radio**

For a small nation, Ireland has a wide and large media environment across print and radio in particular (Kerr 2003), which is additionally unusual in that it substantially incorporates media from a neighbouring country, Britain (Ó Tuathaigh 1984; Corcoran 2004; Horgan, McNamara and O’Sullivan 2007). Kerr (2003) provides a useful overview of the evolution of the Irish media in the era of globalisation, while arguing against conceptualisations of globalisation as a relatively new phenomenon. In an illuminating analysis Horgan’s (2004) observation of how impartiality and balance play out in the context of Irish broadcasting, noted just above, identifies a ‘wall’ which has been erected
in the Irish media context between public service broadcasting and ‘advocacy journalism.’

Writing from a cultural studies perspective, Gibbons (1995), in ‘From Megalith to Megastore: Broadcasting and Irish Culture’, explores the ideological driving forces within early Irish radio, incorporating analysis of the coverage of aspects of Irish culture ranging from traditional Irish music to the centrality of Gaelic games. Gibbons’ examination of the rift between representing the state and representing the (interests of) the nation illuminates the tensions which can emerge between radio’s ‘nation-building’ role in the case of a national broadcaster and public demand for programming where that demand diverges from what the state perceives should be broadcast. In its focus on radio’s ‘nation-building’ capacity in reference to the Irish national broadcaster, Gibbons’ essay touches on a central preoccupation of this thesis. Building on Brecht, Gibbons describes how Irish radio was conceived in some quarters as an ‘electronic museum’ which would illustrate and enshrine Irish traditions. As noted above, Brecht was critical of radio’s function as solely an ‘apparatus for distribution’ (Brecht 1930: 52), as is Gibbons, who reiterates his suggestion that broadcast media function instead as cultural agencies, reinforcing and shaping society rather than simply reflecting it back to audiences. In reference to Benjamin (1936) Gibbons goes further again, citing Benjamin’s central argument in ‘The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction’ that mass production of cultural products undermined the aura of authenticity inherent to an ‘original’ piece of art or cultural product (Gibbons 1995). This cultural proliferation hence served as a challenge to the understanding and circulation of
traditions and their aura of historical and narrative continuity. For the purposes of this thesis, on the one hand a radio programme text is considered as a cultural product with connotations of authenticity, and thus representative of the cultural context which produced it; on the other, as noted, radio’s function as a two-way medium of communication has been superseded by its dominant role as a one-way broadcaster of events. Thus, as will be argued, a radio programme broadcast by the national broadcaster necessarily embodies the national imaginary informing that broadcaster’s programmes.

Additionally, Gibbons recognises the influence of broadcasting in the Reithian model as it developed in Britain, and locates the Irish response to those developments:

The strength of an indigenous culture does not lie in its ability to avoid contact with the dominant forces in the culture industry, but in the manner in which it appropriates the forms and products of the metropolitan centre for its own ends.

(Gibbons 1995: 80)

From an empirical, even participatory perspective, Mulryan’s *Radio Radio* (1988) provides an invested overview of the development of pirate radio stations in Dublin in the 1970s and 1980s, including descriptions of how radio practitioners were chosen and how they often migrated between pirate stations. Mulryan was writing before community radio stations were as widely licensed as they are in Ireland today, and frames his research as a study on ‘unlicensed radio’ in Ireland, incorporating ‘independent, local, community and pirate’ radio. He argues the story of unlicensed Irish radio is an essential counterpoint to the ‘official’ story of Irish broadcasting as related solely or primarily to
RTÉ’s output, much as the stations themselves provided an alternative service to that of
the national broadcaster. Mulryan suggests:

Because pirate stations were not bound hand and foot by legislations, during the
1970s and 1980s they anticipated all the major innovations in Irish radio, like
Irish language broadcasting, music radio and 24-hour broadcasting.

(Mulryan 1988: 1)

Much of critical writing on Irish radio locates its critique of the medium within a larger
analysis of Irish broadcasting more generally. *Communications and Community in
Ireland* (1984) is a series of essays of critical writing on Irish broadcasting which
provides a valuable historical context for the continuing development of radio and
broadcasting in Ireland, and usefully provides contemporary observations and cultural
analysis of Irish broadcasting by key theorists including Gearoid Ó Tuathaigh and Muiris
MacCongail. Ó Tuathaigh’s essay ‘The Media and Irish Culture’ tracks changes in the
interpretation of RTÉ’s perceived role and remit in representing Irish culture in its radio
and television output, incorporating several observations which remain relevant. He
additionally identifies Ireland as a particularly ‘open’ society in relation to
communications, noting the wide proliferation of British and other non-Irish print media
available in addition to Irish produced media and arguing that ‘while the [Irish] media
forms are easy to list, the provenance of the media at work in Ireland is a more complex
matter’ (Ó Tuathaigh 1984: 97).

In her case study of Irish talk radio, ‘“The Ryanline is now Open...” Talk Radio and the
Public Sphere’, O’Sullivan (1997) investigates whether the Gerry Ryan show, which is
the focus of her analysis, functions as a public forum or simply as entertainment, and
queries rather talk radio more generally can be considered as part of the public sphere. O’Sullivan’s analysis comprises one of the few contemporary studies focusing on Irish radio programme content, and provides useful ways of conceiving of talk radio in relation to theories of the public sphere. Also focusing on contemporary Irish radio, O’Neill (2000) writes about the role RTÉ Radio’s arts programming plays in relation to reinforcing a middle class listenership. O’Neill identifies a continuity in Irish cultural experience of the arts, particularly middle class experience, inherent in arts related broadcasting which contributes to ongoing cultural consumption in Ireland. O’Neill’s critique usefully serves to illuminate a key strand of RTÉ broadcasting which I suggest contributes in turn to the national broadcaster’s reinforcement of an Irish identity as represented by the station. As O’Neill argues:

Over the course of its history, Irish broadcasting has undertaken the responsibility of creating and projecting an image of the new Gaelic nation state, reviving its language, preserving its heritage, and later with modernizing its attitudes and opening the society to new cultural influences.

(O’Neill 2000: 774)

Although this responsibility was sometimes unrealized in programming practice and audiences often ignored such broadcasting earlier in the 20th century, Irish broadcasting’s cultural project as described above drew from Reithean values of cultivating cultural appreciation through such broadcasting (O’Neill 2000).

More recently again and writing from a practice-based approach, Browne and Onyjelem (2007), both migrants who have settled in Ireland, provide one of the few existing critiques from a migrant perspective in an Irish critical context, focusing on the lack of
migrant voices (or migrant producers) on Irish radio and noting ‘the extraordinary continuing absence of non-white, non-Irish practitioners in virtually all Irish media, despite the presence of many experienced journalists among recent immigrants to the country’ (Browne and Onyjelem 2007: 185). Browne and Onyjelem argue there are two key reasons for this: the increasing ‘professionalisation’ of Irish media, aided by a proliferation of competitive media studies courses at third level which primarily consist of white middle class settled Irish students and increasingly serve as training grounds for media practitioners; and the arguably contradictory prominence of established social networks in the Irish media, which remain difficult to permeate. Their critique additionally briefly describes migrant participation in Dublin community stations such as NEAR FM. As journalists who both previously worked in the Irish Times, a national broadsheet popularly considered the ‘paper of record,’ their critique as migrant media practitioners in the Irish public sphere is insightful and valuable, particularly for the perspectives they bring to their analysis.

Horgan, McNamara and O’Sullivan (2007) identify three trends which have influenced and informed the production and content of Irish media: internal consolidation combined with increased foreign ownership, alongside a third trend of technological advances including the ongoing expansion of online media. Technological advances and their relationship to broadcasting policies more generally will be discussed more fully in Chapter Two. Additionally, recent studies on migrant media (Titley 2008; Kerr 2007) address the emergence of first language migrant media in Ireland, an area which is of significance to the concerns of this research. The Irish media landscape has shifted in
response to the economic boom, consolidating and fragmenting along new lines of corporate ownership (Horgan, McNamara and O’Sullivan 2007). My analysis of migrant representation by the national broadcaster and of migrant-produced programming in Irish community radio should therefore be read as situated within the wider, shifting Irish public sphere and informed by the theoretical contexts introduced above.

Part Two: Theorising Multiculturalism and Diversity

Part Two introduces those critical theoretical frameworks problematising multiculturalism and the public sphere which centrally inform my reading and analysis of selected radio programme texts and broadcast production practices. I hope to identify and harness the usefulness of the theoretical interventions invoked here in examining and deconstructing the impact of the material discussed. For the purposes of this research, what consistently links these interventions to the programmes under scrutiny is how these radio texts are situated in relation to representations of Irish ‘nation’ and alongside the ways in which diversity, multiculturalism and transnationalism are themselves represented as concepts. This research thus attempts to complicate conceptualisations of ‘nation’ in relation to discourses of multiculturalism, the transnational and transcultural media production, in particular where they intersect with radio programme production and content. A further critique is located in theories of the public sphere in relation to transcultural production, and finally in the conceptualising of elements of the transcultural articulation which is produced.
Approaches to Critical Multiculturalism

This research draws centrally from, and attempts to contribute to, critiques of multiculturalism in an in-depth analysis of RTÉ’s multicultural programming. I employ selected approaches to critical multiculturalism in my examination of the ways in which ‘multiculturalism’ is invoked within Different Voices and Spectrum programme content. In the process, I hope to chart key points along a critical trajectory which situates its point of departure at the celebratory end of a multiculturalist project and arcs through multiple and contested variants of multiculturalism, and posit an end point located within transcultural media production.

Conceptualisations of multiculturalism have multiplied and consequently become increasingly contested. Debates around the intent of differently defined projects of multiculturalism have been further complicated by multiculturalism’s very different history and meanings in Canada, Australia, the US and Britain, to name those countries where English-language enquiries have particularly proliferated. Hage (2005) makes the point that ‘multiculturalism’ delineates a substantially different social space within each national context, arguing with reference to Gunew (2004), that:

[I]t is only by situating each multiculturalism, both within its social and historical context and in relation to the interests that propel it, that the various multiculturalisms that exist in the world today can actually enter into a ‘dialogue’, speak to and learn from each other

(Hage 2005: 491)

Additionally, any understanding of what is meant by ‘multiculturalism’ depends on the context in which the concept is addressed. Multiculturalism manifests itself across
diverse discursive areas including but not limited to education, broadcasting, cultural policy, political activism, social and community initiatives and the academy. My analysis of *Different Voices* and *Spectrum* programme content is framed and informed by critiques of multiculturalism drawn variously from disciplines including film studies, media studies, sociology and anthropology.

The concept of representation must be briefly scrutinised before turning to an exploration of critical multiculturalism: for as Hesse argues, ‘you cannot talk about multiculturalism without talking about representation.’ Spivak (1993) differentiates between two forms of representation: put simply, between that wherein the community is represented and that in which the community or individual is seen to represent themselves. She locates the first form of representation as principally located in the state and political apparatuses and the second in the realm of art and psychoanalysis (Spivak 1993). Spivak’s critique of two types of representation, in which she invokes the German terms *vertreten* and *darstellen*, is invested with a complexity which renders this model not of immediate use for this study. However, her distinction between two forms of representation is particularly important for the concerns of this research. The representation of migrants within multicultural programmes produced by the national broadcaster is a different kind of representation to the self-representation of migrants within community radio programmes, where the opportunity to produce as well as present facilitates wider opportunities for migrant self-representation through participation in the production process.
The theoretical terrain which I draw from in my analysis incorporates Gordon and Newfield’s (1996) detailed analysis of the formation of multicultural pluralism; Žižek’s (1997) concept of a disavowed multiculturalism and Lentin’s (2001) invocation of same in her problematisation of multiculturalism in the Irish national context; Hesse’s (2000) conceptualization of the multicultural transruption as embodying an ‘irrepressible quality of interrogation’ (Hesse 2000: 19) with potential to effectively fuel a critical multiculturalism; and Stam and Shohat’s (2003) connection between multiculturalism and cultural production. Each of these interventions argue effectively for multiculturalism’s limitations, which need to be recognized as such before any movement forward towards an exploration of transcultural articulation. Additionally, Appadurai’s (1996) discussion of the production of locality and his articulation of the link between deterritorialisation and the dynamics of cultural reproduction, including analyses of media apparatuses, is also of use for this study. Appadurai situates his analysis in the academy’s responses to multiculturalism and transnationalism in his identification of an emergent transnational cultural studies (Appadurai 1996).

Gordon and Newfield’s (1996) comprehensive investigation provides a detailed overview of overlapping and contradictory multiculturalisms, showing in the process how and where divergent multiculturalisms can clash. Via a thorough overview of different US approaches to multiculturalism, their interrogation nimbly disseminates the origins of multiculturalism, its central theoretical antecedents and informing principles: cultural pluralism, assimilationism, separatism, commonality or unity, nationalism and cultural relativism. This important essay serves both as a map of the contested theoretical territory
which frames this research, and as a point of departure for subsequent, critical representations of multiculturalism. Gordon and Newfield's analysis unpacks the composition of these variants of multiculturalism and locates each on a spectrum of political usefulness from their own clearly identified left-of-centre position. Within this analysis and from this perspective, they retrieve positive and useful elements of multiculturalism while also indicating its limitations in effecting political change. While their analysis is firmly situated in the mid-1990s and thus draws from contemporary concerns and debates, their rigorous examination of multiculturalism's commodifying tendency and capacity for 'diversity management' continues to resonate strongly.

Gordon and Newfield differentiate between 'strong' and 'weak' multiculturalisms and ultimately argue for a multicultural pluralism also informed by nationalism: 'The multiculturalism that built on both pluralism and nationalism is the only meaningful form of cultural pluralism in existence, for it is the only form that is not a variant on assimilationism' (Gordon and Newfield 1996: 101). This assertion follows their examination of cultural pluralisms4 and the tendency of many versions of cultural pluralism to incorporate an informing principle of a core unity which is determined and shaped by the dominant culture described as Anglo-American in the US. The invocation of nationalism, they argue, successfully mitigates against this core unity by replacing the notion of a dominant culture with the idea of multiple cultures. Interactions between cultures remain typified by power struggles but the dichotomy inherent in a struggle between a migrant culture and a dominant culture of nation is displaced (Gordon and Newfield 1996). Gordon and Newfield recognize and identify multiculturalism's
limitations; their critique effectively untangles the appropriation of multiculturalism at a
corporate level where it is referenced and invoked in a project of diversity management,
thus contributing to multiculturalism’s project of containing diversity as per the
perceived needs of the host nation. This recognition forms the starting point of my
critique of multiculturalism.

Stam and Shohat (2003) outline their informing theoretical territory and revisit Gordon
and Newfield’s critique of multiculturalism while retaining many of their central tenets.
Stam and Shohat also presuppose multiple meanings and uses of multiculturalism,
arguing that a binary approach persists which limits debates around multiracial diversity
to a dichotomy between marginalized communities and a ‘Western’ norm (Stam and
Shohat 2003). Their relational, interdisciplinary critique is primarily centred on academic
practice and particularly on the need to ‘multiculturalise and transnationalise media
studies’ (Stam and Shohat 2003: 1). Stam and Shohat’s critical appropriation and
transformation of multiculturalism and transnational from nouns to verbs signifies an
evolution in how these concepts are understood, considerably widening their ideological
and discursive functions. They argue for a ‘comparative and transnational
multiculturalism, of relational studies that do not always pass through the putative centre’
(ibid.: 4). Stam and Shohat additionally identify and discuss the emergence of ‘whiteness
studies’ arguably first introduced by Dyer’s White (1997)\(^5\), which primarily situates its
critique in film studies. As argued in the Introduction, whiteness studies has particular
relevance for theorizing multicultural Ireland, informing a critique which could certainly
be developed further.
Hesse’s (2000) critique of multiculturalism is shaped in part by postcolonial theory’s call for and emphasis on historical specificity as a way of situating (geographically and historically) multiracial and transnational identities. While the fixity inherent to the imperative of historical specificity is potentially limiting when faced with the fluidity characteristic of transnational identities and experience, Hesse’s reference to a localized fixed identity retains a critical resonance in conceptualizing a critical multiculturalism which recognizes the importance of locality. Vertovec (2001) takes a similar approach when he argues that multiculturalism needs to move forward from locating its possibilities in identities characterized by fixity, towards re-imagining notions of citizenship as (at least) dual. In his argument Hesse introduces the useful concept of the ‘transruption’, with its possibilities for radical and organic critique. He argues, with reference to the British context, that transruptions occur alongside and in reaction to a reinforced nationalism; one defined here as post-imperialist. The transruption, he suggests,

...describes interrogative phenomena that, although related to what is represented as marginal or incidental or insignificant, that is identifiable discrepancies, nevertheless refuse to be repressed. They resist all efforts to ignore or eliminate them by simply recurring at another time or in another place. Transruptions are troubling and unsettling because any acknowledgement of their incidence of significance within a discourse threatens the coherence or validity of that discourse, its concepts or social practices.

(Hesse 2000: 17)

Hesse further situates transruptions into two categories, the names of which are taken from Williams’ (1977) conceptualizations of the residual and the emergent. The emergent version particularly relates to this research; emergent transruptions can be embedded in
migrant-produced radio programmes, but also in those broadcast interviews between members of migrant communities and the settled white broadcaster asking the questions.

**Problematising the Transnational Public Sphere**

A further concern of this research is the broadcast space within which migrant-produced programmes are produced. I examine here what is meant by a transnational public sphere within which migrant-produced programmes circulate and are produced. Naficy (2007) describes migration as a key issue of the present moment, necessitating an ongoing critical focus on ‘the lives and times of diverse displaced persons, migrants, refugees, nomads, stateless persons, émigrés and exiles, from South Africa to North America, who have been roaming the world in recent years in search of new homes and new opportunities’ (Naficy 2007: xiv). This research attempts to examine how some of the experiences of migration are expressed in the mainstream and localised public spheres. Conceiving of a transnational public sphere in a sense signals a break with multiculturalism, where the transnational public sphere functions as a rupture and its introduction an intervention which forces a re-examination and re-definition of ‘the transnational’ in the context of public sphere theory. Thus a problematised conception of the public sphere takes critical multiculturalism as its point of departure. This research argues that those migrant-produced programmes broadcast by selected Dublin community radio stations are produced and circulate within this transnational public sphere, while their strategies of articulation embody characteristics of Naficy’s (2001) conceptualisation of accented cultural production. The frameworks presented below centrally inform the analysis of migrant produced programming in Chapter Four’s case
study of Dublin community radio and *African Scene*, and provide a critical and theoretical context for Sunrise FM's output as examined in Chapter Five.

Naficy (2007) makes the point that collectively, émigrés, exiles and diasporic subjects could 'constitute a formidable global population that endures and thrives in conditions of unprecedented mobility and transnationality' and, crucially, argues that:

> Today's displaced populations, like their predecessors who built the film, media, journalism and entertainment empires of the various countries to which they relocated - are highly media-conscious and media-savvy, not only as consumers but also as producers of the media. Such mediated connectivity allows, indeed encourages, the new displaced populations to break out of the hermeticity of their physical enclaves - national, ethnic, religious, racial or class, which bound previous émigré generations - to create other alternative affiliations and rhizomatic connections with individuals and communities not their own.

(Naficy 2007: xiv)

The term 'translocal' effectively describes the condition of creating and sustaining one's local identity alongside the understanding that migrant locality is necessarily characterised by a transnational experience and lived perspective. The conception of a transnational public sphere emerges from the recognition of the necessity of migrant cultural production as manifested in translocalised mediated environments.

With reference to an emergent transnational public sphere, Fraser (2007) reworks her critique of the public sphere, and thematically her concept of the subaltern counterpublic, in a comprehensive, multifaceted critique which incorporates and refines the concept of a transnational public sphere. She identifies and explores facets of a transnational public sphere with a capacity for critique, serving as a location for alternative ways in which to
represent migrant and ethnic communities which, for the purposes of this research, could include migrant-produced programming which could itself embody critique. Fraser’s (1993) critique of Habermas’ analysis of a singular public sphere and its functions provides the theoretical groundwork for the conception of multiple publics, while the components and mechanics of multiple publics are developed in Squires’ (2002) vocabulary for multiple counterpublics, with specific reference to black, or migrant, public participation. Fraser takes the singularity of Habermas’ posited public sphere as her point of departure, arguing Habermas’ public sphere was formed via the exclusion of marginalized groups, resulting in an idealised space designated for the use of a bourgeoisie public (Fraser 1993).

Given that the public sphere is conceived of as providing a forum for debate, an exclusionary formation is predicated on a normative assumption based on social inequality, which ultimately excludes potential participants in that debate. Hence there is a need for a multiplicity of publics to facilitate full and democratic participation. Further, any conception of a democratic public sphere must be predicated on reinforcing inclusion rather than exclusion, as characterised by what Fraser calls ‘discursive contestation’ (Fraser 1993: 20). The potential and reach of Fraser’s conception of multiple publics is also directly framed and complemented by Appadurai’s (1993) notion of disparate ethnoscapes. Fraser (2007) later revisits this critique, having further identified and clarified the multiple communicative and democratic functions of the public sphere, she effectively argues that conceptions of the public sphere cannot remain predicated on a perceived fundamental link to a territorial state. Fraser notes that understanding of the
public sphere via Habermas (1989) implicitly assumes a correlation between publics and national states and imaginaries, within a historically specific analysis. The assumption is tacit and unproblematised, and has consequently persisted. In contrast, she outlines the current state of scholarship in which:

[A] growing body of media studies literature is documenting the existence of discursive arenas that overflow the bounds of both nations and states. Numerous scholars in cultural studies are ingeniously mapping the contours of such arenas and the flows of images and signs in and through them. The idea of a “transnational public sphere” is infinitely plausible, then, and seems to have a purchase on social reality.

(Fraser 2007: 7)

However, Fraser is quick to clarify that while the term ‘transnational public sphere’, an ‘indispensable’ notion, is being used to describe these spaces, there is no single, agreed upon definition of the ‘transnational public sphere’. She argues therefore for a problematisation of public sphere theory which incorporates the current ‘postnational constellation’, taking earlier but ongoing feminist and anti-racist critiques as central to her analysis and reading them alongside those ‘distinct facets of transnationality that problematise both traditional public sphere theory and its critical counter-theorizations’ (ibid.: 9). Fraser’s marking of this moment as one of transition in a postnational context has a direct relevance for the Irish public sphere, itself also marking a fluid moment of consolidating transnationality. While her critique opens up more questions than it answers, her identification and problematisation of new areas requiring enquiry assists in charting the current postnational moment.
If Fraser establishes a theoretical framework for the analysis of multiple, alternative public spheres, and then charts the evolution of transnational publics, Squires (2002) fleshes out the structures of these overlapping publics and provides the vocabulary for further identifying their discursive functions. Squires’ exploration of the functionality of the public sphere is predicated on a typology of counterpublics, formulated to address the avenues of enquiry laid out above. She charts each category through its response to primarily external phenomena; dominant social pressures, legal restrictions and similar forces from the state. The three responses she delineates are enclave, counterpublic and satellite. As each sphere is defined and typified as a response, fluidity and overlap between types are inherent to this characterisation (Squires 2002: 457).

This research suggests that transnational cultural production provides a bridge, if not a rupture, between a depoliticized celebratory multiculturalism, discussed above, and critical cultural representations embodying an enunciation of the transnational subject position in its shifting, fluid and multiple forms. Vertovec’s (1999) overview of an emergent vocabulary for diverse transnationalisms and his exploration of ‘Transnational Challenges to the “New” Multiculturalism’ (2001) in their examination of what is meant by ‘transnationalism’ provide a discursive context for Naficy’s (2001) concept of accented cultural production, while also reclaiming the term/concept transnationalism from a broadly corporate discursive context. Additionally, a central critique of this research is crucially directed by Naficy’s concept of ‘accented cinema’, which I have appropriated here to refer to an accented style and practice or cultural production, applied here to radio production practice.
If multiculturalism is a ‘situated utterance’, as Stam and Shohat (2003) argue, the same can be said of transcultural articulation. Naficy (2001) locates his analysis within what he calls the accented mode of filmmaking, focusing on the practices of production as well as the resultant film text. In relation to this study, I have appropriated his interrogative apparatus and expanded it to incorporate migrant cultural production: specifically radio production. Naficy’s theoretical apparatus is key because of his focus on production practice and his recognition and exploration of the transnational position of cultural production and enunciation. Hence Naficy’s methods of investigation can be brought to bear on both the selected radio content under discussion here and the production practices which created them. Naficy’s unique interrogation of the modes of accented filmmaking emphasizes and expands the role of the accent in cultural production practice. Hence, he problematises the accent, defining it in practice and audience comprehension as a signifier in itself. Naficy’s proposed mode of cultural production can be argued to circulate in these multiple public spheres: with transnational and possibly migrant public spheres housing new forms of cultural expression and articulation which are participatory and interactive, celebratory, commodified multiculturalism is simply static and passive: to be consumed.

**Media and the Stubborn National Imaginary**

As argued in the Introduction, the arguments of Robins and Anderson are invoked in this research in an attempt to situate this study’s central enquiry, the ways in which representation and participation of migrants in Irish radio are effected, within a wider theoretical terrain.

In an increasingly transnational world, the concept of nation stubbornly endures in hearts and minds. This is evident in Ireland’s conceptualisations of itself, derived from a political and social struggle for recognition and legitimacy prior to Irish independence in 1916. The flourishing Irish diaspora alone, which claims a strong cultural currency in some of the world’s most powerful nations, is a potent source of nation-building in its cultural reinforcement of Irish-ness. Anderson’s deep exploration of the nation as imagined community begins with his by now familiar assertion: ‘My point of departure is that nationality, or, as one might prefer to put it in view of that word’s multiple significations, nation-ness, as well as nationalism, are cultural artefacts of a particular kind’ (Anderson 1991: 4). Anderson’s systemic and multifaceted deconstructions of the ways by which ‘nation-ness’ is constructed ties in with the primary concerns of this research, which posits that transcultural radio programmes are emerging in the public sphere alongside an established performance of an earlier ‘Ireland’, predicated on Irish history and cultural capital. This earlier conception and its inherent assumption of cultural and racial homogeneity allows for and perpetuates ongoing discourses of polarisation which represent migrants as ‘other’ to the Irish norm: it also continues to ‘command…. profound emotional legitimacy’ (ibid.).
Anderson (1991) argues definitions of nation are contested; ‘nation-ness’ is not a singular, absolute ideal. Instead, he posits nationalism as ‘an ideology’; one among many. In this assertion, and in his thorough unpacking of how nation and ‘nation-ness’ is constructed, he anticipates Robins’ (2006) attempt to move away from, or bypass, the persistent paradigm of nation. Central to Anderson’s argument is his analysis of the construction of imagined communities; he defines ‘the nation’ here:

[I]t is an imagined community - and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign. It is imagined because the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion.

(Anderson 1991: 6)

The ways in which communities imagine themselves returns us to the project of this study, and to the exploration of radio’s role in creating and sustaining imagined communities alongside or apart from an overarching community of nationhood.

In addition to his framing and deconstruction of the national imaginary, certain elements of Anderson’s (1991) analysis are of particular relevance to this study. His analysis of the rise of media, in his terms the ‘novel and newspaper’, and their unifying role in the continuing construction of national community achieved through historical and cultural continuity; and of the development of language and ‘vernaculars’ in relation to the rise of nation as a conscious project, centrally inform this study’s exploration of how Irish ‘nation-ness’ is reinforced by the national broadcaster, and its examination of community radio programmes and stations in relation to that Irish ‘nation-ness.’ In conceiving of the construct of ‘imagined communities’ Anderson perhaps unwittingly provides another
framework within which to read migrant communities sustained by community radio. These too comprise ‘imagined communities’, albeit ones which, more often than not, define themselves in relation to Irish nation-ness without necessarily situating themselves as firmly and absolutely integrated within it.

Robins identifies such ‘imagined communities’ in migrant and diasporic communities, arguing that the concept of ‘imagined community’ remains predicated on the nationality of its members: ‘[I]t seems as if belonging to an imagined community ... is the only basis on which it would be possible to make sense of viewers’ engagement with the new transnational media culture’ (Robins 2006: 146). He asserts that even when far from their home or sending country, migrants are framed as communities primarily in relation to their nationality, rather than to their daily life experience as migrants. In his critique of the national imaginary, Robins interrogates methods of reifying ‘the nation’ as the dominant paradigm.

Updating Anderson’s analysis of the continuing persistence of the national imaginary in Europe and its implication for the European media landscape, Robins (2006) argues that in transnational Europe, ‘nation’ and ‘transnationalism’ can more usefully be framed as overlapping, layered paradigms instead of persistently polarising discourses. Robins’ identification and reading of transcultural media across Europe is situated alongside solid proposals for new ways of conceiving of transnationalism which are founded on defining transcultural media as occupying its own, fluid public sphere, rather than repeatedly defined by its ‘otherness’ to ‘national’ media. He locates his arguments within a
paradigm of public service broadcasting, characterised by decentring shifts in national broadcast regulation and the development of digital and other alternative forms of media alongside the near-parallel development of new markets and new commercial broadcasting organisations, which (consciously or otherwise) further the de-centring of ‘nation-ness’ as it circulates and is recognised in the public sphere. Robins’ approach, drawing from comprehensive understanding of transnational and transcultural broadcasting, informs this study particularly with reference to fundamental changes within PSB and the functions and uses of transcultural media.

Irish Cultural Studies and Inward Migration

I here identify and explore critiques within Irish cultural studies and Irish migration studies which serve to map a particular, recent moment of increased inward migration to Ireland from the 1990s and investigate ways in which these critiques can be invoked in media and radio analysis. The invocation of a historical and socio-political framework in this research is partly predicated on debunking the myth that until the mid-1990s Ireland was a completely homogenous nation, what Lentin and McVeigh call a ‘monoculture’ (Lentin and McVeigh 2006), and the suggestion that, as the Irish historically experienced racism and discrimination, they are therefore unable or unlikely to practice racism or discrimination themselves. Ireland’s past as a colony of Britain directly shapes its national imaginary. Racist representations of the Irish permeated the public sphere from the eighteenth century onwards to the twentieth, during which the Irish diaspora continued to be subject to discrimination in Britain and the United States.6
In *Gaelic Gothic: Race, Colonisation and Irish Culture* (2004), Gibbons comprehensively explores the historical construction of the Irish as raced, charting methods of discrimination and racism in the public sphere. He locates this exploration within a biologicalist discourse circulating in Europe in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. He further links racist representations of the Irish with the posited ‘otherness’ of Irish Catholicism. Gibbons locates later nineteenth century stereotyping of the Irish alongside mass Irish emigration, during which Irish communities emerged in cities in Great Britain and the eastern United States. Discrimination and negative representations of the Irish referenced Irish ‘masses’ in cities, linked them to the spread of disease, in relation to that biological discourse (Gibbons 2004: 43 - 45). Hence this negative stereotyping of the Irish was directly derived from their migration. Gibbons’ analysis is rooted within literary and historical analysis, providing a useful context for Irish attitudes towards both ‘race’ and the practice of racism.

Yet, as I suggest in the Introduction, Irish identity is one which is historically and historiographically white, although not necessarily one which is inherently ‘settled’. Dyer’s (1997) study on the ‘invisibility’ of whiteness serves to introduce an interrogation into how Irish white identity is constructed and continues to be reinforced in multiethnic Ireland. Dyer’s argument that whiteness is a constructed identity category has relevance for an analysis of a settled white Irish identity position which continues to dominate the Irish public sphere, and which is represented as normative by the Irish national broadcaster. Additionally Ignatiev (1995) argues that Irish identity in the US shifted from connotations of ‘otherness’ and thus from their subject position of being migrants and
subject to the negative stereotyping noted by Gibbons, to the occupation of a position of relative privilege, acquiring elements of the normative white identity position identified by Dyer. Kiberd (2001) insists that Irish racism comes from a fear of hybridisation, of which he writes ‘[t]he fear of hybridisation is really a terror in the face of potent but repressed forces within one’s own culture’ (Kiberd 2001: 55). A myth of an Irish monoculture was fuelled by embracing a homogenous racial identity, both at home in Ireland and abroad. Multiculturalism functions within an overarching metanarrative positing Ireland as a monoculture wherein racism is naturalised. It is this ethnically homogenous ideological construction of Irishness itself which must be interrogated and unravelled, according to Lentin (2001), who writes about multiculturalism in the Irish context, with its attendant naturalisation of racial and cultural difference.

Žižek (1997), who has written extensively on multiculturalism and its manifestations, often drawing on Lacanian theory, goes further, arguing for the potential for societal damage inherent to this kind of ‘disavowed multiculturalism’, a term also used and interrogated by Lentin (2001):

Multiculturalism is a disavowed, inverted, self-referential form of racism, a “racism with a distance” - it “respects” the Other’s identity, conceiving the Other as a self-enclosed “authentic” community towards which he, the multiculturalist, maintains a distance rendered possible by his privileged universal position.

(Žižek 1997: 11, my emphasis)

Also drawing from Lacanian theory, Hage (2005) argues for the necessity of the ‘other’ within a communal structure, where the presence of the ‘other’ reinforces the fantasy structure of an ideal community:
Nationalists and communalists in general cannot perceive their community without an otherness of some sort standing between them and “it”. The presence of this threatening other is one of the key elements that provide the structure of communal imagining with a minimum of stability.

(Hage 2005: 122)

Both Hage and Žižek invoke a psychoanalytic framework to situate their analysis of the centrality of the ‘other’ in constructions of nation, and as inherent to national anxiety. Lentin sees the ‘politics of recognition’, a term also used by Hesse (2000) underpinning Irish multiculturalism as reductive, arguing: ‘Irish multiculturalist initiatives are anchored in a liberal politics of recognition of difference, which do not depart from western cultural imperialism and are therefore inadequate for deconstructing inter-ethnic power relations’ (Lentin 2001: 1). She suggests they should be replaced by a ‘politics of interrogation’, which scrutinize and critique the causes behind Irish racism so as to better challenge and dismantle them (Lentin 2001: 9).

Lentin and McVeigh situate their arguments in After Optimism? Ireland, Racism and Globalisation (2006), their comprehensive theoretical and empirical critique of transnational Ireland, firmly within anti-racist activism. Their comprehensive theoretical critique of the mechanics of racism and globalisation frames a thorough empirical investigation into the ways by which racism is institutionally perpetuated in Ireland and further incorporates detailed exploration into the representation and experiences of racism of migrant women and Jewish and Traveller communities, and into racism in Northern Ireland. Lentin and McVeigh preface their arguments by defining state racism, which conceptually informs their arguments, in that they derive from the idea that racism is
embedded in state activity. Their study charts meaningful moments in a trajectory of Irish racism: from the moment of optimism introduced into Irish anti-racist discourse in 1997, the European Year of Anti-Racism to what they represent as the end of that optimism: the Citizenship Referendum in 2004, in which 80% voted to repeal conferring of citizenship on all children born in Ireland, leading to the Immigration Act (Lentin and McVeigh 2006). Lentin and McVeigh’s project includes identifying the contradictions in Ireland circulating between a rhetoric of inclusiveness and implemented policies of exclusivity.

Other contemporary work on perceptions of Ireland’s increase in multiethnic diversity has focused on issues around representation of that diversity, in the media and at the level of policies and infrastructure, including Cullen (2000); Devereux et al (2004); Fanning (2003); Garner (2004); Kerr (2007); Kiberd and Longley (2001); Kuhling and Keohane (2007); Lentin and McVeigh (2001, 2006) and Tilty (2003, 2008). Charting and documenting the ongoing changes within multiracial Ireland at the level of representation is vital and valuable work, particularly as these changes have been relatively rapid, first becoming evident in mainstream broadcasting in the Irish soap *Fair City*, which featured a Kurdish character storyline in 1999 and with the introduction of *Mono* in 2002, a television programme which defined itself as multicultural, both of which were broadcast on RTÉ television. RTÉ Radio programmes explicitly covering migrant experiences in Ireland have included *Radio One World, Different Voices, Breaking Bread, A New Ireland* and *Spectrum*. RTÉ Television programmes have included *Mono* and *No Place Like Home*, as well as storylines in *Fair City* featuring Kurdish, Romanian, Nigerian and Muslim characters. Novelist Roddy Doyle’s 2001 play *Guess Who’s Coming to the Dinner?* takes as its subject the interplay between a working class Dublin family and a
Nigerian resident of Dublin. In print media, *Metro Éireann*, billing itself as Ireland's first multicultural newspaper and edited by Nigerian journalist Chinedu Onyjelem, has from its inception in 1999 focused primarily on issues facing all marginalised groups in Ireland, including the Traveller population as well as new migrant communities. Dublin now boasts newspapers produced by the Russian, Romanian, Polish, Muslim, Chinese and Korean communities, all in their native languages. At time of writing, these communities are currently more directly served by media produced by and for themselves than by extant state-run multicultural initiatives.

In this research, I endeavour to locate and map celebratory multiculturalism and transnational articulation as they circulate in the Irish public sphere; specifically in radio programming, content and production practice. However, in this investigation the above claim for exceptionalism will also come under further scrutiny, as examination of radio programme content and practice will also explore the nature of the (Irish) publics within which the programmes are heard and understood.

**Part Three: Researching Radio**

I attempt here to unite the critical concerns which emerge in the theoretical approaches introduced above in the development of those methodologies which have informed, shaped and structured my fieldwork. In particular, those approaches located in earlier radio scholarship predicated on examining the ways in which the institution of radio can produce locality, and conversely can be harnessed in broadcasting homogenisation
strategies, frame my analysis of the ways in which radio programme content can be read in reference to radio form. Selected approaches to critical multiculturalism inform my identification, selection and analysis of multicultural programmes produced by RTÉ.

Theories investigating the possibilities of an emergent transnational public sphere and for transcultural production inform my selection and analysis of *African Scene*, broadcast by Dublin community radio station Anna Livia FM, and additionally frame my examination of the licensing process in relation to Broadcasting Commission of Ireland’s 2004 call for tender for a multicultural station in 2004 and my reading of the structure and output of temporary community station Sunrise FM.

Chapters Three, Four and Five take the form of case studies, focusing on selected programme content and the ways in which it is framed by the institutional contexts within which the programmes were produced. Platt (1992) notes a perception in theories of case study research wherein ‘[m]uch case study theorising has been conceptually confused, because too many different theories have been packed into the idea “case study” ’ (Platt 1992: 48). In light of this, a useful and succinct definition of case study research is proposed by Yin (2009). In his comprehensive overview of case study research across diverse disciplines, Yin (2009) suggests that, generally, case studies are a useful method when ‘(a) "how" or "why" questions are being posed, (b) the investigator has little control over events, and (c) the focus is on a contemporary phenomenon within a real-life context’ (Yin 2009: 2). I argue all three criteria apply to my object/s of research as described above. My impetus was to address the central questions for this study, as outlined in the Introduction, through a comprehensive and multi-faceted investigation.
located in case study research. Platt (1992) observes an earlier emphasis in American
case study research theories in the 1920s and 30s on the ‘personal meanings’ which could
be derived from qualitative case study research, noting ‘[t]o the modern eye, it is striking
how far the virtues imputed to some sort of semi-structured interviewing resemble those
now more commonly imputed to participant observation as opposed to interviewing’
(Platt 1992: 22). My fieldwork was comprised of unstructured interviews, discussed
further below, alongside some in-studio observation; however, I did not engage formally
in ethnographic research practice. Yin notes that ‘case studies are a form of inquiry that
does not depend solely on ethnographic or participant-observer data’ (ibid.: 15) but
instead draw from multiple sources of evidence. For the purposes of my investigation
access has been key: to archived radio programmes under discussion, to the radio
practitioners involved and to radio station studios. I draw on multiple sources of evidence
within each of the three case study chapters to contextualise my analysis of programme
content; studio observation, multiple interviews with producers, presenters and station
managers, as well as Irish critiques of the development of both Dublin community radio
and within Radio Telefís Éireann. These converging lines of enquiry comprise my
investigation process. The case studies developed as comparative studies, following my
early recognition of the substantial difference in the ways in which migrant communities
were represented in multicultural programmes produced by the Irish national broadcaster
and how migrant communities represented themselves (and were facilitated in doing so)
in Dublin community radio.
The Process of Programme Selection

Three radio series form the subject of detailed case studies in this research: *Different Voices*, *Spectrum* and *African Scene*. *Different Voices* began broadcasting on medium wave radio in 2002 and was broadcast from 2003 on Radio 1 until the programme’s demise at the end of 2004. *Spectrum* began broadcasting in summer 2005 and continued on air until its cessation in December 2008. *Different Voices* and *Spectrum* were broadcast by RTÉ; *African Voices* has been broadcast by Dublin City Anna Livia FM since 2005. When this research was first begun, I initially searched for radio programmes which defined themselves as multicultural and were devoted to coverage of new migrant communities and their experiences in and of Ireland. Multicultural radio programmes produced by RTÉ Radio were my first object of study, as I was curious about the ways in which the national broadcaster was responding to and representing growing migrant communities in Ireland. As of autumn 2008, RTÉ Radio has produced two long-running series of radio programmes self-defined as ‘multicultural’. As inward migration and settled Irish responses to it continue to change, shift and hopefully expand, so too does the terrain of multicultural and migrant-produced radio programming continue to fluctuate and expand. This research therefore attempts to mark and examine a temporal moment during a time of significant transition. As will be argued, RTÉ’s production of multicultural programmes is in tandem with its public service remit as Ireland’s national broadcaster. As such, RTÉ is mandated to represent diversity within Ireland in its programming. This point is explored more fully in Chapter Three’s analysis of *Different Voices* and *Spectrum*. 
The necessity to expand the parameters of this research to incorporate questions to practitioners about the production of the programmes under scrutiny became clear as I discovered the ways in which production shaped programme content. The impact of production practice on the resulting programme, and thus its significance for programme content, became evident when I began interviewing RTÉ practitioners working on *Different Voices* and subsequently on *Spectrum*. The impact of the institutional context additionally emerged as a key object of study as I learned about the production contexts RTÉ practitioners were working within. RTÉ’s institutionalised programme remits, themselves drawn from established principles of public service broadcasting, consistently inform and shape the national broadcaster’s programme making. Both *Different Voices* and *Spectrum* were, at least initially, produced by established staff producers at RTÉ, whose practice was at least partly shaped by their prior experiences working for the state broadcaster and hence by its attendant ideologies, which are themselves drawn from wider public service broadcasting principles. Burns’(1977) study of the BBC, in which he examined its work environment, work practices and overarching ideologies revealed an organisation where a standardised, shared work ethic penetrated to all levels, sealing the BBC’s ethos in its own self-reinforcing structure:

> [W]hen one speaks of a moral order prevailing in a working community as large as the BBC, what is under discussion is not some pervasive social conscience which is absorbed by recruits through some process of ethical osmosis but part of the actualities of the talk and actions which constitute work.  

(Burns 1977: 86)

While this statement can be interpreted as somewhat guileless in its emphasis on the impact of work practices on the BBC’s ideology, it is clear that there is an encompassing
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shared sensibility of the organisation which circulates within it. I would suggest that a similar shared ethos exists at RTÉ. There are many crucial differences between the BBC and RTÉ, not least in terms of scale and scope; however for the purposes of this research they are broadly comparable as national broadcasting organizations in that each has drawn, at least initially, from Reithean principles of public service broadcasting. Structurally both organisations continue to attempt to achieve the stated goals of PSB; these principles filter down and impact on everyday working life in that the employees of each broadcasting company are aware of their organisation’s remit and ethos, which in turn inform their practice. In his comprehensive analysis of production practice at the BBC, Burns describes a tendency of senior BBC staff in particular to internalise the organisation’s values as their own:

[T]here is involvement in the goals of the organisation as it in fact is. This presumes that the individual identifies the values implicit in the organisation’s ends as his own - which is, in fact, what one means by involvement of this kind.

(Burns 1977: 109)

This tendency of speaking with the organisation’s voice emerges in Chapter Three, particularly within my interview with Aongus McAnally, a senior producer at RTÉ who worked on Spectrum for several months from its inception.

Identification and analysis of the activity involved in producing a multicultural radio programme broadcasting on a weekly basis further contributes to a better understanding of the overarching context of production. As products of the national broadcaster, the producers of both Different Voices and Spectrum embody a necessary neutrality
characteristic of broadcast producers of current affairs-related programmes, as described by Tunstall:

In sharp contrast to documentary, the prevailing broadcasting law places a legal requirement of political neutrality on news reporting. Television journalists have all, in effect, taken the vows of political neutrality and objectivity. A few of these journalists are well-known among politicians for partisan views of either left or right. However, it is also well understood and agreed that experienced journalists are quite capable of following the ancient news-agency and BBC-radio tradition of steering a central course between the two main political parties.

(Tunstall 1993: 47-48)

Although they engage with current events, particularly those directly related to migrant experience, neither *Different Voices* nor *Spectrum* can be typified as current events programmes. Yet the journalist’s ethos of objectivity and balance is still inherent in each programme’s approach and content, just as journalist practice is characterized by a requirement to generate balanced and impartial reports, as discussed above. As the national broadcaster, RTÉ is required by national legislation to deliver fair and unbiased coverage as part of its public service remit.

Responding to the representation of migrants in the Irish media, Devereux et al (2004) describe the ‘social distance’ of media practitioners:

The media themselves suffer the effects of social distance - their information comes mostly from majority sources, their personnel come mostly from majority groups. As minorities are largely socially distant, and excluded from many institutions, including the media itself, journalists may have as little insight into the lives of ethnic minorities, as the people who read their reports. Lack of access to the media, on the part of minorities, exacerbates the effects of the knowledge gap. This lack of access is even more acute for the non-citizen.

(Devereux et al 2004: 4)
In addition to their positions as media practitioners within the Irish national broadcaster, the non-migrant RTÉ producers, presenters and researchers working on *Different Voices* and *Spectrum* may embody such a distance in production practice, which then translates into the content of the programmes they produce.

In their emphasis on contemporary news events relating to migrants, both *Different Voices* and *Spectrum* incorporate some elements of the current events programme format. However, the level of engagement with current events fluctuates from programme to programme; as will be discussed further, some programmes follow up on recent events while others feature more general 'lifestyle' issues. The 'lifestyle' focus is in itself problematic within multiculturalism in its depoliticising imperative and its potential for commodification of aspects of everyday life made exotic, as will be explored further in Chapter Three. Both *Different Voices* and *Spectrum* can be described as magazine programmes, usually but not always consisting of several items in a single programme, which may share a common theme or may comprise several different topics. Therefore although each programme may comment on current affairs they are essentially features programmes. Ultimately, the current events reported on may be timely but the programme’s remit is not to provide breaking news. Additionally, both programmes, more often than not, were pre-recorded. This produces several results. Firstly, the lack-of-'liveness' circumvents Scannell’s (1991) description of a live broadcast: where ‘the moment of speaking and the moment of hearing are the same’ (Scannell 1991: 1). That immediacy and corresponding intimacy with the listener are removed when a radio programme is pre-recorded. Second, pre-recording allows for an editing process,
allowing the producer (who in the case of both programmes also acts as the editor) to edit for flow of conversation but also for meaning and bias, should he or she choose to do so. In the case of Different Voices and Spectrum both producers certainly seem committed to objectivity in interview. In the case of both programmes, where time to record the programme was limited, when a programme, or sections of a programme, were pre-recorded, the process was almost the same as when a programme goes out live. Studio discussion is often recorded in one take; conversational flow shouldn’t need to be replicated if the conditions are there to facilitate it in the first place. Finally, ‘liveness’ doesn’t mean a programme isn’t planned and constructed; Scannell describes the intentionality inherent to any programme:

All programmes have an audience oriented communicative intentionality which is embodied in the organization of their setting (context) down to the smallest detail: there is nothing in the discourses of radio and television that is not motivated, that is not intended to generate inferences about what is being said by virtue of how it is being said. Most importantly, all broadcast output is, knowingly, wittily, public.

(Scannell 1991: 11)

As I listened to Different Voices programmes, I encountered in one programme a reference to and coverage of The Russian Show on Anna Livia FM, in Dublin, a community radio station I was already anecdotally familiar with. This led me to research The Russian Show further, and then to search Anna Livia FM’s schedule for additional migrant-produced programming, which led me in turn to other community stations also producing programmes by and for migrant communities. It very quickly became apparent that community radio offered opportunities for migrant-produced programmes on a wider scale than did RTÉ. A dichotomy rapidly emerged between those programmes produced by RTÉ Radio representing Ireland’s multicultural project and those produced by
members of migrant communities in community radio, representing their own communities as well as a larger community of new migrants to Ireland. Indeed, community radio stations across Ireland have been broadcasting migrant-produced programming for several years, some of them, such as North-east Access Radio (NEAR FM), for over a decade. I decided to limit my search for migrant-produced programmes to Dublin community stations as there was a proliferation of migrant-produced programming in the capital city. As with my analysis of RTÉ’s multicultural programmes, the study of production practices in community radio became an additional area of analysis, again alongside an examination of the institutional contexts of the broadcasting stations.

Community radio utilises different production practices to public service or commercial broadcasters, primarily due to a relative lack of resources. Most programmes are broadcast live in studio and the running order is generally far looser as there are less advertisements, if any, to fit around programme items. Consequently on-air discussion is often more spontaneous, resulting in very different radio. As the differences between how migrants were represented and were provided with opportunities for self-representation became apparent, my research consolidated into case studies of programmes produced by RTÉ and by the Dublin community radio sector. Analysis of RTÉ’s multicultural programming forms the basis of Chapter Three and migrant-produced programmes on Dublin community radio, in particular African Scene, form the central object of Chapter Four. Chapter Five then provides an institutional case study of sorts, examining the application process of two consortia applying for a multicultural station license and the
ways in which Sunrise FM, which received a temporary license, branded itself as Ireland’s ‘first multiethnic radio station.’

In 2005, most programmes produced by Dublin community radio stations by and for migrant communities were mostly or entirely in the language of the target community, which was overwhelmingly other than English. *African Scene*, however, is broadcast in English, the lingua franca of some African countries including Nigeria and South Africa, where the two producers (respectively) come from. Chapter Five’s analysis of Sunrise FM, a temporary multiethnic radio station, also a Dublin community station albeit a short-term one, includes close readings of that station’s promotional messages. In my analysis of Sunrise FM, programmes do not form the central textual objects of study, as again most programmes broadcast on Sunrise FM were in languages other than English. However, station ‘idents’ and some sponsorship messages were broadcast in English; consequently I have focused on these. The ways in which Sunrise FM represented, or branded, itself as ‘Ireland’s first multiethnic station’ is provided within its station idents, which were evidently professionally and probably expensively produced.

That the majority of migrant-produced programmes broadcast on Dublin community radio are in the first language of the migrant communities represented is itself well worth investigating, as broadcasting directly to a linguistic community serves to better inform and empower that community and their experience of living in Ireland. I would argue for the ongoing importance and necessity for ‘first language radio’ programmes in Ireland, particularly but not exclusively at a time of notable inward migration. In her critique of
the academic discipline of Comparative Literature, Spivak (2003) advocates ‘language-based literary investigation’, suggesting such investigation should perhaps be privileged as a source with greater credibility than ‘evidence from interested cultural informants’, such as myself in this case (Spivak 2003: 13, 16). I am restricted from first-hand investigation into those radio programmes in other languages than English as English is unfortunately the only language I am fluent in. Consequently I have to investigate from my linguistic as well as my identity-based position.

In relation to the English-language programmes under discussion here, this research makes a further and important distinction between radio programmes self-defined as ‘multicultural’ and migrant-produced programmes. This distinction is crucial in that it privileges the production context and foregrounds the production practice of those actually responsible for the programmes’ content. It further derives from, and at the same time points to, a central dichotomy emerging from this research: the ideological and discursive gap between those programmes circulating in the mainstream public sphere as ‘multicultural’, the main function of which is to explain and depict migrant communities and members of those communities to the settled Irish community; and those programmes produced primarily by and for migrant communities. Rather than a dialectical relationship, where the production practice as well as programme content broadly or even occasionally inform each other within the public sphere, the two sets of programmes, ‘multicultural’ and migrant-produced, instead generally circulate in disparate arenas. At time of writing, migrant radio practitioners working in the community sector have not crossed over to the mainstream sector, with the single
exception of South African Riyaz Patel, a presenter on Sunrise FM who also worked for RTÉ Radio. Cleary (2006) describes a homogeneity which characterizes the Irish public sphere:

[I]t is easily forgotten that intellectual and cultural debate, however conducted, is monopolised in modern Ireland (as elsewhere of course) by reasonably well-to-do middle-class women and men who typically share a great deal in common despite the constitutive divisions of the intellectual field. Such sibling commonalities include similar modes of education and professional training, shared forms of cultural taste and cultural capital, and, more significantly, a collective structural positioning and vantage-point within the larger social system conferred by their occupation as intellectual workers.

(Cleary 2006: 4)

This reinforcement of a homogenous status quo may contribute to the ongoing polarisation of ‘multicultural’ and migrant-produced representation across broadcasting spheres.

This research emphasises the importance of reading radio texts with attention to aesthetic aspects of radio: the primacy of sound as providing all meaning, texture and impact; the effect of ‘liveness’ and the combined impression of a reflection of the real. Scannell describes radio’s form of realism:

Broadcasting reproduces the world as ordinary, but that seeming obviousness is an effect, the outcome of a multiplicity of small techniques and discursive practices that combine to produce that deeply taken-for-granted sense of familiarity with what is seen and heard.

(Scannell 1991: 9)

That the radio text can embody a realism achieved within a carefully re-created world within the programme links it to the broader corpus of media texts, and strengthens the
argument for applying cultural critical tools to its analysis. Radio programme content, like any other media text produced for public consumption, can be broken down into its formal elements for the purposes of analysis. For radio, these include the clarity of voices heard in studio; the use of remote contributors, for instance heard via telephone; the tone and authority of the presenter/s' voice/s; the use of the vox pop and the effects of editing. All content is framed by the presenter; formally, s/he introduces the programme and programme topics; informally, the presenter's tone of voice frames the content and the listener's reception and understanding of it. These formal elements can be read alongside approaches by theorists drawing from analysis of elements in programme content with reference to how liveness functions within a programme, to give one example (Scannell 1991; Hutchby 1994; Hendy 2000). Within the narrative of the programme's content, the length of time slots allocated to each item can be compared to assess the relative importance given to each story. Similarly assessing the time allocated for each contributor to speak also provides a comparative analysis of each guest's relative importance. Content is examined for its strategies of migrant representation, migrant community participation and the enunciation of migrant identities. How and where and to what degree these are achieved is the key concern and investigation of this study. Each of the three programmes under analysis here have evolved and expanded from their inception and each facilitates a form of migrant representation in some way. Each programme represents a different attempt, variously realised, at representing migrant experience.
Additionally for the purposes of this study, the accents heard in a radio programme themselves form an additional object of scrutiny, particularly their inherent capacity for performing migrant identity position and their potential for articulating a transnational perspective. Naficy’s (2001) positing of the accent, both symbolically and actually, as inherent to the accented cultural text, requires a critical reading of radio texts which incorporates analysis of migrant accents. In my close reading of selected radio programmes from the three radio series, recurring tropes emerged at the narrative, ideological and aesthetic levels. In identifying and reading the performance of recurring themes, I was listening for instances of multicultural representation, wherein tangible illustration of difference was foregrounded on air, often in the form of programme discourse comprised of descriptions of food, clothing, music and religious or other ritual of the migrant community represented. I was additionally listening for areas of intersection between and across members of migrant constituencies, across migrant communities and with members of the settled Irish community. When authority figures or experts were brought on the programme, as happened frequently on Spectrum, slightly less so on Different Voices and rarely on African Scene, I listened for how the interaction was performed, how much time the expert was given to speak and how much time was allocated for response, from the presenter/s but also from (other) members of migrant communities.

The programmes selected for analysis from both the mainstream public sphere and the community public sphere, particularly those excerpts included in the following chapters, have been selected for close reading because they embody, with reference to the above
formal elements, distinct ways of representing and framing migrant experience, whether for the consumption of a settled Irish audience or across migrant communities. Additionally most excerpts incorporated and replicated here embody a discursive intersection between different migrant perspectives and settled Irish life and infrastructure, providing perspectives on migrant experiences and, at their most effective, an interrogation of Irish perspectives on and mainstream framing of migrant communities.

**Interview Practice and Negotiating the Transcript**

Analysis of radio programme content in this research includes some scrutiny into the work undertaken by the programme’s presenter/s, producer/s and researcher/s, in order to understand the processes and decisions which went into creating the programme content under investigation. Radio production practice includes the decisions contributing to choice of programme topics; selection of and initial communication with interviewees; the ways in which interviews (live or pre-recorded) are conducted; the ways in which contact groups or networks are built and sustained and how callers into the show are spoken to. Topic choice was a key area of analysis within the programmes under scrutiny, as topics varied from illustrative showcases of ethnic food, music and ritual through to live on-air discussions of current issues particularly relevant to migrant communities. A programme’s topic dictated, at the very least initially, the ways in which migrant communities were framed within the programme: as subjects, or as contributors. Those programmes produced by RTÉ which framed the representation of migrants in relation to cultural products (food, music, art, ritual) are analysed with reference to theories of
critical multiculturalism, particularly Gordon and Newfield’s (1996) investigation into multiculturalism’s capacity for commodification. In many cases, much of programme production takes place hours or days before the actual broadcast: the news and press releases are scanned for stories, topics are decided upon, background research is conducted and interviews are arranged. Whether the programme goes out live or is pre-recorded, these elements of preparation come together prior to the programme’s start. Consequently, what I observed in studio at RTÉ Radio or Anna Livia FM, in Dublin, was the final result of this prior preparation by practitioners as it coalesced into a finished programme.

This research incorporates transcripts of interviews with radio practitioners and utilises these as supporting texts. The decision to interview radio practitioners and to include partial transcripts was motivated by my desire to ‘give room to voices other than the theorist’s own’ (During 1993: 21) and to hear what informed programme-making in the words of the practitioners themselves. These interviews centred entirely on production practice, so comprise a gathering of insights into programme production rather than embodying an ethnographic approach. These interviews were semi-structured, as I wanted to allow for and accommodate both variation within and depth of responses. The semi-structured nature of interviews conducted also allowed for adaptability to emergent lines of enquiry during the interview itself, ‘letting research participants speak for themselves’ (Guba and Lincoln 2005: 209) about their production practice. I drew up questions prior to each interview which addressed areas I wanted to ask about. These included:
How are topics chosen?

What dictates running order?

How do you find and/or gain access to interviewees for the programme?

In addition I asked questions as they occurred to me during the course or flow of the interview. If a respondent answered in some depth and/or changed the topic somewhat, a new area of enquiry often emerged which I would follow up if it seemed at all relevant. My prepared questions weren’t exhaustive; often a new, related question would occur to me as the interview progressed. The interviews were all recorded, initially on a minidisc player with microphone, then in later interviews, on an MP3 player with built-in microphone. It is possible that respondents felt somewhat more comfortable when being recorded on the MP3 player; the MP3 player was quite small and hence unobtrusive, which may have had an impact on the responses gathered. I requested permission from all interviewees to record their responses during initial discussion and scheduling of interviews. Each interviewee agreed to this prior to the interview taking place; in addition I informed each interviewee at the moment of switching on my voice recording technology so that each interviewee was made immediately aware that he or she was being recorded from that moment on.

Also informing these interviews was my own subject position. Back (1993) describes the necessity when undertaking fieldwork to locate your own subjectivity within your researching and interviewing process. He insists: ‘it is essential to look at degrees of mutuality/intersubjectivity, and the complex texture of the social contexts where researchers replete with gender and class identities interact with their subjects’ (Back
1993: 223). As indicated, this research does not embody an ethnographic approach; interviews with broadcast practitioners were conducted to glean insight from those practitioners into the production process, which would in turn provide greater depth to the analysis of radio programme content which is the central object of this research. However, I did conduct in-depth interviews with radio and media practitioners during which my own subject position could not but be a factor. As Guba and Lincoln (2005) argue, '[r]eflexivity forces us to come to terms not only with our choice of research problem and with those with whom we engage in the research process, but with our selves and with the multiple identities that represent the fluid self in the research setting' (Guba and Lincoln 2005: 210). Frankenburg (1993), writing about the intersections between race and gender in relation to the researcher's subject position, makes the point that 'white people and people of colour live racially structured lives' (Frankenburg 1993: 1). She argues that, in relation to acknowledged privilege 'any system of differentiation shapes those on whom it bestows privilege as well as those it oppresses. White people are “raced” just as men are “gendered.” '(ibid.). Alongside Dyer(1997) Frankenburg thus insists on making whiteness visible, and incorporates the acknowledged privilege conferred by whiteness into recognition of her relative privilege, examining how it relates to her subjectivity as researcher in her own work.

While arranging interviews and then interviewing each of my respondents, I brought to these encounters some shared experiential ground in relation to knowledge of radio production practice. I was able to draw on my own experience as a journalist and radio practitioner and was familiar with many, if not all, of the radio practices the respondents
described, including researching for radio, thinking up programme ideas, identifying potential contributors, arranging and conducting interviews, organising the running order and cueing the microphone and presenting live. Additionally, as a migrant from the US, living in Ireland for 12 years at time of writing and resident in Britain for four years before that, I had some common experiential ground with some of the interviewees, albeit at different levels depending on who I was speaking to. Melanie Verwoerd, South African presenter on *Spectrum*, South African Lizelle Joseph and Nigerian Olatunyi Idowu, producers and presenters on *African Scene*, and I are all migrants, but as a white, female, middle-class migrant I occupy a relatively privileged position in a socio-economic context, especially as I hold two passports, US and Irish. The privilege of my dual citizenship is heightened further if seen in reference to the 2004 Referendum in Ireland, which repealed the ‘right of soil’ previously in effect in Ireland, whereby any child born in Ireland could claim Irish citizenship, even if his/her parents were not Irish. Consequently my conversations with Joseph, Idowu and Verwoerd were nuanced differently in regard to our shared or diverging areas of privilege. I located myself within what Frankenburg calls the ‘power-relations of racism’ (Frankenburg 1993: 30). Frankenburg, drawing from earlier feminist perspectives on research (Gluck 1977; Oakley 1981), argues that ‘there is no disinterested position to be adopted in scholarship’ (ibid.) and proposes that the researcher must insert him/herself into the interviewing process accordingly, as the interviewer cannot be truly neutral. In speaking about shared experiences of arriving and then settling in Ireland I drew from my own experiences but was at the same time informed by my awareness that many experiences of migrancy and settling in to a new host country were *not* shared between us. This recognition emerged
from my understanding of our respective positions in the ‘power-relations of racism’ and contributed to my attempt at what Downing and Husband (2005) refer to as intercultural competence. ‘Intercultural communicative competence’, a phrase they trace back to Kim (1992), is characterized according to Downing and Husband by sensitivity and empathy across potentially deep cultural differences; openness of communication and a reflexive critical self-awareness, leading to ways in which media practitioners ‘are able to find through the language and values of their profession, a means to address biased and racist practice’ (Downing and Husband 2005: 184; emphasis in the original). Thus I attempted my own intercultural competence, assisted in part by my own, notably different, experiences as a migrant in Ireland.

Although my questions addressed the same areas of enquiry in the contexts of RTÉ and of community radio, my delivery and manner varied to some degree in response to the diverse institutional contexts I was interviewing within. Frankenburg (1993) observes, in reference to research interview practice, that ‘no presentation of the self is really neutral. One’s words and nonverbal signals send messages’ (Frankenburg 1993: 31). As a features journalist conducting interviews for print publication, I had prior experience in ‘taking the temperature’ of my interviewee and consciously adjusting my way of speaking, body language and other responses in order to further gain their trust. In the institutional context of RTÉ’s radio studios in Dublin, the headquarters of the national broadcaster, I was acutely aware that I had limited time with the producer and presenter of Spectrum, while the producer for Different Voices, which was put together at RTÉ’s regional station building in Cork, gave me more time. In the case of the
producers/presenters of *African Scene* I was aware I had more time but less of their trust initially. Many of my questions to the producers and presenters of RTÉ’s *Different Voices* and *Spectrum* addressed each series as a whole. I wanted to discover what informed the making of each series; in particular how the multicultural remit of each series was understood by the producer and presenter. Consequently, my initial line of enquiry in this context focused on the *form* of a self-defined multicultural programme and included questions such as:

Who do you see your audience being?

What’s your [programme] remit, or responsibility?

How does *Spectrum* differ from other RTÉ programmes positing themselves as multicultural?

Subsequent questions were attempts to interrogate the producers’ and presenters’ ideas about what comprised multicultural *content*; for example:

What about the term multiculturalism? How do you feel about it?

On the show, you use the phrase “a new multicultural Ireland”. How do you see that manifested?

As will be seen in Chapter Three, the responses from RTÉ radio practitioners to these questions reflect both individual opinions and an informing, institutional perspective.

The questions I prepared for the producer-presenters of *African Scene* also addressed programme form, programme aims and projected or perceived audience/s. For example, my question: ‘Is your priority the African community [in Dublin]?’ references both community representation and audiences. I also asked ‘how important is it to get migrant-
produced programmes on air? Is there a lack?', which was an attempt to get Idowu and Joseph’s perspectives as migrants on the then-current Dublin broadcasting landscape in relation to migrant representation. My questions relating to the meaning of multiculturalism, while framed differently to those put to RTÉ practitioners, elicited a more developed discussion than similar questions did at RTÉ. However, I additionally asked questions relating to access and building contacts, for example: ‘how open do you find organisations are in speaking to you? Are some more open than others?’ As will be discussed in Chapter Four, while producing, researching and presenting African Scene within the structures of community radio, Idowu and Joseph were working with considerably less resources than their equivalents at RTÉ Radio. Consequently I felt questions predicated on a relative lack of pre-existing resources would generate further information regarding their production practice within community radio. Finally, I asked questions regarding their plans, if any, for future work in broadcasting or other media and also asked ‘if you were working in the mainstream, would you change anything, if you were asked to?’

Interviewee responses of direct interest to this study included descriptions of contact- and relationship-building within diverse migrant communities. For my purposes, hearing how these relationships were built and sustained formed a key element of the resultant programmes. The deeper and more sustained relationships between the production staff and members of migrant communities were, the greater the potential for gathering stories from within the communities. This in turn had the potential to produce changes in content ranging from a simplistic celebration or commodification of difference to the provision of
a forum for participatory discussion of migrant issues, and/or the creation of a sustained space for a transnational performance of migrant identity, as represented within stories - news and features - emerging directly from migrant communities. As can be seen, the questions I asked were not standardised, but were instead context-specific, developed in advance to address the different institutional contexts of the respondents and their production practice. Additionally, I allowed for further questions to emerge organically in order to provide the opportunity for following up a point or observation made during the interview. The object of the interviews was to obtain both an insight into production practice and into the practitioner's perspective on that practice, in relation to the programme content which resulted. Consequently a direct comparative analysis, which would balance multiple answers to the same questions against each other, wasn't attempted here. However, I was able to compare descriptions of production practices - the subject of my interviews with all interviewees - based on the varied answers to my questions. It seemed to be the case that institutional approaches to production by the various interviewees were reflected to different degrees in the ways my questions were answered. Interviewees speaking about production practices at RTÉ would at times speak on behalf of RTÉ, consciously or otherwise, situating their production practice within standardised RTÉ practice. This was the case with the responses of a senior producer at RTÉ, who consciously situates his practice within an overarching institutional context at the national broadcaster. It was additionally the case that the migrant producers and station managers I spoke to from community radio gave more time over to answering my questions, as did the producer of Different Voices at RTÉ Cork. In the case of that producer and two station managers from two Dublin community radio stations, the
interviews were scheduled outside of their designated working hours at the station. In the case of *African Scene*, on community station Anna Livia FM, I interviewed its two producer-presenters a few hours before the programme was broadcast. This was also the case for the producer and presenter of *Spectrum*, broadcast from RTÉ’s radio studios in Dublin.

An interview transcript, like any other (re-)produced text, is inherently negotiated. Instead of simply a document containing acquired, objective information, an interview transcript is instead a produced text following an encounter, also negotiated, between the interviewer and the interviewee/s. The interviewing process is ‘inextricably and unavoidably historically, politically and contextually bound’ (Fontana and Frey 2005: 695). This suggests that an interview is anything but objective. My interviews with radio practitioners did not provide scientific evidence of production processes; they provided instead practitioners’ perspectives and reflections on their practice. Further, my interviews with migrant radio practitioners served as an additional articulation of migrant experience. The two producer-presenters from *African Scene*, Lizelle Joseph and Olatunyi Idowu, necessarily spoke from their experience as migrants about their programme and the ways in which it is addressed to their migrant community. They articulated their central imperative of providing information and a forum for discussion. Their subject position was further elaborated in discussion of their projected and desired career trajectories as broadcasters within the Irish public sphere. Joseph and Idowu situate their responses within personal narratives of projected success in the mainstream public sphere as working radio journalists. They describe an impetus to represent the
African community in Dublin but also to air issues affecting migrant communities more generally. Joseph in particular represents herself as hard working and idealistic, especially about representing issues affecting women. A dynamic that can be heard on air between the passionate, politically motivated Joseph and the more laid-back Idowu is replicated in their interview, as they were interviewed together.

If an interview transcript is a negotiated text, the role of the interviewer - in this case, myself - is one of the negotiating factors. As interviewer, I provide the questions and the framing pretext, but I additionally bring to the interview my related experience: in this case, my knowledge of and familiarity with radio production practices. This knowledge meant I was able to more quickly comprehend what was meant when a particular practice was described or an element of practice was referred to, such as a running order, a vox pop or a pre-recorded package. This provided me with a way in, so to speak, via this shared area of production experience. An additional area of common ground was achieved, to a limited degree, through our shared status as migrants now living in Ireland. My familiarity with elements of radio production practices and experiences of being a migrant myself additionally helped to counter a traditional hierarchical structure existent in the interviewing process. Writing about the evolution of interviewing practices from a claimed neutrality of political involvement, Fontana and Frey describe a movement away from this hierarchical approach. They reference Oakley’s feminist maxim ‘no intimacy without reciprocity’ (1981), and develop it further:

Thus, the emphasis is shifting to allow the development of a closer relation between the interviewer and the respondent. Researchers are attempting to minimise status differences and are doing away with the traditional hierarchical situation in interviewing. Interviewers can show their human side and can answer
questions and express feelings. Methodologically, this new approach provides a greater spectrum of responses and a greater insight into the lives of the respondents.

(Fontana and Frey 2005: 711)

Speaking politically, this erosion of hierarchy which often informs a fieldwork interview reduces the representation of the interviewer as an authoritative voice: in any case, the interviewee is ultimately being interviewed in order for the interviewer to learn something from him or her. The interviewee is transmitting knowledge; so in a sense it is the interviewee who can claim an authority. What a reduced sense of hierarchy achieves is a reduced distance between the interviewer and interviewee. By locating their 'human side', interviewers are also able to reveal and represent themselves more comprehensively. This can be read in tandem with a postmodernist endorsement of reflexivity as well as the employment of reflexivity in feminist scholarship as noted by Frankenburg (1993) above, in which the interviewer, or 'author' of the interview, identifies, describes and clarifies their own subject position in relation to the power dynamic of the interview process. Crucially, both the insertion of the knowledge of the interviewer's subject position and the conscious erosion of a power differential must be undertaken in good faith, not simply as a further device to gain the trust of the respondent. It is important too to note the centrality of the framing and interpretation of the interview process and the resultant interview transcript. Fontana and Frey call attention to the question of 'how the framing is being done and who is doing the framing.' They list a series of framing devices:
This means that the type of interviewing selected, the techniques used, and the ways of recording information all come to bear on the results of the study. In addition, data must be interpreted, and the researcher has a great deal of influence over what part of the data will be reported and how the data will be reported.

(ibid.: 712)

Again, reflexivity is inherent in these practices, although in a different way to how reflexivity is manifest in the context of the interview process itself. The respondent/s must be aware that the interviewer can take away their responses, however recorded, and shape them however s/he likes. There can be a tangible bond of trust in place ensuring those responses will not be abused: that is, quoted only in part or otherwise out of context and their meaning changed. As I had previously interviewed people for newspaper articles and was consequently legally accountable for representing their responses accurately, I was well aware when transcribing of the necessity for precision and accuracy.

My interpretation of respondents’ descriptions of production practices were again informed by my own experience of radio production, albeit in a different context than that of the respondents. Enough of my experience overlapped with areas of the respondents’ experience that I could empathise with the day-to-day issues of production they would sometimes refer to. The nuances of the varied responses were less clear-cut and provided some of the most interesting material for this research. Some of the more interesting examples of nuanced responses were articulated within respondents’ attitudes or opinions about their production practices and what informed these. In relation to the process of transcribing, then employing, these nuanced responses, those responses which
spoke to the production of the radio programmes themselves, but also those which, in the
case of Olatunyi and Lizelle, referenced their own subject positions in relation to their
access to other migrants, were the most helpful in informing my analysis of the relevant
programme content.

I have attempted here to introduce this research’s analysis of selected radio texts,
extrapolating reasons why the medium of radio is particularly suited to exploring migrant
representation and participation in the Irish public sphere. The qualities and ‘liveness’ of
talk radio and the format of the magazine programme serve as vehicles for the
representation of migrant experience. My investigation comprises an analysis based on
close reading of selected programme content alongside in-depth practitioner interviews,
arrived at by processes detailed above.

This chapter has attempted to provide a comprehensive, thematic overview of the key
theoretical approaches and methodologies underpinning the analysis of programme
content in Chapters Three, Four and Five. The theoretical approaches evoked here
provide critical avenues to addressing the questions posed at the start of this research, and
also assist in identifying another crucial consideration: how and where are radio texts
located in an emergent Irish transnational public sphere, and how does this re-worked
public sphere facilitate migrant representation, participation and community-building in
Ireland, alongside those programmes produced by the national broadcaster RTÉ? To
more comprehensively frame this question, the following chapter examines the
overarching policy contexts for public service broadcasting and community media, which ultimately shape the programmes and production practices under scrutiny in this thesis.
Notes

1 See http://www.radiostudiesnetwork.org.uk/ (accessed 20 March 2009). As of 2008 there have been four Radio Conferences, each comprised of distinctly international speakers. The resultant papers touch on topics equally diverse. The conferences took place in Sussex, UK (2001); Madison, WI, USA (2003); Melbourne, Australia (2005) and Lincoln, UK (2007). With the Radio Conference in Madison the term ‘A Transnational Forum’ was added and was retained in the Melbourne and Lincoln conference titles, reflected in the international range of papers.

2 Sadly, after providing an exemplary model of multicultural radio, broadcasting in up to 18 languages and on air since 1994, Berlin’s Radio Multi-Kulti was scheduled to stop broadcasting on 31 December 2008. (See http://www.goethe.de/kue/mus/thm/idd/en4058995.htm, accessed 20 January 2009.)

3 Observation made by Hesse at a panel he chaired at the ACS conference in Kingston, Jamaica in July, 2008.

4 Gordon and Newfield’s incorporation and analysis of cultural pluralisms, in accordance with their analysis more generally, is located primarily in a US context.

5 Dyer’s book-length study derived from his essay, also titled ‘White’, first published in Screen 29 (Autumn 1988). Other studies focused on the ‘invisibility’ of whiteness include Frankenberg (1993) who problematises ‘whiteness’ as a naturalised construct, with reference to the representation of women, drawing from her own subject position in her arguments. Writing on the representation of white femininity, Ware (1992) posits a reading of white women as a historically constructed category. In contrast, Pfeil (1997) interrogates the construction of white masculinity in contemporary popular culture. More recently, a focus on deconstructing white privilege has contributed to the development of ‘whiteness studies’, examining white identity as a cultural formation. See also Frankenberg et al (1997) and Back and Ware (2001).

6 See Ignatiev (1995) for a comprehensive account of ‘how the Irish became white’ in the United States.

7 While the insight for the concerns of this research provided by a psychoanalytic approach can be illuminating, as seen here, the very complexity of Žižek’s critique of multiculturalism has meant that it can only tangentially inform this study. Hage additionally provides a usefully multifaceted critique of multiculturalism through his ethnographic work; his arguments contribute to a wider theoretical context within which multiculturalism, particularly its significance in the Irish context, can be read and critiqued.

8 RTÉ Radio’s Radio One World, discussed in Chapter 3, was first broadcast in 1999. However, as it was broadcast on medium wave it would have been notably less accessible than the television programmes mentioned.

9 In the case of the national broadcaster RTÉ, archival programme material was provided from the Different Voices programme for the years 2003 and 2004, when it was broadcast over about 13 weeks from autumn to winter of each year. I recorded Spectrum radio content throughout the autumn 2005 series, from October to Christmas 2005. Additional material was also provided by then series producer, Aongus McAnally.
The ways in which RTÉ incorporates principles of PSB are explored in Chapter Two’s analysis of RTÉ’s remit in relation to the representation of diversity.

I had previously heard of *The Russian Show* when researching Russian media in Ireland.

Lentin and McVeigh (2006) provide a detailed analysis of the impact of the 27th Referendum on Irish Citizenship, which took place on 11 June 2004.

As will be discussed in Chapter Three, *Spectrum* began broadcasting in summer 2005, after the demise of *Different Voices* and at the same time as two other RTÉ Radio programmes self-defined as multicultural went on air; thus the comparative basis to the question.
Chapter Two

The Representation of Diversity Across Broadcasting Policy Contexts

This chapter examines broadcast policies in relation to representing diversity in Irish and European contexts, and explores the ways in which they inform and facilitate the production and circulation of multicultural and migrant-produced programmes in the Irish public sphere. This chapter additionally investigates how the multicultural project, identified in the previous chapter, is provided for within evolving public service broadcasting (PSB) policy discourse. Changes in definitions of community radio and community media at policy level, following discussion of an emergent transnational public sphere in the previous chapter, are additionally scrutinised here in reference to the facilitation of migrant-produced programming in community broadcasting. Both PSB and community media policy have incorporated provision for the representation of diversity; in the case of PSB originally deriving from a historical emphasis on pluralism, while community media policy was originally formulated on foregrounding opportunities for self-representation of marginalised communities, including ethnic or migrant communities. In this research, as identified in the previous chapter, programmes representing migrants emerge from two distinct, disparate spheres: public broadcasting, in the form of the national broadcaster RTÉ, and community media, represented by Dublin community radio. Thus, this chapter takes as its object the ways in which representation of diversity is provided for within broadcast policies in reference to both the public service and the community media spheres. This analysis of broadcasting policy attempts therefore to locate and scrutinise stated commitments to representation and participation of migrants in the
public sphere from both the public and community sectors and chart the ways these continue to evolve.

This study has developed during a time of changing definitions at the European level across both public service broadcasting and community media. The notion and nature of PSB, re-named and re-framed recently in some contexts as PSM, or public service media (to replace the technological limitations of the term ‘broadcasting’), is continuing to evolve in national contexts and at European media policy contexts (Jakubowicz 2007). One rationale behind these increasingly fundamental structural changes is explored below. Additionally, however, as is argued further in this chapter, a historical concept of PSB contributed to and shaped the PSB model currently embodied by the Irish national broadcaster RTÉ. Even as that prior model has attenuated, its legacy continues to inform RTÉ’s structure and remit, so is scrutinised here to some extent. Finally and at the same time, definitions of and resources for community radio and community media are also undergoing fundamental change, most notably at the level of European policy. These changes are identified and discussed in this chapter. The implications for Irish radio programming and production are drawn from the wider context of changes in European broadcasting policy.

In the European context and internationally, the BBC model of public service has historically provided a template of public service broadcasting at the level of the state-sponsored national broadcaster. Both BBC and European community media policy incorporate, in substantially different ways, provision for the representation of diversity; the BBC from a remit of ‘inclusiveness’ and community media from an
initial and persistent emphasis on foregrounding the self-representation, participation and articulation of marginalised communities, within which ethnic and migrant communities have historically been included. In the broader European context, this chapter will explore how ‘top-down’ paternalism and the commitment to inclusive, pluralist programming inherent to the original BBC public service ethos has evolved into a ‘bottom-up’ policy approach to representing diversity increasingly emphasised in European and international community media policy. PSB itself has undergone a profound shift in the last decade, if not earlier, as a result of changes in regulatory policies which moved from a focus on public service to a greater focus on regulation of emerging commercial broadcasters, and the emergence of technologies enabling a wider provision of media, blurring the close, often overlapping relationship between PSB and national broadcasters.

I here briefly introduce ways in which cultural policy can be analysed within cultural studies and media studies, situating the analysis of media policies within an overarching theoretical framework informed by a cultural studies approach, before turning to examination and analysis of public service and community sector broadcasting policy. Part One of this chapter charts current developments inherent to the ongoing process of re-framing PSB at policy level, followed by an overview of PSB principles which have historically informed, directly or contextually, PSB’s development and evolution, before turning to examine the Irish PSB context and the ways in which this informs the remit of Irish national broadcaster RTÉ. Part Two examines the principles informing community radio, the ways in which community radio is defined, the development of Irish community radio and the current terrain of community media policy.
PSB’s guiding principle of pluralism can be read as applicable to community media as well as to public and national media (Community Media Research Group 2007; Lewis 2008). Community radio has expanded and flourished in the last decade across Europe, benefiting in part from those same technological advances noted above while broadly retaining production practices and producing output consistent with community-building ideologies. As of September 2008 community media has been recognised and legitimated within EU cultural policy as ‘third sector’ media alongside public and commercial broadcasting. This official recognition opens up further possibilities for legislative as well as financial support for historically under-resourced community media.

As observed in Chapter One, mainstream (public and commercial) radio incorporates a tendency to transmit nationhood in the form of broadcasting culturally specific events, which serves to reinforce a constructed ideal of ‘nationhood’. This chapter’s analysis of broadcast policy discourses at the national and community levels in relation to multiculturalism relates to situating Irish broadcasting policy’s framing of representation of diversity in a wider policy context. Under scrutiny are the provisions made and resources allocated for ethnic and migrant representation in broadcasting policy across public and community spheres.

In relation to broadcast policy discourse, Wall (1999), writing about radio, describes a recurring trope in the language of stated criteria: ‘Much of the debate, and critique of existing provision, about local and commercial radio has been characterised by attempts to establish concepts of ‘community’ and ‘service’ as major criteria for
judging the performance of this radio sector' (Wall 1999: 1). Re-examining what is meant by ‘community’ and ‘service’, both within those policy documents scrutinised and in the context of the arguments of this research, ultimately contributes to a critique which informs my subsequent analyses of station practice, production practice, and programme content, and helps to further situate the current scenario of polarised programming within the public service and community public spheres.

Critical writing on broadcast policy forms a recognised area of critical enquiry within media studies. Some of these critiques problematise PSB within larger arguments investigating media capacity for producing democracy (Raboy 1995; Seaton 1997; Tracey 1998; Carpentier 2006). PSB is itself a shifting concept, currently in crisis due to factors outlined above including technological innovation and increased commercialisation, both leading to more opportunities for ‘niche’ programming, as well as changes in regulatory practice and policies. Historically every country interprets and implements PSB principles differently, although there is substantial overlap in interpretation. As noted, the British broadcasting model in the form of the BBC provided a key template for PSB. In this study, the discourse of selected PSB policy critique from Britain and elsewhere in Europe informs my analysis of Irish policy documents and the ways in which they facilitate and encourage the representation of migrant communities.

In relation to a cultural studies approach, policy analysis has been framed and described as cultural policy theory (During 1993). Cultural policy theory, as outlined by During, takes two disparate forms. The first is predicated on an inherently economic approach and focused on the allocation of often scarce resources to cultural
production and distribution. The second is more abstract and theoretical, broadly based on a Foucauldian understanding of power relations, and according to During, asserting that:

In its most radical guise, the neo-Foucauldian thesis argues that culture is neither an end in itself nor the product of autonomous agents - whether individuals or communities - but a mechanism for transmitting forms of “governmentality”, for ordering how we eat, think, live. Indeed, so the argument goes, cultural work and effects only exist in relation to other government structures.

(During 1993: 19)

McGuigan (2001) notes a shift within a broader cultural studies analytical framework from a Gramscian critique of hegemony and struggle at the level of everyday life to a Foucauldian model predicated on governmentality and emphasising the adjustment of micro-power relations rather than changing macro-power relations. McGuigan further critiques the Foucauldian approach as embodying ‘instrumentalism, excessive pragmatism, managerialism and lack of critical responsibility’ (McGuigan 2001: 198), which could additionally be harnessed into an uncritical approach to the role of the nation-state, precluding recognition of transnational economic and political forces. McGuigan sums up his critique of a Foucauldian approach by arguing:

Quite simply, such a theoretical position, though privileging certain important issues from a nation-state perspective, provides little if no conceptual grounds for formulating and addressing empirical questions of culture and power internationally, except, for example, under the auspices of formal interstate collaboration, as in the European Union and Council of Europe.

(McGuigan 2001: 199 – 200)

Additionally Barnett (1999) argues that a Foucauldian critical model is particularly unsuited for critique of media policy because its reliance on a conception of governmental power based on disciplinary practice cannot accommodate the temporal and spatial distanciation of broadcasting; the gap through which a broadcast
programme is simultaneously located in the place it is broadcast *from* and the location of the audiences it is broadcast *to* (Barnett 1999; see also Scannell 1996). Barnett argues:

> The distinctive spatialities and temporalities of electronic mass media might be interpreted as extending forms of power premised on visibility, but they also introduce a significant factor of indeterminancy not provided for in those theorizations of culture that continue to take the areal locales as their models of disciplinary power.

(Barnett 1999: 385)

Barnett additionally critiques what he identifies as a tendency in cultural policy studies to overstate the effect of cultural policy analysis on actual policy development and/or implementation, suggesting that the literature in this area 'stakes the political relevance of cultural studies on its putative role in contributing to the cultivation of national citizenship' (ibid.: 375), where the shaping of that citizenship is itself a cultural process worth scrutiny. He asserts that:

> The claims made with respect to the proper balance between criticism and policy are therefore open to question on the dual grounds that, first, the assumed conditions for intervention in cultural modes of government are not everywhere identical, and second, that they are undergoing significant processes of institutional and spatial restructuring in the contemporary period.

(ibid.)

While Barnett calls for a more pragmatic consideration of the centrality and importance of cultural studies analysis to shaping cultural policies, it is worth noting here three reports which centrally inform the concerns and arguments of this research, and which have also influenced European cultural thinking and in one case, directly impacted on changes to European media policy.
In relation to media and media policy analysis predicated on technological determinism, McGuigan returns to Williams' (1974) dialectic critique complicating technological determinism on the one hand and the concept of symptomatic technology on the other, which was based on the idea that technological developments and innovation were solely the effect of social change. Williams insisted instead on intentionality, described by McGuigan thusly:

Scientific discovery occurs in determinate social and cultural conditions and is applied quite deliberately to produce technical solutions to problems that are identified and selected in an active process of transformation.

(McGuigan 2001: 203)

Where a cultural studies approach to cultural policy, and by extension media policy, can be useful is in its potential to recognise and explore the power structures informing cultural policy. This research does not incorporate a developed Foucauldian approach to its analysis of programme content, production practices or institutional broadcasting contexts. I do however recognise an asymmetry in broadcasting, located within institutional hierarchies and within smaller hierarchies within the studio itself, but also at a macro level with relation to the allocation of resources, of policy recognition of the necessity to provide for diversity representation, and it is with regard to asymmetries in these contexts that a recognition of power relations can be broadly informative.

Part One: The Evolution of Public Service Broadcasting

From Public Service Broadcasting to Public Service Media

In summer 2008 the British broadcasting regulator Ofcom published a summary of responses to its second PSB review, following its first PSB review conducted in 2004.
The Ofcom review is significant in terms of the scale and scope of its findings and responses and thus has relevance for broadcasting policy in wider contexts. Drawing from a wide range of responses from cultural, community and broadcasting organisations around Britain, it noted the following, significant shifts in PSB:

We identified that access to public service content has expanded dramatically in the past few years, largely as a result of the internet and digital television. Consumers and citizens today have a huge digital opportunity, greater access than any previous generation to information from around the world....Yet our research showed that audiences attach high value to programming that reflects the UK, and the public service broadcasters play a dominant role in delivering this.

(Ofcom 2008a: 2)

What is evident from this statement is that when provided with notably increased access to a growing variety of media options, British audiences remain attached to national and local programming and PSB retains a central role in providing this. Taking on board the opportunities apparent within new media platforms as well as increasingly fragmented audience demand, Ofcom further notes that

[The existing model for public service broadcasting was not sufficiently flexible to respond to audiences' evolving requirements, being unable to exploit the new opportunities that are emerging on interactive platforms or addressing the risks to linear public broadcasting in the future]

(ibid.)

Ofcom identifies several areas which need to undergo change to reflect these evolving requirements, including the recognition of the increased centrality of new media platforms and of the ongoing plurality of provision of PSB, positing the question of how PSB is to be defined in the future in order to reflect these changes.

Of course, the need for further evolution in PSB, its functions and the ways in which it is defined and understood expands beyond Britain. Speaking in relation to the
European media landscape and the multiple forms of national PSB within it, Jakubowicz (2008) argues fundamental changes in the ways in which PSB is conceived of and put into practice are essential, predicated on his and others’ observations that the societal and technological context within which the principles of PSB first emerged have themselves fundamentally altered. He suggests that PSB be re-named as PSM, or public service media, to reflect a technological context wherein broadcasting is no longer the sole medium of transmission, and proposes the following:

For a number of years now, the need for a reassessment and redefinition of PSM, but primarily for a renewed source of its legitimation and rationale for its existence, has been increasingly apparent. Nevertheless, what we might call the “incumbent” or “legacy” concept of PSM has displayed considerable staying power. Policy and regulatory frameworks for PSM have equally displayed considerable inertia and resistance to change. As a result, in some cases PSM inhabits what might be called a time warp: it is still defined, and in many cases organized, in line with ideas inherited from the past which have an ever smaller purchase on the reality surrounding PSM today and requiring its fundamental change.

(Jakubowicz 2008: 1)

It is within this wider, shifting climate of change in perception and practice of PSB/PSM that this research situates analysis of RTÉ’s programme content and production practice. While this research focuses on specified RTÉ output, the overarching context and changing terrain of PSB/PSM additionally informs my reading of programmes and production practices of the Irish national broadcaster. Jakubowicz calls for a model of PSM that facilitates and encourages participation as part of a closer connection to and partnership with civil society, stating that:

The time has come for a new, participatory stage of PSM evolution, based on partnership with, and participation by, users and civil society in general. This is required in order to meet the new expectations of the public, but primarily to provide new legitimacy and rationale for PSM, as the old one, speaking to the general public on behalf of the elite, is no longer tenable.
The distance between civil society and a PSB approach which historically in many cases was paternalist and prescriptive is explored in more detail below. A 2008 UNESCO Report, produced in collaboration with the International Association of Media and Communication Research (IAMCR), argues for a research framework designed in part to chart changes in the digital media landscape and locate opportunities for greater participation for all. The report insists the ‘highest priority’ for such a research framework is to ‘mobilise research that challenges dominant paradigms that envisage the emergence of a homogenous knowledge society’ (UNESCO 2008: 4). The report stresses the importance of moving beyond a model defined by a singular, universalist approach and towards greater recognition of the possibilities within multiple media platforms, the growing numbers of amateur producers and co-producers utilising these platforms and the potential for ‘new communities and civil society actions to emerge within mediated environments’ (ibid.: 6).

The need for the development of alternative PSB policies emerges out of a prior conception of PSB characterised by paternalism and a pedagogical project (Bardoel and d’Haenens 2008; also Barnard 2000). In a western European context, PSB was previously conceived of as promoting democracy through pluralism and through the protection of cultural identity, which was informed by a unifying approach to representing that cultural identity. Jakubowicz (2007) notes the universality inherent to conceptions of PSB from its inception and suggests a universal approach to developing content should be retained, alongside thematic services, so as to provide a comprehensive public service. Against the perspective that the traditional public
service remit fully retains its relevance and importance into the 21st century, he argues that

[A]t the same time, nothing is the same as it was 80 years ago when that remit was first formulated. Social, cultural, technological and economic change has been so profound that the traditional remit can by no means respond to the needs of the public today. Changing circumstances require its thorough redefinition and extension, by adding new elements to those from the past.

(Jakubowicz 2007: 17)

Additionally, Jakubowicz (2007) identifies two European policy perspectives in relation to the future of PSM. He suggests EU legislation and the Council of Europe have significantly different, although not necessarily opposing, approaches to the structures and regulation of PSM. At a time in which central policy areas of PSB have come under the jurisdiction of the EU, a sense of these perspectives is crucial. A clear link remains between EU policy and national media policy in relation to PSB. The EU approaches PSB at the legislative level in relation to regulating competition across the broadcasting sector, and thus perceives it as a source of problems in regulating competition across media. Thus in regulating state aid rules to national broadcasters, the EU may slow down the modernisation measures perceived as necessary to enable PSB to become PSM, that is public service broadcasting with the potential for audience reach across new as well as existing media platforms.

In contrast, the Council of Europe sees PSB/PSM as ‘part of the solution of many problems’, including the promotion of social inclusion and media representation of migrant communities (Jakubowicz 2007: 21). Jakubowicz expands on the Council of Europe approach to PSB:
The Council of Europe has always approached this issue in an entirely different way. It consistently promotes public service broadcasting and its independence and special remit, considering it an indispensable part of the media system and of crucial importance to the exercise of many human rights. The remit is defined as offering news, educational, cultural and entertainment programmes aimed at different categories of the public and supporting the values underlying the political, legal and social structures of democratic societies, in particular respect for human rights, culture and political pluralism.

(ibid.)¹

Across European countries which are increasingly multiethnic, demand for programmes which can address the needs and experiences of diverse communities continues to grow; particularly in the context of increasing digital options. Bardoel and d’Haenens (2008) repeatedly make the point that communities, including migrants and children, are ‘drifting away’ from PSB programming. Both these factors contribute and create a broadcasting landscape characterised by a multiplicity of options; it is within this shifting landscape that PSB is being re-examined, re-conceived and reinvented.

Jakubowicz (2008) suggests ways in which programme-making and approaches to programming can be developed in the emergent conception and practices of PSM, arguing that changes in remit and programme requirements are inherent to the fundamental changes needed in PSM:

In the field of culture, new tasks stem from the process of globalization, migration, the increasingly multicultural nature of many societies and the need to maintain or promote social cohesion and facilitate intercultural and inter-religious dialogue and understanding among peoples (see Jakubowicz, 2006). This should involve serving minorities and immigrant communities in a way which satisfies their cultural and linguistic needs, but does not prevent their integration with the rest of the population; promoting intercultural and inter-religious dialogue at home and internationally.

(Jakubowicz 2008: 11)
Jakubowicz further observes that in the context of increasing trends of fragmentation and individualisation contributing to the necessity of re-visioning PSM, ‘PSM’s traditional role in maintaining social cohesion acquires all the more importance’ (ibid.: 12). Reducing social exclusion in a changed technological as well as social context requires new, focused ways of ensuring programme delivery across multiple platforms in order to ensure the public, however diverse their access and interests, are fully and truly served. In the British context, from responses received, the 2008 Ofcom PSB review noted the following areas which public service content should cover:

- Online public service content
- Content that caters for ethnic minorities including community radio
- Community based media projects, whether broadcasting or online
- Commercial local television programming
- International programming
- Films produced in the UK that represent UK culture.

(Ofcom 2008a: 5)

These responses indicate that what audiences want from public service content is increased coverage of local news and events and further opportunities for community participation, alongside programming about and for ethnic communities which could be both locally and internationally produced.

The development of new formats and genres appropriate to the new platforms and reflecting an ever-broader range of public needs and interests provides a way of ensuring content delivery. As Jakubowicz argues, ‘What is needed is a deliberate
strategy to serve distinctive target groups by a cross-media approach and the ability to
develop new content, formats and genre designed specifically for the new platforms’ (Jakubowicz 2008: 12). Yet the imperative, as can be seen, is not solely technological.

The greater requirement of PSM to form a new relationship, characterised by participation and partnership, with civil society, requires in turn the provision of substantive opportunities for such participation. New modes of social communication need therefore to be developed and produced. Jakubowicz (2008) suggests a new partnership with civic society could be effected through a shift from an approach historically often predicated on combined traditions of corporatism and social responsibility to one characterised by citizen participation. He explains that:

The citizen participation tradition is based on the idea that the media belong to the people, with an emancipatory, expressive and critical purpose. They should be institutionalised as the voice of citizens, without being beholden to the market or government authority. Traditionally, citizen participatory media have emphasised the role of local community, as well as the small scale and alternative media. With the redefinition of public service media, they would have to display a concerned and responsive attitude to their audiences and encourage feedback and interactivity. They can employ participatory formats and engage in surveys and debate that are genuinely intended to involve citizens.

(ibid.: 22)

This movement towards facilitating interactivity and debate would additionally need to contain opportunities for critique of authority and institutions entrusted with public welfare and well-being. The re-definition of PSM would incorporate a function by which media platforms could serve as locations for articulated critique of such authority and institutions, a role that Jakubowicz describes as ‘radical’, saying ‘without the radical role, participatory democracy would not be possible’ (ibid.). In tandem with such an approach, the 2008 UNESCO report argues that ‘[a]n alternative research framework is needed that can facilitate debate of the values that should be at
the core of initiatives to build knowledge societies' (UNESCO 2008: 5, emphasis in the original). Such a framework could address and explore the ways by which opportunities for alternative or radical critique could be facilitated. Such a shift, from one-way transmission to truly two-way communication, would see a partial realisation of Brecht's (1930) hopes for the then-new medium of radio.

**Historicising ‘Inclusiveness’ in PSB Discourse**

To understand how multicultural programming is provided for within a PSB mandate, it is necessary to frame the discussion and examination of ‘multicultural’ programmes produced by RTÉ in relation to PSB discourse in general and to the mandate of Irish public service broadcasting in particular. Arguably PSB has made some provision for multicultural programming since its inception. Conceived of as a way of regulating the budding broadcasting industry from its beginnings, particularly the allocation of spectrum space and financing mechanisms, PSB principles emerged in direct reference to these and other pragmatic concerns (Scannell 1995). In the British context, which was to prove influential for international PSB discourse due to the relative international success of the BBC as a PSB broadcaster, the emphasis was on providing a ‘national service in the public interest’ (Scannell 1995). A representative role was thus built into PSB discourse from the start, accompanied by the stated need for programme diversity, the better to serve this mandate (Scannell 1995: 3). Concepts such as diversity have also been built into PSB discourse from the beginning, although definitions of what constitutes diversity have evolved considerably since then. ‘Pluralism’ and ‘access’ are also key concepts in PSB; pluralism initially referred to ‘media pluralism’, meaning a variety of different types of programmes (entertainment, educational, informative), and ‘access’ was used in reference to actual
public access to broadcasting services. The embedding of these concepts in PSB discourse ultimately served the promotion of multicultural programming, positing multicultural programmes as addressing the stated public concerns of representing diversity and promoting plurality. It is worth noting, however, that such discourses of inclusiveness circulated within a top-down model of PSB characterised by a paternalist approach embodied in the stated imperative to ‘educate and inform’ audiences from what has been considered an elitist position.

The historical broadcasting context which first produced PSB discourses has since attenuated and shifted in ways identified by Jakubowicz and others above, as it referenced an emergent media form which was technologically limited in contrast to the broadcasting technology available and in use today, and broadcasting to a smaller, more homogenous population with far less access to broadcasting receivers. Consequently the parameters of PSB discourse have shifted considerably since their inception, as have the arguments for inclusiveness. However, charting the evolution of those discourses serves to identify the importance of inclusion from PSB’s beginnings; even if the terms and definitions of inclusiveness, conceptually and socially, have altered and become more complex.

The development of PSB has taken place in tandem with the political and geographical structures of the national context from whence the broadcasting organisation emerges. Tracey and Padovani (2003) situate this development historically:

PSB institutions historically have been nestled within the “post-war settlement.... of western industrial society.... based on a concept of the world being a place of full employment, stable currencies, perpetual growth, coherent nation states” (Tracey 1996: 26). As Tracey (1996) observed, the
“construction of an ideological order... provides the language to justify the process of deconstruction of the post-war order [and] significant economic, political and structural developments.”

(Tracey and Padovani 2003: 132)

Earlier in the history of PSB, particularly in Britain, representing the nation was seen as preferable to representing anything ‘foreign’ (Raboy 1995: 5). The faultlines dividing the British public described in early PSB discourse of the BBC were primarily based on region and class (Scannell 1995) and the goal of plurality in British programming was consequently designed to represent and address audiences across class and regional lines, as part of PSB’s stated project of social inclusion. Yet fluid terms such as pluralism and access, already part of PSB’s lexicon, opened up the conceptual possibility for wider social inclusion, one which could include multicultural programming which would further that goal.

PSB has also been posited as representing the public interest in a dichotomous relationship wherein market forces are a corrupting force on the PSB ideals of educating, informing and entertaining. Scannell (1989) claims that PSB continues to serve the public interest: ‘I wish to argue for broadcasting in its present form, as a public good that has unobtrusively contributed to the democratisation of everyday life, in public and private contexts, from its beginning through to today’ (Scannell 1989: 136). He proposes this is achieved through two essential characteristics which he views as constitutive of public service broadcasting: ‘the provision of a service of mixed programmes on national channels available to all’ (ibid.: 137), adding ‘[t]he principle of universal availability has technical and economic components’ (ibid.). Scannell here argues for universality of technical access via widely available
‘national’ channels, combined with ‘mixed’ programmes also accessible, ideologically as well as physically, to all.

Charting a brief history of the development and evolution of PSB within the BBC, Barnard (2000) notes that in Britain prior to the inception of the BBC in the 1920s, the function of public service was ‘[d]evotion to public service in the cause of one nation - drawing together all classes in a common national goal’ (Barnard 2000: 30), a conception of public service drawn from the post-Disraeli Conservative party at the turn of the 20th century and attendant notions of representing the British Empire. As with all national broadcast policy to differing degrees, the BBC’s version of public service was informed by political and financial restraints imposed by the government. Barnard argues:

Only as the BBC developed and its programming took on a momentum of its own did “public service” become synonymous with non-profit-making, universal availability, centralised control and cultural enhancement. These notions were rooted in the paternalistic perception of the public as being capable of development rather than an audience to be exploited or pandered to. 

(Barnard 2000: 29)

However, Scannell (1995) argues the two approaches, public service and commercial, complement each other: PSB guidelines ensure the public(s) are served by programming while money is made by popular programmes which attract advertising as well as attention to the station (Scannell 1995). A successful example of this is Britain’s Channel 4; created by the Broadcasting Act of 1980 for British television and established in 1982 with the goal of cultural pluralism, Channel 4 became well known for its broadcasting of multicultural programmes. Murdock (1999) describes the remit of the nascent Channel 4:
Commissioning and purchasing decisions would be guided by a distinctive remit which emphasised the need to address constituencies of interest who were under-represented in mainstream terrestrial programming and to maintain a positive commitment to innovation and experiment with programme forms.

(Murdock 1999: 34)

Channel 4 was not without its critics, who claimed the channel didn’t provide enough genuine variety with the programmes it broadcast (which were independently produced), and was consequently reductive in its representation of cultural diversity. However, the advent of Channel 4 did herald the permanent creation of a recognised space for multicultural broadcasting (Scannell 1995). One interpretation of the Channel 4 remit at its inception described its aims thusly:

Its difficult task, with the liberal encouragement of the new Broadcasting Act behind it, was to give a voice to the new pluralism of the 1980s; that explosive mixture of racial hatred with new multi-racial and multicultural tolerance, of the quest for sex equality with the consolidation of new forms of male supremacism, of a new tolerance in matters of sexual orientation with outbursts of homophobic hysteria, of a commitment to a welfare state with the argument that its existence was incompatible with the principle of a free market.

(Harvey 1994; cited in Scannell 1995: 31)

The emotive and contradictory tone here is possibly indicative of a consciousness of or exasperation with political and societal inequities in Britain at time of writing. Nonetheless, a strong commitment to pluralism is clear. In advance of the inception of Channel 4, the 1977 Annan Report in Britain took a pluralist view; in relation to its aims Seaton suggests that ‘broadcasting should cater for the full range of groups and interests in society, rather than seek to offer moral leadership’ (Seaton 1997: 304). This increased inclusiveness was perceived as a break with the prior concept of PSB as reformist, characterised by ‘paternalistic and abstract rule’ (ibid.: 302).
In March 2008, Channel 4 published a Research Report entitled ‘Race, Representation and the Media 2007’, partly in response to considerable public controversy following the broadcast of racist remarks on the television show ‘Celebrity Big Brother’. The report states: ‘We are absolutely committed to ensuring that Channel 4’s operations and output truly represent the diversity of contemporary Britain. We believe this is vital to our ability to fulfil our public role’ (Channel 4/Next on Four/Roberts 2008: 5). While it is evident from this that Channel 4 remains committed to representing diversity, it is also clear that conceding to commercial pressures contributed to the furore which may have, in turn, led to the publishing of this report.

The following series of policy statements from the European broadcasting context provides an overview of commonly held PSB concerns, particularly in a wider recognition of conceptual and interpretative shifts within the guiding principles of PSB. In 1994, the Council for Europe’s Fourth European Ministerial Conference on Mass Media Policy included a nine-point mission statement stating the objectives of PSB as they were perceived at the time:

- A common reference point for all members of the public
- A forum for broad public discussion
- Impartial news coverage
- Pluralistic, innovative and varied programming
- Programming which is both of wide public interest and attentive to the needs of minorities
- Reflection of the different ideas and beliefs in pluriethnic and multicultural societies
- A diversity of national and European cultural heritage
Original productions by independent producers

Extended viewer and listener choice by offering programs not provided by the commercial sector

(Council of Europe 1994, cited in Raboy 1994: 15)

Recurring and central concerns common to much of PSB discourse appear here, including: the need for a forum; impartiality; the reflection of a multiethnic and diverse society; representation of the relative diversity of heritage; pluralist programming, accessible to ‘minority’ communities and the ‘wide public interest’ alike. This statement in the Council of Europe report stating that ‘[p]rogramming which is both of wide public interest and attentive to the needs of minorities’, contains a dichotomy in its inherent separation of minority interest and a wider public interest, a dichotomy resembling that sometimes assumed by Channel 4 in its pursuit of programming for a migrant minority defined by its ‘otherness’ to the ‘wider public’, and, as will be discussed, by RTÉ.

In relation to wider interpretations of PSB incorporating US and well as British perspectives and definitions, Tracey identifies eight principles of PSB:

 Universality of availability; universality of appeal; provision for minorities, especially those disadvantaged by physical or social circumstance; serving the public sphere; commitment to the education of the public; public broadcasting should be distanced from all vested interests; broadcasting should be so structured as to encourage competition in good programming rather than competition for numbers; the rules of broadcasting should liberate rather than restrict the programme-maker.

(Tracey 1998: 26 – 32)

These principles closely resemble those drawn up in Britain by the Broadcasting Research Unit (BRU), published in 1985. Raboy (1995) argues the BRU principles
are problematic. The incorporation of characteristics such as accessibility and attention to minority communities are straightforward, says Raboy, and typical of PSB arguments for inclusion. However, in their reference to an established nationhood, the BRU principles rely overmuch on an uncontested understanding of nation, which Raboy suggests does not apply to all countries using PSB. Raboy additionally takes issue with the reference to distance from vested interests, saying this distance is dependent on an ideal situation where broadcasting institutions do not have (the need for) vested interests (Raboy 1995).

Ofcom’s 2004 review on PSB identified four aims of PSB programming:

To inform about, and increase understanding of the world; to reflect and strengthen cultural identity, particularly through the provision of high quality regional programmes; to stimulate interest in and knowledge of the arts, sciences and humanities; to support a tolerant and inclusive society (which may be viewed as an extension of the first aim above).

(McNair 2005: 108)

Ofcom regularly conduct reports into the effects of broadcasting in Britain, and thus provide a useful comparative analysis alongside elements of a recognised PSB discourse. Cultural identity is here conflated with regional representation; ‘understanding of the world’ could be read as represented by educational and informative programming, and the stated support of an ‘inclusive society’ reinforces PSB’s persistent emphasis on social inclusion. The broad term ‘social inclusion’ serves as an umbrella under which programming for diverse, marginalised and ethnic communities can be situated and provided for. Ofcom’s four criteria were to be understood ‘within a pluralistic organisational framework which through competition, encourages the pursuit of quality, creativity, innovation and independence in broadcasting, both from government and short-term commercial pressures’ (McNair
2005: 108). The acknowledgment of a competitive environment indicates a shift in PSB discourse to allow for the increasing spectre of competition. In 2008, Ofcom published the results of a second PSB review conducted in 2007 which, as observed above, proposes new directions for the short and medium term in British PSB in order to incorporate the new digital platforms and promote greater diversity in media consumption. An update on the review, proposing a new ‘PSB Blueprint’, emphasises the ongoing centrality of the BBC with a strong ‘alternative’ PSB station embodied in Channel 4, and acknowledges the ongoing importance of the market in determining content.4

Critiques of PSB from the last decade have focused on the widening of programming opportunities offered by technological options, particularly the advent of digital television and radio but also the potential broadcasting spaces offered by mobile phone networks and the internet (Titley 2003; McNair 2005; Sussman 2005); in short, the changes in the media landscape identified at the start of this chapter. Digital broadcasting and its offshoots offer a double-edged sword: on one hand, the increased multiplicity of channels provides new platforms from which to broadcast multicultural programmes and programmes of special interest. With reference to Graham and Davies (1997), McNair describes the possibilities for addressing diversity through use of these increased platforms:

[T]he multi-channel possibilities of cable, satellite and digital technology had the potential, it was argued, to liberate the notion of public service, refreshing and renewing it for a new century. This would be a century in which, while individuals still want to occupy some common cultural space with their neighbours, difference and diversity would be celebrated as never before. This was an era in which there was not one public, but many publics to serve.

(McNair 2005: 103)
On the other hand, such a proliferation of channels could provide viewers with a disincentive for continuing to pay a license fee to their national broadcaster when their viewing needs could be met by the plethora of new speciality channels on offer (McNair 2005); digital broadcasting from this perspective offers a consumer-led service, where more channels equals more viewer choice. McNair argues that

There will be a lightening, if not abandonment of public service requirements on commercial terrestrial broadcasters as they seek to make the transition to looming digitalisation.

(ibid.: 110)

The advent of more choice may reduce pressure on PSB to produce multicultural and special interest programmes as these could conceivably be commissioned, produced and broadcast by dedicated multicultural digital stations.

Robins (2006) historicises the role played by PSB in a nationally centred media landscape in Europe, arguing that PSB’s provision of mixed programming on national television and radio channels was inherent to its remit of constructing and sustaining a sense of national unity, stating that from the postwar years onward, ‘it was broadcasting that became the central mechanism for constructing this collective life and culture of the nation’ (Robins 2006: 143). Robins develops this further, locating his analysis firmly within a critique of nation-building:

Historically, then, broadcasting assumed a dual role, serving both as the political public sphere of the nation state, and as the focus for national cultural identification. We can say that broadcasting has been one of the key institutions through which listeners and viewers have come to imagine themselves as members of the national community.

(ibid.)

Two changes in the European media landscape have served to further de-centre PSB as previously understood as a set of guiding principles for broadcast practice,
although definitions of the characteristics of PSB-driven programming remain fluid. A shift in regulatory media principles relocated the emphasis from regulation predicated on the perceived national public interest to a regulatory regime primarily driven by commercial imperatives. This shift coincided with a proliferation of new distribution technologies which led to the development of new, transnational broadcasting systems and consequently the development of transnational markets (Robins 2006). Regulation, in the service of the nation represented, no longer stopped or started at the border. The free flows of globalisation transcended the boundaries of the nation state.

Robins argues that such shifts should not be considered as epochal, marking the end of one broadcasting era, superseded by another. He points out that “both “public service” and “global” are fluid and changing categories” (ibid.: 144). The proliferation of broadcasting as well as access technologies alongside the commercial creation of new markets has led to a wide variety not just of media options but broadcast spaces, including national, local-regional and transnational. Within this new broadcasting landscape, Robins notes:

[T]he imperative to effect some kind of distancing from the national imagination and the national paradigm if we are to develop a media policy that is sensitive to the new cultural diversity of the continent.

(ibid.)

The ideological evolution within PSB detailed above is in many ways intrinsically linked to changing conceptions of nation. Movement away from a top-down, paternalist model of PSB predicated on a singular conception of nation and nationhood has led to a bottom-up approach, as described by Jakubowicz (2007, 2008) and Robins, characterised by multiple approaches to broadcast production to reflect the
emergence of multiple media platforms in addition to terrestrial television and radio alongside increased diversity of audience needs; which brings us to the fundamental new ways of defining and re-defining media policy in Europe embodied in the emergence of PSM as a possible successor to PSB.

Writing with reference to the Dutch broadcasting system, Bardoel, d’Haenens and Peeters (2005) describe several methods of evaluating quality in broadcasting output, and thus facilitating the processes of accountability, another central PSB concern. Within a discussion of research instruments, they locate the usefulness of a ‘diversity index’, which would indicate the level of diversity within each programme category:

On the level of the whole programme output, the public broadcasting service aims to make programmes where men and women, indigenous citizens and ethnic minorities, old and young, those who are in good health and the sick..., are proportionally represented.

(Bardoel, D’Haenens and Peeters 2005: 72)

Such an instrument, if effective, could be useful in monitoring the amount of programmes aimed at diverse audiences, particularly in the context of the increased scope offered by multiple digital platforms. Yet amongst an increasing array of programme options, PSB’s commitment to multicultural programming could be marginalised rather than expanded, as commercial pressure grows and demand for niche programming increases.

**PSB in the Irish Context**

The principles of PSB and their embodiment in the British national broadcaster have informed Radio Telefís Éireann (RTÉ) from its inception, although Horgan (2001) suggests that broadcasting in Ireland has historically been politicised by close
relationships between Irish broadcasting, politicians and governments, which have perhaps also informed programme content, if not RTÉ’s remit. RTÉ is a public service broadcaster and funded by a license fee, which is standard for a national broadcaster, but also by advertising, in a model similar to the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC) and Radiotelevisione Italiana (RAI). Britain’s Channel 4 also adheres to a public service remit while taking in advertising, meaning it is effectively a commercial public service broadcaster. However, as discussed above, Channel 4 does not serve as the recognised national broadcaster of Britain so is not funded by the state to the extent the BBC is.

As with definitions and structures of PSB/PSM in a wider context, the regulatory context in Ireland continues to evolve, although more slowly than elsewhere. The Broadcasting Commission of Ireland (BCI), established in 2001 and formerly the Independent Radio and Television Commission, or IRTC, is an independent statutory organisation which fulfils several overarching functions in Irish broadcasting. Its main functions are licensing independent broadcasting services, including terrestrial television and radio services alongside cable, digital, MMDS and satellite systems; the development of codes and rules relating to programming and advertising standards and monitoring all licensed services for compliance to statutory obligations and license contracts. As of early 2009 the BCI was responsible for 58 regional, local, community and community of interest and institutional radio stations. The BCI is guided by four pieces of legislation: the 1988 Radio and Television Act, the 2001 Broadcasting Act, the Broadcasting (Funding) Act of 2003 and the Broadcasting (Amendment) Act of 2007.
The BCI currently functions as an interim organisation pending the proposed establishment of the Broadcasting Authority of Ireland. In 2006, a new Broadcasting Bill was announced, stating the following in relation to the BAI:

The new regulator, the Broadcasting Authority of Ireland (BAI), will encompass the existing regulatory functions of the broadcasting Commission of Ireland, the Broadcasting Complaints Commission and the RTÉ Authority. The BAI will be operationally independent.6

Kerr (2003) observes that the role and functions of RTÉ has been central to debate and discussion around the role of broadcast media in Irish society and the impact of technological convergence and forces of globalisation following the publication of the 1995 Broadcasting Green Paper in Ireland. The Green Paper on Broadcasting7 was a comprehensive attempt to situate the future of Irish broadcasting in terms informed by the principles of PSB in the context of globalisation (Horgan 2001). According to Farrel Corcoran, who contributed to the Green Paper, the Green Paper was an attempt at:

...re-focusing the national broadcaster in the context of basic values: cultural diversity, broadcasting as a public good, the linkage between broadcasting and democracy and the need to put Irish broadcasting on a sound legislative footing at a time of intense change in a vexed continent, flooded with virtually instantaneous information circulated by ever more sophisticated technologies.

(Corcoran 2004: 48)

While the Green Paper ultimately did not serve to inform or otherwise lead to the creation of new broadcasting legislation, although it suggested new beginnings, one proposal would continue to inform discussion and debate for the next seven years: that of 'merging the policy and regulatory functions of the RTÉ Authority and the IRTC to form one over-arching authority' (Department of Arts, Culture and the Gaeltacht 1995: 166). At the time the Green Paper was published, Byrne (2008) notes a change in the context of governmental authority in broadcasting, observing that
The government department charged with overseeing broadcasting had moved from Posts and Telegraphs, through Communications and now to Culture, so that human communication was now seen as a cultural imperative (Byrne 2007: 15).

Chapters Three and Four of the Green Paper propose that Irish broadcasting should retain the principles of PSB; Chapter Four includes the following note about an EU Report published prior to the Green Paper, which found that:

...notwithstanding the tremendous growth in private commercial broadcasting in recent years, public service broadcasters, generally speaking, are still the most important element in the European audiovisual landscape.

(Green Paper, Department of Arts, Culture and the Gaeltacht 1995: 157)

This statement serves to emphasise a desire for national broadcasters to retain primacy. Chapter Four additionally stated that a broadcasting philosophy should be formulated which included a stipulation that Irish broadcasting service retain an ‘Irish quality’:

[I]n Ireland the underlying philosophy could be stated to be the desire to provide a broadcasting service, which so far as possible, will have a distinctly Irish quality, will reflect Irish values and will recognise the responsible concern of the national broadcasting service with cultural interest as well as entertainment.

(ibid.: 151)

The Green Paper’s ‘Introduction’ reinforces the importance of retaining a national character to Irish broadcasting in reference to the context of European broadcasting in relation to globalisation. The ‘Introduction’ argues persuasively for the retention of a national sovereignty as against globalisation’s provision of free flows of information transcending national borders. The following paragraph argues for a preservation of national continuity in the cultural context of globalisation:
What it means to have an identity in today’s world is profoundly influenced by cultural forces. Just as individual identities can be strong, weak, disordered, confused or in crisis, so too can whole societies suffer identity crises if they lose a hold of a sense of continuity with their past and become lost or confused through cultural amnesia. Pressures towards globalisation, however, can undermine the anchoring of identity in the local environment and the imagined community of the nation. The new consciousness of the present associated with modernity implies the end of a sense of the customary, of a given order based on the power of the “taken for granted” tradition which legitimises everything that is done in the present.

(ibid.: 130)

The emphasis on continuity with the past and its equation with legitimising the present is reminiscent of Anderson’s (1991) analysis of nation building through the recording of history for mass consumption, and his argument that national continuity is itself constructed. The above statement strongly asserts the importance of preserving an Irish ‘nation-ness’ through the preservation of ‘cultural forces’ against a perceived tide of globalisation. Later in the ‘Introduction’ the persistence of nationalism as a continuing potent ideological force is argued for (ibid.). A further paragraph identifies the contradictions embodied in contemporary broadcasting:

Broadcasting today exists within these contradictions. As a mode of publication communication, it is strongly charged with opposite meanings, of promise and threat. It can be the motor of modernisation, cultural innovation, social transformation, even democratisation. It can cultivate a healthy public sphere in which national self-confidence flourishes and is oriented towards the future as a set of challenges to be met in a progressive way. It can critically interrogate a nation’s history, culture and identity and offer a vantage point for the renewal of that heritage. But broadcasting can also be a threat, pitting profit motive against collective rights, deterritorialised imperialism against minority cultural needs. It can disfigure us politically, homogenise us linguistically, and depress our inclination for cultural expression. A primary objective of this Green Paper is to stimulate debate on ways in which, through legislation, we can maximise the promise and reduce the threat.

(ibid.)
The above paragraph identifies key broadcasting functions, such as the role of broadcasting in interrogating national ‘history, culture and identity’, while also recognising broadcasting’s negative capacity for linguistic homogenisation.

While the Green Paper did not perhaps achieve a substantial or sustained answer to what Corcoran (2004) identifies as its dominant question: ‘What is the public interest in relation to broadcasting and how can it be best served in future’ (Corcoran 2004: 56), it did at least (re-)introduce public and political focus on the responsibilities of a national broadcaster. Legislation was subsequently drafted and announced in 1997 by the then Minister for Arts, Culture and the Gaeltacht, Michael D. Higgins, which incorporated the potential for the development of digital terrestrial television and incorporated the principles of PSB, including the establishment of a Broadcasting Commission. Higgins, who first proposed and developed the Green Paper, additionally wrote into European legislation, in the Amsterdam Treaty in 1995, a statement which effectively defined public service broadcasting as being the preserve of the public broadcaster (Horgan 2001). This meant that the public broadcaster had final control over the principles of PSB as embodied by the broadcaster’s practices and output. Higgins’ contribution led to a shift in European legislation, and thus perceptions, of how PSB was to be conceived of in future. However, the Amsterdam initiative supporting PSB could not solve the financial pressure and problems of national broadcasters, not least in Ireland. The solution proposed was to raise the license fee for the first time since 1986, by IR£8 to IR£70 in September 1996 (Horgan 2001). At this point the then Minister for Arts, Culture and the Gaeltacht, Sile de Valera, who took office in 1997, decided the license fee would not be linked to inflation, so additional funding provided by an indexed license fee could not be
guaranteed. Additionally it was proposed that RTÉ would be ring-fenced to some degree by the new proposed overarching Broadcasting Commission.

Since the Green Paper was published, there have been qualitative shifts in the Irish media landscape. One of these has been the establishment of the BCI noted above, as part of a trajectory of evolution in broadcasting regulation resulting in the eventual establishment of the BAI. Another shift with a significant impact has been an increase in cross-ownership of Irish media. Kerr (2003) notes that ‘[c]oncentration of ownership is not in itself a problem if the quality, diversity and service offered serve the cultural and political diversity of the audience’ (Kerr 2003: 19). However, often programmes are simply shared across channels and regional newspaper content is often syndicated across all papers owned by the parent media company, instead of comprising locally produced regionally specific content.8

The principles of PSB also inform more recent legislation. Ireland’s Broadcasting Act of 2001 includes the following within Section 28, which addresses RTÉ’s public service character and provisions in relation to the RTÉ’s programme schedules, stating that:

[They must] provide a comprehensive range of programmes in the Irish and English languages that reflect the cultural diversity of the whole island of Ireland and include, both on television and radio,...programmes that entertain, inform and educate, provide coverage of sporting, religious and cultural activities and cater for the expectations of the community generally as well as members of the community with special or minority interests and which, in every case, respect human dignity

(Broadcasting Act, 2001, section 28, no. 2: a, 29, my emphases)
To entertain, inform and educate are the three core goals of PSB discourse. The provision for community members with ‘special’ or ‘minority’ interests is vague but allows for providing programming for migrant communities.

The Green Paper proposed a broadcasting policy comprising several elements which again are informed by PSB discourses of serving the public interest and impartiality. Points four and five from the list of stated requirements embody a position on inclusive and national broadcasting, incorporating a component of nation building:

Minorities should receive particular provision

Broadcasters should recognise their special relationship to the sense of national identity.

(Green Paper on Broadcasting 1995: 152)

Similarly, the Irish Public Broadcasting Charter (2004), published on the RTÉ website, includes several statements which make provision for multicultural programming. It was proposed in 2002 that RTÉ should operate under a Public Broadcasting Charter, the purpose of which was to identify RTÉ’s public service obligations and commitments and to reinforce the national broadcaster’s accountability to those commitments. The Charter was drawn up following a broad public consultation process, with submissions from commercial broadcaster TV3, Screen Producers Ireland, Independent Broadcasters of Ireland, RTÉ Trade Union Group, as well as other bodies such as the Department of Foreign Affairs, Dóchas, the Family and Media Association, the Irish Hard of Hearing Association, the National Adult Literacy Agency and the National Consultative Committee on Racism and Interculturalism.
The Charter states its function as: ‘A statement of principles that clarifies what is expected of RTÉ as the national public service broadcaster, including RTÉ’s accountability to its audience.’ Also corresponding with the core concerns of PSB discourse, it states the following under its ‘Public Service Remit’:

RTÉ, as the national public broadcaster, shall reflect the democratic, social and cultural values of Irish society and the need to preserve media pluralism

RTÉ shall, at all times, strive to reflect fairly and equally the regional, cultural and political diversity of Ireland and its peoples

[N]o editorial or programming bias shall be shown in terms of gender, age, disability, race, sexual orientation, religion or membership of a minority community

(Public Service Broadcasting Charter 2004: 2)

These statements include a commitment to media pluralism, to the equal ‘reflection’ of diversity of region, culture and political position, and to the requirement to erode bias characteristic of PSB. As with all policy language, interpretation is key here: for example, how ‘reflecting cultural values’ is read depends on what those cultural values are identified or defined as. The following page of the Charter includes commitments to the representation of the following groups, as well as separate commitments to regional emphasis and social inclusion: children, an Gaeilge speakers¹⁰ and those with a ‘physical, sensory and intellectual disability’, alongside a provision to ‘resist gender stereotyping’ and a stipulation against invasion of individual privacy (ibid.: 3). Finally, in relation to the provision of services RTÉ states ‘a responsibility to reflect the full range and diversity of cultures within Ireland’ (ibid.: 2). While there is no specific provision made for ethnic diversity, these statements, taken together, can be read as comprising a holistic approach to comprehensive representation of all Ireland’s communities, again in the tradition of PSB. Again, however, interpretation is central: what comprises the ‘full range and
diversity of cultures’ in Ireland to the national broadcasters, commercial broadcasters or community broadcasters?

RTÉ’s ‘Guiding Principles’ (2005) and ‘Programme Makers’ Guidelines’ (2002), available via RTÉ’s website, also incorporate references to addressing diversity in its programming, in sections titled ‘Respect for Diversity’, ‘Recognising Marginalised Groups’ and briefly in ‘Broadcasting to all the Nation’. These serve as stated commitments from the broadcaster rather than commitments enshrined in policy. The reiteration of these commitments to representing diversity has the effect of reinforcing their impact. They share rhetorical characteristics which indicate they were drawn up in relation to Ireland’s Public Charter for Public Service Broadcasting, with further reference to European guidelines. These documents are available on RTÉ’s website and thus accessible to any member of the public who wishes to look, in accordance with RTÉ’s remit of accountability.

Reflection and lack of bias, while essential in themselves, demonstrate something less than an active commitment to representation of or facilitating participation by Ireland’s migrant or Traveller communities. As of 2006, multicultural programming produced by RTÉ has been framed as part of its public service remit, explicitly provided for in 2006. However, changes in the understanding of nationhood as well as correlating changes in the language of PSB discourse between the beginnings of PSB and the present moment suggests this realisation was reached in relation to political, economic and societal changes contributing to greater ethnic diversity in the form of increased inward migration. RTÉ’s ‘Statement of Commitments 2006’ incorporates provisions for multicultural broadcasting on television and radio,
stipulating RTÉ 1 and RTÉ Radio 1 as the channels allocated for such programming across television and radio respectively. These provisions were manifested on RTÉ Radio comprehensively if briefly in the ‘multicultural season’ which began broadcasting in June 2005 on RTÉ Radio 1. The ‘multicultural season’ incorporated three new multicultural programmes: *Breaking Bread, A New Ireland* and *Spectrum*. The first two ran for six weeks and 13 weeks respectively, while *Spectrum* continued to be broadcast through August 2006, then returned to Radio 1 in October 2006. Prior to these three programmes RTÉ Radio broadcast *Different Voices*, also on Radio 1, from 2002 to 2004.

Television fared somewhat better, in 2005 introducing several multicultural programmes including *Far Away, Up Close, 3 Sixty, Oz Ability Awards* and *Hands On*, in addition to *Mono*, broadcast since 2002 (Guiding Principles, RTÉ 2005). RTÉ’s ‘Statement of Commitments 2006’ introduced further new multicultural programmes for television including *Islam*, a three-part study of Islam and *No Place Like Home*. Two further programmes described as multicultural, *Cathal O Searcaigh in Nepal* and *Claracha Gealige*, explored other countries in conjunction with the arts, the latter through Irish language. Additionally there was televised footage of the summer 2006 Dun Laoghaire Festival for World Cultures which included interviews with several of the participants as well as coverage of the music. RTÉ television’s coverage of the Dun Laoghaire Festival, which has become a regular event and represents itself as multicultural, could be seen to expand RTÉ’s parameters of what constitutes events which should be televised. In relation to RTÉ’s ‘corporate’ commitments to multiculturalism, the ‘Statement of Commitments 2006’ lists under Corporate Commitments its ongoing commitment to broadcasting the Media and
Multicultural Awards (MAMA) in conjunction with multicultural newspaper *Metro Éireann*, although RTÉ stopped sponsoring the MAMA awards in 2006.

The Guiding Principles document incorporates these two sentences:

- RTÉ, shaped by its past, will be flexible enough to adapt to the future
- RTÉ will focus on holding existing and attracting new audiences

(Guiding Principles, RTÉ 2005: 7, 8)\(^{14}\)

These are directional, if vague statements. New audiences can be read as referring to Ireland’s increasing migrant communities, but this is not explicitly stated or even suggested. What can be seen in the above stated commitments to representing diversity is a lack of further specificity, except in the case of RTÉ’s annual statement of identified programme commitments for 2006, in which commissioned programmes are named and described within the remit to multicultural programming.

The Irish broadcasting landscape will continue to be informed by European cultural policy and broadcasting policy developments. Bardoel and d’Haenens (2008) argue that with PSB and perceptions of PSB in crisis, a ‘reinvented’ PSB is necessary. In their analysis of public broadcasting in western Europe, they identify three models of public broadcasting at the national level: the ‘liberal’ model, embodied most thoroughly by the BBC and its relative independence from government and direct political influence; the ‘polarised pluralist model’, characterised by state intervention, politicisation and clientelism and located primarily in Mediterranean countries and the ‘democratic corporatist model’ found in Scandinavian countries as well as Austria, the Netherlands, Belgium and Germany (Bardoel and d’Haenens 2008: 339). Within this typology, PSB in Ireland probably corresponds most to the liberal model, although
RTÉ has historically had a closer and thus more problematic relationship with both the Irish government and individual politicians (Horgan 2001, 2004).

As noted above, Jakubowicz (2007) has identified the need for a dialectical approach in PSM, retaining popular programming and continuing to serve large audiences while also developing ‘niche’ programming targeted at marginalised groups, including ethnic and migrant communities. A key component of a shift towards ‘alternative’ PSB as indicated by Bardoel and d’Haenens lies in changes to the ways in which it is regulated. Echoing Higgins’ proposal above that PSB is ultimately shaped and formed by the public broadcaster itself, as mandated in turn by the state, Ireland is moving towards establishing a Broadcast Authority which would significantly inform and possibly alter ways in which PSB is conceived of and produced by RTÉ.

**Part Two: The Principles and Development of Community Radio**

**Community Radio: Emphasising ‘Community’ Over ‘Radio’?**

In September 2008 EU parliament voted to officially recognise community media alongside public service media and commercial media. Legitimating community media as ‘third sector media’ effectively facilitates the provision of greater resources to community radio and television stations, leading in turn to further growth of community media. Additionally, the parliamentary decision contributes to a climate wherein regulatory practices will also fall under greater scrutiny. Prior to the parliamentary vote, Lewis’ 2008 report ‘Promoting Social Cohesion: the Role of Community Media’ called for the official recognition of community media across the EU. Serving as a thorough overview of community media and as a recommendation to
the European Parliament to recognise and legitimate community media, Lewis’ report summarised existing definitions of community media or, as he terms it, ‘third sector media’, in relation to infrastructural categories such as ownership, structure, funding and different platforms, as well as content provision, and audience involvement (Lewis 2008). Alongside others noted above including Robins (2006), Jakubowicz (2007) and Bardoel and d’Haenens (2008), Lewis notes the changes in Europe resulting from inward migration and hence to audience and broadcaster needs:

[T]he report argues that the inability, for various reasons, of public service and commercial broadcasting to meet the needs of marginalised and disadvantaged social groups means that third sector media are becoming the focus of official attention.

(Lewis 2008: 5)

Lewis additionally notes and references the crisis at the European level with new definitions for PSB/PSM, discussed above.

Lewis argues that for community media, for the most part ‘practice preceded theory’ (ibid.: 11), which can be read to suggest that when the principles of community media practice conceived of by the World Association of Community Radio Broadcasters (AMARC)¹⁶ and other community media organisations were drawn up, they evolved from experience with community media practice and so can be read as incorporating a pragmatism derived from practice alongside stated idealism. The ‘community’ aspect of community media has been much discussed (Community Media Research Group 2007); Lewis summarises the relationship between ‘community’ and ‘media’ thusly: ‘It is a case of the community moving into broadcasting rather than broadcasting moving into the community’ (Lewis 2008: 13), and references the founder of South Africa’s Bush Radio Zane Ibrahim’s remark that community radio is ‘10% radio, 90% community.’
Lewis’ (2008) report is directly informed by AMARC’s multiple and diverse principles of community broadcasting, but is additionally concerned with the pragmatic issues addressed at the Community Media colloquium in London in 2007. In the context of the uses of third sector media for social cohesion, and in particular reference to the potential uses and benefits of community media for migrant and ethnic communities, Lewis poses the question: ‘to what extent do community media assist in the dual role of according space for the expression of minority cultures and languages, and of assisting minority communities to settled in their new home?’ (Lewis 2008: 27). Further discussion of polylingual programming is located in Chapter Five’s analysis of Dublin’s temporary multiethnic station Sunrise FM, which broadcasted programmes in several languages, and in Chapter Four’s analysis of migrant-produced programming in Dublin.

A crucial difference between common and historical conceptions of PSB and the principles of community media is that PSB emerged entirely from a national context, as an extension of the nation state in the form of representative broadcasting. Where much of PSB discourse has incorporated the promotion of inclusive programming within a larger, overarching commitment to public service, community media discourse and practice is commonly predicated on the promotion of inclusiveness as its primary goal. Community radio embodies Hartley’s (2000) assertion that the medium of radio lends itself to the production of locality, and thus to what Hartley terms ‘community-building’. Community radio is often defined as local radio (Hendy 2000; Meadows et al 2007; Community Media Research Group 2007), although the ‘community’ of community radio can also refer to ‘community of interest’ in the
licensing process and in programme making. Community radio is commonly and necessarily recognised as a separate tier to local commercial radio. In Britain, local radio grew from the BBC but quickly embodied qualities and characteristics of commercial radio, in addition to facing pressures of funding and institutional resources. The first commercial stations in Britain were local radio stations (Lewis and Booth 1989). Lewis and Booth argue that the inception of local radio in Britain was heavily informed by the concept of localism and ‘community’, which carried (and still carries) connotations of solidarity and unity, particularly when read as relating to a rural geographical location. Thus both localism and community became selling points for the promotion of conceptions of ‘local radio’, as ‘the idea of community remained wedded to locality, even when the social divisions…. became uncovered’ (Lewis and Booth 1989: 91). Community media’s inherently bottom-up approach to broadcasting, which takes as a starting point the often diverse needs of the community or community of interest to be represented means that as a medium it is ideally situated and is in fact designed to provide opportunities for community participation.

Depending on the broadcasting policy and legal definitions of community media in a given country, a small ‘local’ station can be created under a community or a commercial license, or indeed remain unlicensed and therefore pirate. While community and local radio can both have a remit to serve a specified geographical community with programming which reflects that community’s needs and interests, they can differ fundamentally at the level of institutional structure and funding sources. Community radio can be local radio, but ‘local’ radio does not de facto embody the principles which inform community radio stations and practice. Further,
and importantly, community radio also recognises and serves the notion of ‘community of interest’, which facilitates radio stations dedicated to representing communities which are not necessarily site-specific, such as gay or lesbian groups, disabled groups or ethnic and migrant communities.

Lewis’ term ‘third sector media’ (2008) situates community media, and thus community radio, within a structural broadcasting hierarchy which corresponds to a hierarchy of national/regional/local but differs structurally, at the level of resources and funding, and at the level of principle. A second crucial difference in how PSB provided for the representation of diversity and how the community media sector facilitates that representation is the centrally informing concept in community media policy discourse of active community participation. As discussed above, a crisis in conceptions and regulation of PSB has led to an increased awareness of, amongst other areas, the need to include migrant audiences alongside other potentially marginalised audiences. Where PSB has arguably shifted from a top-down, paternalist approach, community media originally emerged from bottom-up approaches which community media organisations, groups and movements mainly retain.

A further distinction lies in the difference between the top-down approach of the BBC, to use the best known example, informed in that case by a national identity originally conceived as singular in its broadcast representation; and the bottom-up approach embodied and promoted by community media, conceived of as inherently plural, multiple and hybrid in nature.¹⁷ This distinction also applies in the Irish context where a similar dichotomy persists between public service broadcasting
produced by the national broadcaster and the practices and output of community media.

Barnard usefully and unequivocally links community radio with ‘alternativism’, a concept he defines as follows:

The term implies a coherent, uniform, oppositional response to the mainstream, but it covers different approaches, attitudes and precepts that are sometimes defined in terms of modern versus traditional, progressive versus conservative, or even revolutionary versus reactionary.

(Barnard 2000: 68)

This definition can be read alongside his analysis of community radio:

One of the key arguments of supporters of community radio is that it is a response to mainstream radio’s tendency to either ignore or fail to adequately reflect the needs of minority audiences, however the term minority may be defined.

(ibid.)

By linking community radio with alternativism Barnard situates community radio as a politicised institution or communication tool; one that, taking on board Hartley and Brecht, embodies radio’s community-building potential. The interactive practices inherent to much of community radio broadcasting encourage and facilitate migrant participation alongside that of other disenfranchised peoples who historically have had less access to radio production or presenting opportunities. Community radio’s rationale is persistently predicated on radio’s community-building capacities. Community radio is additionally perfectly placed for promoting social justice. Both these guiding principles recur in discourses around community radio and the multiple yet often overlapping conceptions of its remit.
AMARC provides multiple definitions of community radio, from which the following are drawn:

The historical philosophy of community radio is to use this medium as the voice of the voiceless, the mouthpiece of oppressed people (be it on radial, gender, or class grounds) and generally as a tool for development.

Community radio is defined as having three aspects: non-profit making, community ownership and control, community participation.

It should be made clear that community radio is not about doing something for the community but about the community doing something for itself, i.e. owning and controlling its own means of communication.\(^{18}\)

The very multiplicity of definitions published by AMARC, many of which appear on their website in no particular order of importance or priority, is itself a reflection on the organisation’s internationally inclusive ethos. The following definition, also from AMARC, contrasts community radio with commercial or national broadcasters, echoing Barnard’s depiction of community radio as often functioning in opposition to mainstream radio:

Community radio in the commercially dominated media system means radio in the community, for the community, about the community and by the community. There is a wide participation from regular community members with respect to management and production of programs. This involvement of community members distinguishes it from the dominant commercial media.\(^{19}\)

AMARC’s central focus is international community radio broadcasters and their practice. Their ‘Principles and Objectives’ are worth scrutiny for their delineation of the agreed-upon aims and objectives of international community radio broadcasting practice. The ‘Principles’ for broadcasters are:

To: contribute to the expression of different social, political and cultural movements, and to the promotion of all initiatives supporting peace, friendship among peoples; recognize the fundamental and specific role of women in establishing new communication practices; express through their programming: the sovereignty and independence of all peoples, solidarity and non-intervention in the internal affairs of other countries, international cooperation based on the creation of permanent and widespread ties based on equality, reciprocity, and
mutual respect, non-discrimination on the basis of race, sex, sexual preference or religion and respect for the cultural identity of peoples.\textsuperscript{20}

AMARC's stated 'Objectives' are:

Developing and furthering a general understanding of the concept and role of community radio; promoting the use of community radio as a viable alternative model for communication; promoting the use of community radio as a tool for development, peace, justice and solidarity; promoting and facilitating cooperation and information exchange between community radio broadcasters; defending community radio broadcasters who respect the principles of AMARC and are threatened by political developments; contributing to the democratization of communication that meets the needs and demands of communities, in the pursuit of a new world information balance; facilitating the representation of its members on the international scene, or representing them if they so request; undertaking all additional activities determined by the General Assembly with a view to improving the objectives defined above.\textsuperscript{21}

The 'Principles' and 'Objectives' represent an internationally recognised ideological foundation for community radio, but are not in themselves prescriptive. Within these principles and objectives, community radio can take different forms and incorporate different, if consistently overlapping, ideological approaches.

In his comprehensive comparative study on what he terms 'ethnic minority media services', Browne (2005) identifies AMARC as a watchdog organisation which:

...assists ethnic minority efforts as part of its overall mission of supporting community broadcasting. That support takes several forms, including exchange of information on experiences, guidance on starting a community-based station, promoting and assisting with training programs, and making its members aware of the suppression of community stations by national governments and the need for members to bring pressures to bear on those governments to relent.

(Browne 2005: 72)\textsuperscript{22}

AMARC supports, facilitates and promotes community radio globally. It is not a policy making organisation, although it can be argued that its principles are influential.
for broadcast policy making organisations. Significantly, the Broadcasting Commission of Ireland (BCI) incorporates AMARC’s principles on its website in relation to the representation of diversity in broadcasting, and attaches AMARC’s European Charter to each broadcast license contract for a community radio station (Byrne 2007), suggesting in so doing that AMARC provides a recognised, standardised approach and set of principles to community media and its development.

The ‘Finding and Funding Voices: The Inner City Experience’ international colloquium held in London in September 2007 produced a report, also titled *Finding and Funding Voices* (2007), containing further, multiple definitions of community radio, and its remit and aims, located within the overarching context of community media. Many of these definitions incorporated that political capacity of community radio noted by Barnard, specifically in relation to community radio’s role in facilitating community outreach activities and promoting social justice for the communities represented. The colloquium’s rationale stated:

> Community media can provide opportunities for social groups excluded or misrepresented in the mainstream to come in from the margins and give voice to their cultures and concerns. In inner cities across Europe there are many examples of young people, migrants, minority ethnic communities (for example), using media which they own and control, and of local authorities including media in their plans for urban regeneration.

*(Community Media Research Group 2007: 5)*

This rationale’s emphasis on providing opportunities for marginalised peoples, on local control and on community media’s role in urban regeneration posits the role of community media as one of community-building, in often pragmatic terms. While ‘media’ is used in the rationale, the colloquium was primarily targeting discussion of community radio. Benefits of community radio for the community identified in the
report included: training in and building of highly transferable digital and communication skills; contributing to and promoting social inclusion and community regeneration, and facilitating local participation in on-air discussions and debates. The emphasis on training community media practitioners has opened up community radio to criticism at the level of ‘polish’ in presentation styles, as community radio often facilitates amateur radio practitioners as part of community outreach activity. Additionally, the lack of resources which characterises many community radio stations means many producer/presenters are unpaid.

A key stated goal of the colloquium was to ‘gain public and political recognition of the value of community media as part of Public Service (Media) Sector in the UK’ (Community Media Research Group 2007: 6). This statement suggests how community radio is situated in media policy discourses in Britain; informed by principles of social inclusion also found in PSB discourses, community radio is relegated to the periphery because of its locality. The BBC’s local stations remained part of the BBC institution; in contrast, community stations are usually independent, subject only to national broadcasting guidelines. In Britain, policy provisions have only relatively recently been made for the licensing of community radio. The Community Radio Fund (CRF) was established in 2004 and as of autumn 2007 Ofcom had issued 150 community radio licenses. The Finding and Funding Voices report identifies the overarching frameworks of community radio, technical, legal, regulatory and economic, which combined contribute to community radio’s sustainability (Buckley/Community Media Research Group 2007). The key areas of community radio identified as requiring ongoing attention were regulation, funding and production (Community Media Research Group 2007). Unlike the national
broadcaster, the BBC, discussion around community radio necessarily incorporates inclusion of financial and legal structures to a greater degree.

Community radio’s focus on social inclusion has resulted in multilingual programming in some stations. Sound Radio in East London includes programmes in Kurdish, Bangladeshi, Turkish and several African languages (Gellor/ Community Media Research Group 2007). As will be seen in Chapters Four and Five of this study, Dublin community stations such as NEAR FM, temporary multiethnic station Sunrise FM and community of interest station Dublin City FM (formerly Anna Livia FM) all feature several migrant-produced programmes often broadcast in the first language of the respective communities represented. Sunrise FM, by definition and in accordance with its temporary license remit, featured exclusively ethnic- or migrant-produced programming in a wide variety of languages, including Russian, Mandarin, Persian, Spanish and German as well as some English-language programmes, typically for communities for which English functioned as a lingua franca, such as The African Perspective.

A further example of the efficacy of community radio in community building can be found in a key study of Australian community radio audiences. In an audience-based study of Australian community media, Meadows et al (2007) trace the evolution of community broadcasting. Although Community Media Matters focuses exclusively on Australian community media, the writers outline their findings of the uses and functions of community broadcasting for the radio audiences surveyed in what is notably one of very few studies on audience responses to and uses of community media. With reference to audiences listening to ‘specialist ethnic programming on
generalist community radio stations' or 'full-time ethnic community radio stations',
the study found audiences were drawn by the following factors:

Station programming plays a central role in maintaining culture and language;

Programs help them to maintain community connections and networks;

Stations enable them to hear specialist ethnic music unavailable through other
media;

They want to hear local community news and gossip; and

They want to hear news and information relevant to their lives in Australia, from
their home countries, and from neighbouring countries/regions.

(Meadows et al 2007: 1)

These factors can be used as informing guidelines when analysing selected
programme content in relation to identifying and scrutinising the aims, strategies and
functions of those programmes in terms of making them accessible to intended
audiences.

Community radio remains contested ideological and discursive territory, both in
theory and in practice. It has historically been developed to support, facilitate and
promote community development: radio produced for the community by the
community. The concept can be semantically neatly divided in two, leading to the
recurring question: in community radio, is ‘community’ more important than ‘radio’?
In other words, is the first imperative of community radio to serve the needs of the
community, or to produce effective, accessible radio? This question can be framed
another way: is community radio primarily about serving the needs of the local
presenter/producer participants, or the local audiences?
Community Radio in the Irish Context

Ireland has licensed community radio stations since 1993, when Anna Livia FM and Raidió na Life were both granted unique licenses (Kissane 2007: 31). Anna Livia FM was awarded the first Community of Interest license; Raidió na Life was the first Irish-language station to be licensed. From the start of community radio licensing in Ireland, community stations were also often conceived of as community development organisations, with the remit of promoting social inclusiveness (Byrne 2007: 19). The National Association of Community Broadcasting (NACB) was formed in 1983, and in 1985 almost secured legislation which would have established a recognised community sector based on a co-operative model. However, the proposed Bill to secure legislation was stalled twice and eventually fell (Byrne 2007: 13 - 14). In 1988, the Radio and Television Act provided a structure for licensing independent broadcasting services (that is, broadcasting services outside RTÉ) for the first time. In Ireland, many community stations were broadcasting as pirate stations, without licenses. At the end of 1988, all pirate broadcasters were instructed to stop broadcasting if they wanted to be considered for a license (Kissane 2007: 29). Thus from the beginning of 1989, as Kissane notes, ‘the focus shifted from ensuring that the legislative framework accommodated the community sector, to actually securing licenses and getting on-air’ (ibid.). The Independent Radio and Television Commission, which would later become the BCI, was established under the Radio and Television Act and charged with licensing the independent broadcasting sector in Ireland. There was no distinction made under the Act between community, commercial or public service-type stations. This was perceived as an open approach to different models and development of local radio and as such was welcomed by the NACB (Kissane 2007: 30). The IRTC established a Pilot Community Radio Forum in
1995 to explore the possibilities for developing community radio stations. A pilot group of eleven stations were licensed for 18 months; the group incorporated city, town and rural stations and stations serving communities of interest. The pilot project was to run from mid-1995 until the end of 1996. Pilot stations began broadcasting from September 1995; licenses were later extended beyond the project’s end date while the IRTC considered the outcomes (Kissane 2007: 32). Byrne acknowledges that:

Nowadays we are fortunate here in Ireland that we have a good working relationship with the Broadcasting Commission of Ireland. There is a commitment to the development of existing services and to the emergence of further community radio services so that there is no strategy to deprive people of access to media ownership.

(Byrne 2007: 13)

Irish community radio stations, like most community radio stations around the world, are still short on resources and can lack support, but the licensing system for community radio is today firmly established and the number of licenses awarded continues to expand. The BCI issues regular tenders for new community or local stations around the country. The Broadcasting Act (2001) makes provision for community directed programming under sections 38 and 39, which deal with Local Interest Channels and Community Channels respectively. These sections describe in some detail the provisions made for local community programming and broadcast services to facilitate and address community interest. As will be seen in Chapter Four, these provisions for community broadcasting serve to enable and encourage migrant-produced programming across Ireland, albeit with access, and hence participation, limited to the locality.
The Broadcasting Commission of Ireland (BCI) defines community radio within the Irish context thusly:

A community radio station is characterised by its ownership and programming and the community it is authorised to serve. It is owned and controlled by a not-for-profit organisation whose structure provides for membership, management, operation and programming primarily by members of the community at large. Its programming should be based on community access and should reflect the special interests and needs of the listenership it is licensed to serve.

(BCI Policy on Community Radio Broadcasting 2006: 3)²⁵

The BCI describes Community Broadcasters as distinct from two other category strands: Independent Commercial Broadcasting and Public Sector Broadcasting. The community nature of an organisation or group is additionally defined by the BCI with reference to the AMARC Community Radio Charter for Europe, specifically the following framework:

Stations included in the community broadcasting strand will be expected to:

- describe clearly the geographical community or community of interest served
- promote and support active participation by this community at all levels in the operation
- operate in a manner which is in keeping with the ethos or value system which underpins community activity

(ibid.)

The BCI Policy on Community Radio Broadcasting further references the AMARC Charter in its Appendix, which includes the following in regard to multicultural broadcasting in item 5: ‘Community Radio Stations...provide a right of access to minority and marginalised groups and promote and protect cultural and linguistic diversity’ (ibid.: 12).

The present legislation refers only to “independent radio” and does not draw any distinction between commercial radio and community radio. Broadly speaking, the term embraces all “non-RTÉ” services. It might therefore be helpful to give formal recognition to the distinction between commercial and community radio in any new legislation. The most obvious difference between them is that one is “for profit” and the other is “not for profit.”

(Green Paper on Broadcasting 1995: 196)

Reading backwards from 2008, this paragraph reveals the extent of RTÉ’s cultural monopoly over the airwaves, in that all other radio broadcasting in Ireland, commercial and community together, was defined primarily in relation to RTÉ Radio. In Britain, the BBC similarly dominated policy discourses as Britain’s national broadcaster; in both cases, this dominance has a historical basis. Both national broadcasters were in existence for decades before commercial radio and television emerged, to the extent that the advent of a commercial television or radio station was once seen as somewhat radical. Britain’s Channel 4 is one example; even the commercial station Radio Ireland, launched nationally on St Patrick’s Day in 1997, seemed to offer a genuinely alternative service at the time of its inception.26

The simplicity of radio technology recognised by Hendy (2000) and others make radio an ideal medium for communities with few financial resources. Due in part to this technology, community radio in particular is in an ideal position to facilitate and support migrant self-representation and participation, and to create dedicated migrant
community programming. Hence this research includes an investigation of the structures around Irish community radio; particularly the licensing and application process and the station guidelines which licensed community radio stations in Ireland must adhere to. The application and licensing process stipulated by the BCI emerged as potentially of interest for this research in 2004, when the BCI called for applications for a dedicated multicultural radio station. Neither of the two consortia that applied were ultimately awarded the franchise, and a repeat round of applications as of 2008 has not been invited. The rationale of the BCI and the applications of Global FM and Failte FM are worth examining, particularly in relation to the criteria indicated by the BCI on the application documents. In 2005 and again in 2006, Sunrise FM successfully applied for a temporary license for a ‘multiethnic’ community radio station. That station’s branding strategies are also examined in this discussion in Chapter Five, as Sunrise FM as of 2008 remains the only dedicated multiethnic radio station ever licensed in the republic of Ireland.

In summer 2007, the BCI stated that rather than issue tenders for a dedicated multicultural radio service, it encouraged instead a ‘bottom-up’ approach to multicultural or migrant broadcasting. The rationale for this approach is that any applicant for a new radio service license would incorporate the representation of diversity, including the representation of migrant communities, as part of or otherwise inherent to their application as a whole, by way of fulfilling the community service remit to represent the entire community. The BCI’s assumption is that in multiethnic Ireland, this community includes migrants. In September 2008, the BCI issued a new call for ‘expressions of interest’ in community broadcasting contracts. Chief Executive Michael O’Keeffe stated:
Since the Commission last sought expressions of interest in 2005, there has been a significant increase in the number of groups who have chosen to avail of temporary licences in order to pilot community services. We feel that it is appropriate therefore to seek expressions of interest on a national basis in order to inform discussions on a new community radio licensing plan.\(^{28}\)

This development, alongside the BCI’s commissioning of research in 2007 into the representation of migrants in Irish media, suggests an increasing consciousness and hopefully commitment to further facilitating the representation and participation of migrants across Irish media.\(^{29}\)

As PSM and community media continue to develop in new directions, how will the representation of diversity continue to be incorporated into European media policy? Robins (2006) argues for a ‘transnational cultural policy’ which extends and transcends national policies without necessarily superseding them:

> A new type of transnational cultural policy is required, to supplement and extend existing national provisions for cultural management. We call this transnational cultural policy for transcultural diversity, and use the term “transnational” to refer to policy dimensions that are no longer directly tied to a national state and a historically defined national polity. A transnational perspective requires an enlargement of imagination and concern on the part of governments and other institutions - beyond the conventional national imagination and concerns. It means acknowledging the inescapable reality of the new transcultural frames within which many cultural identities and communities are now being constructed and sustained, and cultural lives and activities enacted.

(Robins 2006: 42)

This policy, Robins suggests, takes as its point of departure the notion that cultural space and public culture is defined in the first instance as European, rather than predicated on individual nation states. Many community radio stations are located - literally and in relation to the communities they represent - within a locality and take
the social and cultural dimensions of that locality as their reference point. Taking this principle on board may be the next step for developing PSM policy into the future. While PSB emerged from and remained informed by a national context, with a public service remit predicated on serving a national public, the inherent locality of community radio combined with new technologies making local stations accessible via online streaming or podcasts has resulted in what may be a truly transnational medium, producing locality for international and transnational listenerships.

This chapter has explored how PSB has historically made provision for the representation of diversity and how fundamental changes within PSB, leading in some cases to a re-definition of PSB as PSM, could serve to ensure provision and access of content of interest to migrant and ethnic communities. At the same time, the centrality of the market in shaping national and European broadcast policies remains a key factor, which may mitigate against programming perceived to be less profitable. This chapter has additionally identified legislative changes contributing to the recognition of the importance of community radio and the centrality of community development to its informing principles. Broadcast policy across the public service and community sectors is in a state of significant flux; these changes and the policies which result will have a direct and ongoing impact on the evolution of PSM and community media in Ireland, and ultimately on the ways in which migrant communities continue to be represented on air.
Notes

1 It should be noted that the Council of Europe, where Jakubowicz was previously Chair of the steering Committee on Mass Media, lacks the scale of legislative powers of the EU.

2 Where content from broadcasting policy documents or reports is re-produced in this study, it appears as it does in the original in relation to spacing of the text.

3 These were to be undertaken 'within a pluralistic organisational framework which through competition, encourages the pursuit of quality, creativity, innovation and independence in broadcasting, both from government and short-term commercial pressures' (McNair 2005: 108). This emphasis on a competitive environment is addressed later in this section in relation to the opportunities perceived to be offered by the advent of digital media.


8 The most recent example of the sharing of programmes across two television stations with a view to cutting costs is the output of TV3 and 3e, formerly Irish cable channel Channel 6, acquired by TV3 in late 2008. See http://www.gaire.com/e/l/view.asp?parent=1118579 (accessed 23 January 2009).


10 The Irish language was recognised as an official European language in 2005. However, broadcasting policy documents in Ireland have always stipulated some programming space be allocated for programming in Irish as part of the licensing agreement for radio stations.


12 It could be argued that the programme No Place Like Home, introduced in 2006, was itself problematic in that it exoticised countries of origin of its subjects by framing them through the visit of a white, Irish presenter to the home country of the families depicted rather than in conjunction with the Irish-based family itself. This chapter does not have the scope to address representation of multicultural issues on television, although certainly a study of RTÉ’s multicultural television programmes would be of interest.

13 The Media and Multicultural Awards (MAMAs) are sponsored by multicultural newspaper Metro Éireann and were broadcast in conjunction with RTÉ television from 2002 until 2007.

14 http://www.rte.ie/about/guiding_principles.html (accessed 1 August 2006). The two sentences each serve as subtitles for listings of proposed goals, actions and targets for 2004/5.

‘AMARC’ stands for the organisation’s name in Spanish: Asociacion Mundiale de Radios Comunitarias, and in French: Association Mondiale des RadioDiffuseurs Communautaires.

Of course, commercial broadcasting occupies a significant share of the market in both Britain and Ireland; however except in certain cases such as Channel 4 and specifically funded programming, it does not generally adhere to a public service remit.


Browne goes on to argue that ‘That final category is the closest that AMARC comes to being involved in policymaking’ (Browne 2005: 72).


A definition of what is meant by community is included in section 39, no. 8: ‘In this section “local community” means the community of a town or other urban or rural area’ (Broadcasting Act 2001, section 39, no. 8: 40).


The BCI’s ‘bottom-up’ approach was explained to me on 24 July 2007 by BCI Research Officer Caroline Smyth.


The project is titled ‘Irish Broadcasting and the ‘New Ireland’; Mapping and Visioning Cultural Diversity’ and was commissioned for an 18-month period from summer 2007 (personal communication from Gavan Titley, June 2007).
Chapter Three
RTÉ Radio and Multicultural Programming

Seen as both a historical fatality and as a community imagined through language, the nation presents itself as simultaneously open and closed.

(Anderson 1991: 146)

This chapter examines the ways in which Ireland’s national broadcaster represents migrant communities and frames ‘diversity’ within two dedicated multicultural radio programmes, *Different Voices* and *Spectrum*. Both programmes are informed by PSB discourses of inclusiveness positing the representation of diversity primarily as the representation of difference as difference. As discussed in Chapter Two, within PSB discourses both ‘diversity’ and ‘difference’ have historically been framed in reference to ethnicity. This chapter analyses selected programme content from *Different Voices* (2002 – 2004) and *Spectrum* (2005 – 2008) in an exploration of how members of migrant communities are framed within RTÉ Radio’s multicultural programmes, and to examine what provision, if any, is made for migrant self-representation within these programmes.

Unusually for a national public broadcaster, RTÉ is legislated to fulfil a public service remit in its broadcasting but is also subject to commercial pressures, relying on advertising for a substantial proportion of its income. Thus the development and scheduling of RTÉ programming is subject to a dialectical tension emerging from the necessity of fulfilling a public service broadcasting remit on one hand and from meeting perceived audience demand on the other. These often conflicting requirements directly inform what programmes are made and when they are
scheduled. RTÉ has primarily represented migrant communities in the form of television or radio programmes defining themselves as multicultural: this ‘multicultural’ programming is therefore usually about migrants, in other words a depiction of various migrant experiences, but not necessarily for migrants. Rather, this chapter makes the argument that RTÉ’s multicultural programmes have been primarily directed at the white settled Irish listener.

Close readings of selected Different Voices and Spectrum programme content reveal strands of representation which incorporate recurring celebration of cultural products from sending countries (food, music, rituals); institutional commentary on societal aspects of Ireland’s multiracial and multiethnic diversity, and occasional attempts to bridge the interstices between new migrant communities and the settled white Irish community. As will be argued, a celebratory representation of diversity embodied in the programmes under discussion here results in only limited exploration of migrant experience in favour of snapshots of diversity. These representational strategies are located in topic selection, contributors chosen, variations in airtime allocated to contributors, length and of interviews and questions asked and the use and editing of vox pops, all of which frame how migrants are represented. Programme content identified by RTÉ as ‘multicultural’ is examined in this chapter alongside a critique of multiculturalism which attempts to identify its thematic preoccupations and ultimately locate its limits as a method of conceptualising difference as difference. In particular Gordon and Newfield’s (1995) recognition of multiculturalism’s project of the containment of difference as per the needs of the host nation frames a critique of the representation strategies of both programmes under discussion. In relation to representational strategies Lentin (2001) and Hesse (2000) problematise the concept
of a ‘politics of recognition’ serving as a means for moving beyond reductive representations of diversity.

Comprising a small subset of ‘multicultural’ programming within RTÉ’s radio schedule, *Different Voices* and *Spectrum* can be read as the national broadcaster’s attempt to ideologically frame and contain Ireland’s growing multietnicity. Programmes analysed in this chapter are from the 2003 and 2004 series of *Different Voices* and the autumn 2005 series of *Spectrum*. The chapter opens with an overview of the development of RTÉ radio programming self-defined as multicultural. Part One explores programme content and production practices of *Different Voices* alongside analysis located in critical approaches to multiculturalism in relation to topic selection and the ways in which the diverse voices heard on the programmes are structured and framed. Part Two scrutinises programme content and production practices of *Spectrum*, examining how its presenter, Melanie Verwoerd, negotiates the programme’s representation of migrant communities and of ‘multicultural’ Ireland and exploring the representation of diverse cultural perspectives within a culturally sensitive programme in the series.

Radio Telefís Éireann broadcasts two television and four radio channels nationwide. Radio 1 is a primarily talk-based service, incorporating current events programmes, features and arts programmes, sports coverage and speciality music programmes. *Different Voices* (from 2003) and *Spectrum* were both broadcast on Radio 1. Radio 2 is aimed at a younger audience and is music-based, primarily playing popular mainstream music as well as a popular mid-morning call-in talk show. Lyric FM, which began broadcasting in May 1999 from Limerick city in the south-west of
Ireland, is also music-based, broadcasting a diverse range of music including classical, jazz and world, alongside occasional talk radio programmes incorporating arts coverage, documentaries and features. Raidió na Gaeltachta is RTÉ's Irish-language radio service and is primarily talk-based.

RTÉ Radio introduced its first multicultural radio programme in 1999 with *Radio One World*, which initially served as an information service for Kosovar refugees in Ireland and was broadcast in Albanian.\(^1\) It was produced at RTÉ's Cork studios by Marcus Connaughton, a Cork-based RTÉ producer, and presented by Paulina Chiwangu, originally from Tanzania, also based in Cork. Former Director of RTÉ Radio Helen Shaw describes this information service content as follows:

> What we looked at doing was creating content which was in Albanian, which was directly focused at the Kosovar community, and providing in a sense content, information, entertainment, companionship, music, they would recognise and also a way in which we could get key messages out to that community about what was available to them in terms of resources, in their assimilation in Ireland. ... We got very good responses from people, people felt it was very useful, but we were feeling very uncomfortable about the fact that it was only dealing with one community.

*(Interview with Shaw, 11 November 2005)*

This 'uncomfortable' feeling, of only representing a single community, albeit in an emergency situation, led to a wider remit for *Radio One World*. While the Kosovar service was implemented with some urgency as an emergency measure, *Radio One World* was subsequently conceived of as an information provision service for multiple migrant communities. According to Shaw:

> [T]his is a more thoughtful and mature way of providing a real service which fits within our public broadcasting remit and which allows us to to play a role in assisting both the flow of information and indeed understanding.

*(Promotional brochure for *Radio One World*, RTÉ 1999)*
In turn Radio One World provided the impetus and, broadly, the template for Different Voices, which began broadcasting on medium-wave radio in 2002 before moving to RTÉ Radio 1 in 2003. Following the demise of Different Voices in January 2005, RTÉ introduced what was called a ‘multicultural season’ in June 2005. This comprised three programmes, two of which ran for a limited time over the summer only. Each of these two were presented by a white Irish woman: A New Ireland, broadcast from June through August 2005, was presented by popular radio personality Carrie Crowley and produced by Aongus McAnally, who also produced Spectrum from its inception until December 2005; Breaking Bread was presented and produced by Fiona Kelly and broadcast for six weeks from June through July 2005. Breaking Bread featured Kelly visiting the homes of different migrant families each week, alternating discussion of their everyday rituals as well as detailed description of the meal being shared. The third programme, Spectrum, was presented by South Africa’s former (white) ambassador in Ireland, Melanie Verwoerd; Verwoerd was replaced in autumn 2007 by Polish presenter Zbyszek Zalinski. In September 2006 RTÉ Radio introduced a four-part series, Muslims in Ireland, which ran from 7-28 September 2006.

As of autumn 2008, RTÉ Radio had produced two recurring series of multicultural programmes: Different Voices, which was broadcast from 2002 through December 2004 and Spectrum, which ran from June 2005 until December 2008. The 2003-4 series of Different Voices comprised 13 programmes; the 2004 Different Voices series comprised seven programmes. The first series of Spectrum incorporated 30
programmes, from June 2005 to December 2005; after this, *Spectrum* continued to broadcast regularly, with occasional breaks, until December 2008.

**Part One:  Different Voices**

**Topic Selection in Different Voices**

*Different Voices* sought to depict migrant communities across Ireland and explore a variety of migrant experiences. Each week, the programme topic represented an attempt to investigate a specific area of migrant life and experience. *Different Voices* programmes were talk-based and follow a magazine format, wherein each programme consists of several pre-recorded items or ‘packages’, which are then linked for continuity live on air by the presenter, who is often but not always also the reporter featured in the pre-recorded items. Although the first two series of *Different Voices*, as distinct from its predecessor *Radio One World*, were transmitted on medium wave, the subsequent two series went out on RTÉ Radio 1. The final series finished in December 2004. Another series was pencilled in for autumn of 2005, but was never broadcast, probably because by then *Spectrum* was covering similar thematic ground and also defined itself as a ‘multicultural’ programme. Marcus Connaughton, series producer of *Different Voices*, described the programme’s remit: ‘Our banner at the end of the day is celebrating diversity in a changing Ireland’ (interview with Marcus Connaughton, 3 May 2005). The 2003 series of *Different Voices* incorporated 13 programmes which ran between October 2003 and January 2004, while the shorter 2004 series broadcast eight programmes. *Different Voices* was broadcast on Saturday evenings from 7 – 8pm in 2003 and from 7 – 7.30pm in 2004.
With a few exceptions, in a typical programme *Different Voices* linked diverse migrant experiences together under a common thematic umbrella. Thus, the 2003 series featured programmes, listed here in no particular order, on the following subjects: multicultural sports initiatives, Dublin’s Moore Street market, the third annual Dun Laoghaire Festival of World Cultures, the 2nd Frontline Human Rights conference, representations of Afghanistan and Chechnya in new documentary photography, the Chinese New Year, a focus on international or ‘world’ music and a comparison of different kinds of food and seasonal celebrations at Christmas time. Three programmes had a specifically regional focus, looking at rural or semi-rural areas around Ireland, including a Brazilian community in Roscommon, a Turkish community in Lanesborough in Longford and several emerging migrant communities in Ennis. All other programmes were set in Dublin or Cork, where *Different Voices* was produced. One programme, ‘Multicultural Issues in the Media’ is reflexive in its scrutiny of other examples of self-defined multicultural media, taking as its subject media representations of diversity in Ireland.

Music from Asia, Africa, South America and New Zealand forms part of *Different Voices’* content and contributes in part to its primarily celebratory manifestation of multiculturalism; occasionally music has been the programme’s central subject. In response to a question I posed regarding how programme content is decided upon, series producer Marcus Connaughton, who produced *Different Voices* since its inception and produced *Radio One World* before that, described the production team’s methodology:

We’re certainly cognizant of our responsibility to try and serve as many masters as we can. But obviously within a specific run of 13 weeks we try and do our best to give as much as we possibly can. And back to your original question, how do we come at that, I would tend to sit down with the presenter
and if we have the luxury of planning the first three or four programmes, then they tend to gather a momentum of their own, because obviously people from within the different communities, if they’re involved in organisations or whatever, will come forward with different amounts of material and let us know of different events happening in their locality.

(Interview with Connaughton, 3 May 2005)

Connaughton briefly described the process involved in choosing topics for the programmes:

[This involved] trawling through the national newspapers on a weekly basis during the run-up to a particular season and cutting something out that is reflecting a story in a community, whether that be a provincial newspaper or a national newspaper. I would tend to be an inveterate reader of the Guardian, and that will sometimes inspire me to look in a particularly different direction. They sometimes examine areas on a cultural basis.

(Interview with Connaughton, 3 May 2005)

These items can consist of a one-to-one interview or take the form of an informal monologue by the person featured. While the latter practice allows the speaker to get his/her views across clearly, it reduces a semblance of objectivity by not framing their monologue with targeted questions, and also results in somewhat monotonous radio. This practice also suggests a non-critical liberalism, at times resulting in a short public relations opportunity for the institution represented.2 These most often seem to include church groups and faith-based organisations, although the GAMA construction company, whose primarily Kurdish workers subsequently went on strike against unfair working conditions in May 2005,3 was represented as a benevolent employer in a Different Voices programme from 2003, based in Lanesborough, Longford.4 Another programme in the 2003 series is based entirely on the photographic work (necessarily unseen) of a white African photographer. Simon Northam was born and raised in part in Nigeria and has photographed Afghanistan, Chechnya and Chad amongst other countries. The programme essentially takes the
form of a 26-minute monologue that takes as its subject the political significance of his work and exhibitions. Another programme focused on (and titled) ‘Fashion and Festive Food and Drink’ compares examples of culturally specific clothing (African) and food (Chinese) without providing further context, thus emphasising and exoticising ‘difference’ without providing further insight about the communities thus featured.\(^5\)

A form of multiculturalism which concentrates solely or primarily on cultural output such as music, clothing, festive activity or other performance, can embody a celebratory approach to the cultural products thus represented, to the exclusion of examining the wider experiences of raced, ethnic and migrant communities. This variant of multiculturalism is ultimately apolitical, in that it merely reflects and reinforces established public perceptions of migrants represented metonymically through cultural signifiers, and fails to facilitate interactive dialogue or a critical examination of the political and social inequities facing many migrants, or to include the provision of information to address these inequities. The primary function of these programmes is consequently illustrative rather than interactive; thus they correspond to the second of radio’s inherent capacities as posited by Hartley in Chapter One as a one-way broadcaster of events (Hartley 2000). Similarly, RTÉ’s role as national broadcaster is to cover such events as best reflect its conception of the ‘Irish nation’. The representation of migrant communities in *Different Voices* is too often limited to simplistic depictions of difference, of migrant experience posited as ‘other’ to the settled white Irish experience, represented and reinforced across the majority of RTÉ radio programming. This approach to representing diversity comprises a selective, commodifying multicultural project. Kiberd (2001), writing critically about
multiculturalism in Ireland, describes this selective multiculturalism as a ‘messy and promiscuous multiculturalism’ (Kiberd 2001: 57), what Stuart Hall terms a ‘multiculturalism without guarantees’ (Hall cited in Kiberd 2001: 57).

Lentin (2001) describes a ‘politics of recognition’ which informs Irish multiculturalism generally, and dismisses it as reductive:

Irish multiculturalist initiatives are anchored in a liberal politics of recognition of difference, which do not depart from western cultural imperialism and are therefore inadequate for deconstructing inter-ethnic power relations.

(Lentin 2001: 1)

Žižek (1997) goes further, arguing there is potential for societal damage inherent in this kind of ‘disavowed multiculturalism’, a term also used by Lentin and Hesse (2000). He describes this as a form of racism:

Multiculturalism is a racism which empties its own position of all positive content (the multiculturalist is not a direct racist, he doesn’t oppose to the Other the particular values of his own culture), but nonetheless retains this position as the privileged empty point of universality from which one is able to appreciate (and depreciate) properly other particular cultures—the multiculturalist respect for the Other’s specificity is the very form of asserting one’s own superiority.

(Žižek 1997: 11)

As explicated by Žižek, such a multiculturalism posits all difference from the viewpoint of a privileged subject position wherein all difference can be incorporated and ultimately contained within a universalist perspective. From this subject position seeing and representing difference remains a chosen, deliberate strategy which serves to reinforce the privilege of the position.

Multiculturalism’s stated aims of promoting diversity can thus become what Gordon and Newfield term ‘diversity management’; in other words the containing, so
ultimately shaping, of diversity as per the needs of the host nation (Gordon and Newfield 1996), akin to what Hesse describes as ‘managing the aesthetic of diversity’ (Hesse 2000: 16). They further locate a depoliticizing impetus in what they describe as ‘multiculturalism’s cultural turn’ or ‘multiculturalism’s culturalism’ (Gordon and Newfield 1996: 78 - 79), which emphasises culture at the expense of education or other infrastructural areas. The commodification and exoticisation of cultural products such as food, music, clothing, dance, storytelling and other performance and ritual embodied in Different Voices’ framing of diversity is part of this project of containment, realised through a celebration of difference, which focuses on migrant cultural products rather than other aspects of migrant experience such as those rooted in social and economic inequities. This ‘celebration’ of diversity is primarily illustrative, a passive depiction of difference instead of a deeper exploration of more varied migrant experiences or a facilitation of cross community interaction. Gordon and Newfield’s analysis is particularly pertinent here, as it is this celebratory, depoliticised form of multiculturalism that can be heard most often in Different Voices in its focus on cultural products and ritual. Lentin, in reference to Hesse (2000), argues for the politics of recognition informing such multiculturalist practices to be replaced by a ‘politics of interrogation’, which scrutinises the causes behind Irish racism so as to better challenge and dismantle them. She writes:

Instead of a politics of recognition, Hesse posits a politics of interrogation, a subversive circumvention of western culture, or...a subversive inscription of racialised spaces in white-settled-Catholic Ireland, by Travellers, African asylum-seeker-activists, and by other members of racialised ethnic groups working to establish antiracist spaces and discourses.

(Lentin 2001: 9)

Occasionally, programmes in the Different Voices series do attempt to incorporate a politics of interrogation described by Lentin and Hesse through the examination of
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approach in its focus on other programmes self-defined as multicultural. Approximately a third of 'Multicultural Issues in the Media' is devoted to showcasing a migrant-produced radio programme produced for Dublin community radio. 'Multicultural Issues in the Media' is presented by an Irish man, Michael O’Kane, a regular presenter during the 2003 series, who prefaces the show by announcing its subtitle: ‘how multicultural issues are addressed in the national and local media’. The programme examines the coverage of ‘multicultural issues’ within several community and migrant-produced media and features commentators representing these media.

Contributors include Sergei Kouznetsov from The Russian Show on community station Anna Livia FM; Jacqueline Healy, Communications Officer with the National Consultative Committee on Racism and Interculturalism (NCCRI); Shalini Sinha, Indian-Canadian presenter on Mono, RTÉ’s multicultural television show which broadcast from 2002-2005; Fariq Ysul, Sudanese editor of the Muslim newspaper the Friday Times; Israeli-born Ronit Lentin, head of the M.A. in Race and Ethnicity Studies, Trinity College and Chinedu Onyejelem, Nigerian-born editor of multicultural newspaper Metro Éireann. In several of the interviews, including those with Kouznetsov, Healy, Sinha and Lentin, the programme cuts back and forth from one soundbite to another. The effect of this places two institutional, authoritative voices (Healy and Lentin) directly in contrast with those of the presenters (Kouznetsov and Sinha). The strategy occurs repeatedly in Different Voices; however here the dialectic is somewhat altered. The radio and television presenters featured, Kouznetsov and Sinha, are necessarily invested with some authority as they speak to but also for the migrant communities they aim to represent through their programmes.
This dynamic coalesces in discussion of the issue of funding for *The Russian Show*. Following the item dedicated to the Russian-language programme, O’Kane’s interview with Healy touches directly on the programme’s limited funding. O’Kane remarks on *The Russian Show*’s stated lack of targeted funding, whereupon Healy responds with a list of reasons explaining why this is the case. Healy is represented sympathetically on air, as authoritative but concerned. [Audio 1; 1:27sec] Generally, contributors to *Different Voices* are represented positively and their positions on issues being discussed are taken at face value, which contributes to a persuasive consensus wherein all contributors agree on the benefits of multiculturalism. There is a tendency in *Different Voices* to passively extol the virtues of multiculturalism, instead of interrogating the effects of increasing diversity on Ireland as a whole, across established communities and new migrant communities alike.

Lentin’s voice functions as the programme’s meta-narrative; her academic position, associated authoritative delivery and critical vocabulary give weight to her observations. Her voice in the context of media practitioners is invested with an overarching authority, although she is not a media practitioner herself; although she occasionally appears in an expert capacity on the subjects of race, racism, migration and multiculturalism on Irish current events discussion programmes on television such as *Questions and Answers*. In the last third of the programme, Lentin’s voice is juxtaposed with Onyejelem’s commentary on *Metro Éireann*, as he describes its aims, coverage and audience. [Audio 2; 2:37sec] Hence Lentin provides a meta-commentary on both *Metro Éireann* and obliquely on Onyejelem’s comparatively straightforward contribution. The difference is partly rhetorical; a gap can be perceived between commenting on one’s own media practice, with its attendant
demands of accuracy, deadlines and the pertinence of stories pitched, as described by the media practitioners on the show; and commentary on an overarching landscape of multicultural media practice, as articulated by Lentin.

Sinha’s commentary, which begins nine minutes into the programme, is usefully self-reflexive. She refers to her subject position and her experiences from her self-identified perspective of a migrant in Ireland and describes how these directly inform her work on Mono, which includes sourcing ideas for the programme as well as researching and presenting. The item on Sinha and Mono consists primarily of a monologue; Sinha, a subcontinental Indian born in Canada, begins by describing her first impressions of Ireland on arrival, then describes her experiences specifically as a new migrant, before discussing her work with and hopes for Mono. Two of her statements in particular suggest new and different ways of thinking about (the representation of) race and ethnicity in the Irish public sphere, as articulated in her comment about content development on Mono:

We broke new ground [on Mono], by saying we would never ask questions like where did you come from, how long have you been here, that we would just let it sit that these are Irish stories. And it’s Irish people of colour you’re not used to seeing, it’s Irish people of accents you’re not used to seeing or Irish identities you’re not used to seeing but we’ll let it sit that these are Irish stories.

(Sinha, Different Voices, 5 December 2003)

This statement effectively addresses a token approach to migrant representation which has been restricted to the edges of Irish media. The underlying assumption that these new migrants are irrevocably ‘other’ underpins each of these examples. As noted previously, this ‘otherness’ is also mined for its market value as part of a process whereby migrant communities are singled out as potential new consumers.
Sinha also identifies and describes a crucial element of media production in its representation of migrant issues:

We need black and ethnic minority producers, and that gives a richness, it would give a richness to any programme, not just [one] about black and ethnic minority people. We have a different way of seeing things, a different perspective on life. I know Ireland well, even though people assume that I won’t. But I know Ireland well and I see it differently to how a lot of people are used to seeing Ireland. And the perspective I can bring can be really refreshing and really insightful.

(Sinha, Different Voices, 5 December 2003)

With her use of ‘we’ Sinha employs a collective voice, suggesting the meaning ‘we migrants’, particularly in the sentence stating ‘we have a different way of seeing things’ and in her articulation of that difference within her statement as a whole.

Sinha speaks from a position of authority in her role as a television presenter but also as an established features writer concentrating on migrant issues in the Irish Times newspaper. How her voice is framed here is characteristic of a recurring dialectic in Different Voices noted above between the expert voice and the migrant voice.

Arguments regarding the clarity or intelligibility of migrant accents in direct reference to their inclusion on radio programmes can be selective. In his exploration of accented cinema as migrant-produced cultural production, Naficy (2001) describes the use and power of accents to situate the speaker for the listener and the value(s) attributed, or removed, from a given accent due to its metonymic meaning. He writes:

Even though from a linguistic point of view all accents are equally important, all accents are not of equal value socially and politically. People make use of accents to judge not only the social standing of the speakers but also their personality. Depending on their accents, some speakers may be considered regional, local yokel, vulgar, ugly or comic, whereas others may be thought of as educated, upper-class, sophisticated, beautiful and proper. As a result, accent is one of the most intimate and powerful markers of group identity and
solidarity, as well as of individual difference and personality. The flagship newscasts of mainstream national television and radio networks have traditionally been delivered in the preferred “official” accent, that is, the accent that is considered to be standard, neutral and value-free.

(Naficy 2001: 23)

This description provides a point of departure from which the ‘other’ accent can be found and situated. Naficy goes on to note that the apparently ‘value-free accent’ (ibid.) maps on to the dominant means of cultural production; thus in much the same way as whiteness is rendered invisible by its constructed universality (Dyer 1997), the seemingly valueless accent has its own currency, whereby it circulates as the dominant hegemonic voice. The migrant voice on the radio is often situated in direct contrast to this hegemonic voice.

Yet the migrant voice carries connotations of authenticity and authority in its function of articulating transcultural experiences and perspectives. Kosnick (2008) complicates reading those voices ‘speaking with an accent’ in the context of PSB in her analysis of programme content and practices in Berlin’s Radio Multikulti. She observes that even though Radio Multikulti’s German language programmes, that is, those programmes in the majority language, contain and indeed foreground contributions from ‘accented’ speakers from migrant and established ethnic communities, the content of the majority language programmes remains characteristic of PSB: ‘matters of common and public concern, but now seen and discussed from a different, “foreign” perspective’ (Kosnick 2008: 56). In the context of radio, racial and ethnic difference cannot be viewed, so is signified by accented speech. Kosnick argues that in the context of programmes produced by a public broadcaster, ‘what immigrant
moderators [presenters] say does not necessarily challenge the dominant political culture of the public domain', suggesting that:

Accents can much more easily be normalised than substantially different perspectives that would denaturalise the dominant political culture, in the sense of revealing its link to a particular imagined national community (Anderson 1983) and thus marking - in the sense of rendering discernable - cultural “Germanness”.

(ibid.: 59)

While Germany and Ireland perpetuate and reinforce the project of multiculturalism and nation-building strategies in historically different ways, the representation of a homogenic national identity was a key component of original PSB principles, as seen in Chapter Two. Thus, if ‘Germanness’ were replaced with ‘Irishness’ in the statement above, this could be read as a depiction of the framing of migrant accents in RTÉ’s multicultural programmes.

Connaughton has fielded multiple complaints from primarily white Irish callers asserting that Different Voices represents a migrant point of view (as if there were a single migrant subject position, such as that suggested by Sinha’s contribution) at the expense of what is posited as a single, unanimous Irish viewpoint (interview with Connaughton, 3 May 2005), as has McAnally, Spectrum’s first producer (interview with McAnally, 9 December 2005). The assertion from these callers is variously problematic, not least for its implicit assumption of a divide between the ‘Irish’ or official voice and the voice of the ‘other’. Clearly Connaughton was not swayed by such comments as he hired Guy Bertrand Nimpa, who is from Cameroon, as the show’s main presenter in autumn 2004. Different Voices fulfills its remit of representing racial, religious and cultural diversity and incorporates members of migrant communities in Ireland in every programme. What becomes problematic is
the relationship between how these ‘voices’ are broadcast and how these responses to an interviewer’s question are framed, in comparison to and in conjunction with official or institutional responses. ‘Multicultural Issues in the Media’ foregrounded migrant-produced media as its subject; yet the substantial contributions by migrant media practitioners are ultimately framed by two expert voices, Healy’s and Lentin’s, who explain the functions of migrant-produced media to the listener. However, this expert framing is complicated by Lentin’s own subject position as a migrant now settled in Ireland; while one of the expert voices is Irish, the other is a migrant voice.

Where ‘Different Voices’ Intersect: Multiple Voices

*Different Voices* programmes focusing on inter-community grassroots relationships or organised initiatives are possibly more effective at balancing the diverse voices featured. As will be argued, in programmes such as that featuring the Moore Street market in Dublin’s north inner city, the framing and authority of the institutional or expert voice becomes less clear when other hierarchies also apply. In the case of the Moore Street programme, stallholder hierarchies are in place, evidently determined by the length of time a trader’s stall has been located in the market. In some ways, this constitutes an assertion of established longevity as equalling a tacitly superior social (and probably economic) position more overtly than other *Different Voices* programmes. Yet the Moore Street programme, along with a programme on multicultural sports initiatives in Dublin, is more successful than most other *Different Voices* programmes at charting the interstices where people from different migrant communities as well as those from more established Dublin neighbourhoods meet and interact. These two programmes come closer to illustrating an ordinariness in ‘multicultural’ social (and fiscal) encounters. The institutional voices are still in place,
but the institutions they represent function primarily at a grassroots level which is reflected in their spokespeople’s responses. These interstices are also apparent, although within a more binary construction, in the three programmes set in smaller Irish towns. The programme on growing diversity in Ennis in predominantly rural Co. Clare is more formulaic and less exploratory of these intersections, featuring mainly positive responses from different sections of the community without examining these relationships in greater depth. Programmes set in semi-rural towns in Co. Roscommon and Co. Longford, however, while again more binary in structure, come much closer to depicting interstices as they occur in daily life rather than constructed for a radio programme.

A Different Voices programme broadcast on 7 November 2003 serves as an aural portrait of the Moore Street market and the voices of its traders. An established food market in Dublin’s north inner city, Moore Street was an early multicultural business model in the Irish capital following the introduction of new, migrant-run businesses to the street market in the mid to late 1990s. This street market on Dublin’s northside inner city was one of the city’s earliest interfaces of migrant diversity. A long-established food market, in the late 1990s Moore Street began to see new migrant traders working alongside Dublin traders who had been there for decades. Moore Street remains one of Dublin’s most diverse commercial areas, including Irish butchers, Chinese restaurants, Nigerian mobile phone entrepreneurs and Caribbean hair product shops among its various businesses.

‘A Trip to Moore Street’ provides a useful juxtaposition of interstices between cultural perceptions of diversity and commerce, moving between the voices of traders
from Dublin’s inner city who had been working there for decades and new migrant traders and businesses. Traders and regular visitors to the market are interviewed via vox pop. Their responses are juxtaposed with a soundscape of the market itself which opens with Dublin women’s voices advertising their wares in a singsong chant, the sound of horse’s hooves and of people walking on the street. [Audio 3; 1:58sec] The first voice we hear is that of a Dublin man, Irish ‘local historian’ Terry Fagin, recounting his own memories of Moore Street growing up in the neighbourhood nearby. His voice segues into the song ‘Dirty Old Town’ by The Dubliners. The litany of the women traders recurs throughout the programme, situating the listener within the market and its sounds. Various other contributors voice their opinions on the changing nature of Moore Street, including Ibrahim, whose shop sells African videos; Irish butchers John Collins and Dan Troy; Ali, who runs the Medina Food Company; Nigerian trader Bon Me, who sells and repairs mobile phones; several un-named Dublin women traders and a passing Australian now resident in Dublin.8

The Moore Street programme to some degree replicates the commodification of difference embodied in cultural products identified above. The programme could be read as simply the aural presentation of a diverse array of ‘exotic’ food and music. However, the focus here is on those who work in the market - white settled Irish and new migrant entrepreneurs alike - and their lived daily experiences of working alongside each other. Unlike other Different Voices programmes, no single ‘expert’ voice is featured. Instead, contributions come solely from market traders and regular visitors themselves. The lack of an authoritative voice foregrounds these responses, which comprise the representation of the street market. Although it seems that several people were happy to be interviewed for the programme, it is interesting that only a
few of these gave their full names. All of those who did were white Irish men, some of them traders, the other two commentators simply sharing their memories of Moore Street. Other traders, such as Bon Me, who identifies himself as of the Yoruba tribe in Nigeria, and Ali and Ibrahim, simply give their first names, although they are otherwise forthcoming. Women traders are not named throughout the programme; it is unclear whether this was their choice or simply overlooked. Similarly the Australian tourist remains unnamed.

Irish presenter Cliona O’Carroll introduces the programme with the following link:

> Moore Street is in many ways a window into a changing society. The sights and sounds no longer dominated by the Dubs. Today there is a mix of people, and products, from all over the world.

*(Different Voices, 7 November 2003)*

The most intriguing aspect of this programme is the series of voiced opinions about Moore Street today, and more centrally, how these are juxtaposed in the programme.

The following contributions have been transcribed and are juxtaposed here to illustrate the comparative perspectives heard during the programme.

Looking at Moore Street, it’s changed a lot. It means we’ve become a multicultural society (T. Fagin).

I think it is an excellent street. You wouldn’t get a street like this in Dublin. To tell you the truth, people are dying to get shops here. It’s just the demand for it. They’re willing to pay anything, the Nigerians, Chinese (Ali).

The culture coming in has got nothing to do with fruit and veg. It’s all them Bingo shops and computer shops and the talk shops, it’s getting filled with them while the fruit and veg, the Molly Malone sort of stuff has gone out of it. (unidentified inner-city Dublin Irish man).

It’s not bad doing business on this street except that there’s a stigma on Moore Street today. People tend to think that Moore Street is for the less privileged, blacks, drunks; that is not true. Very decent people conduct their businesses on this street (Bon Me).
They've made a hell of a difference, because we'd have been gone. This place is alive. We'd be going home at 5.30, 6 o'clock and this place would be packed (unidentified Dublin Irish woman trader).

Now we have all the refugees coming in and they all want good value and they get it in Moore Street (unidentified Dublin Irish woman trader).

I get the impression that the Irish haven't had much experience with other cultures. There seems to be separation or something like that. They're not looking outside of their own culture (unidentified Australian man, resident in Ireland).

(Different Voices, 7 November 2003)

The above excerpts provide contradictory views on the 'changed' Moore Street, but it is those very contradictions that provide an appealing and informative density to this programme, as well as multiple points of identification for the listener. Several of the comments are pragmatic in nature, such as that from an unidentified Dublin woman trader asserting that the diversity of stalls and traders in Moore Street has kept the market viable: 'They’ve made a hell of a difference, because we’d have been gone.'

'Refugees', possibly meaning new migrants, are identified as a consumer market by another Dublin woman trader, in her insistence that 'the refugees' 'all wan' good value' and that they 'get it in Moore Street.' The final voice, that of an Australian looking inwards to Irish culture from the standpoint of a country which has its own established yet problematic conception of multiculturalism, serves as a further framing device, even as he describes what he perceives as a tendency towards polarised communities in Ireland.

Close to the programme's end, a Radio Eireann newsreel from 1958 describes in voiceover 'Molly Malone Night', a cooperative event historically held on Thursdays on Moore Street. [Audio 4; 4:57sec] This segues back into 'Dirty Old Town' by The
Dubliners, which then segues back into street noise, traders’ calls and background banghra music. The use of archive RTÉ radio audio situates Moore Street as part of Dublin’s heritage, while the Dubliners track expands the programme’s focus on the street market, situating the market within a larger representation of Dublin as a ‘dirty old town’ which yet bustles with activity. Finally, the bangra music serves to update this historically homogeneous representation of Dublin through Irish music and archival audio by introducing music from one of the city’s new migrant communities.

Change of Presenter, Change of Perspective? The Accented Voice

As has been argued, the migrant events and experiences of the 2003 series of Different Voices were framed by the Irish voices of the presenters. An immediate difference in the 2004 series of Different Voices, introduced in October of 2004, was embodied in its new presenter and reporter. Guy Bertrand Nimpa moved to Cork in 2001 from Cameroon. Nimpa on air was a warmer, more accessible personality than 2003’s presenter and reporter Cliona O’Carroll, as can be heard on the audio clip.

[Audio 5; 37sec] Nimpa served as the face of Different Voices on the programme’s webpage on the RTÉ website (see Fig. 1). Nimpa also had considerable access to and contacts within various migrant communities, partly through his work with the Common Purpose Leadership Development program in Cork and as a founder of Irish Immigrant Voices. It is possible that simply hearing his accent also encouraged members of migrant communities to listen to and perhaps contact the programme.

Describing ‘writing with an accent’, Modarressi (1992) describes the power and effect of the accented voice:

The accented voice is loaded with hidden messages from our cultural heritage, messages that often reach beyond the capacity of the ordinary words of any
Different Voices

Different Voices- a programme which celebrates diversity in a changing Ireland returned to the airwaves on RTÉ Radio 1 in late September. Different Voices is presented this season by Guy Bertrand Nimpa who is a native of the Cameroon, he has been active in organizing students and members of the broader community on issues related to social justice, human rights and the democratic process.

Guy Bertrand holds a degree from the Faculty of Sciences from the University of Yaoundé, and a teaching qualification in Physics.

He has attended numerous workshops and conferences on human rights, is a founder member of Irish Immigrant Voices; a group aimed at providing a common platform for immigrant voices to be heard and is currently involved with Common Purpose Leadership Development Program in Cork.

Different Voices Series Producer is Marcus Connaughton who has had a long association with Inter Cultural broadcasting on RTÉ Radio 1 since 1999 - and its predecessor Radio One World.

Listen to the series
language....Perhaps it is their [immigrant and exile writers'] personal language that can build a bridge between what is familiar and what is strange. They may then find it possible to generate new and revealing paradoxes.

(Modarressi, cited in Naficy 2001: 23-24)

The bridge-building capacities of Nimpa's African accent may well have encouraged other migrants to contribute to Different Voices whilst he was presenting the programme. Additionally, Nimpa conducted many of his interviews in French in the first instance rather than in English. Speaking both languages gave him greater access to interviewees, particularly from Francophone African countries. While Connaughton remained the series producer, Nimpa was also involved in the production process, suggesting ideas and interviewing contributors, drawing on his experience presenting and researching a programme for migrant communities broadcast from University College Cork's radio station, Cork Campus Radio. Through this previous experience, Nimpa had considerable access to different groups within the migrant communities of Cork city, which increased the amount of migrants contributing to the programme during this series. Further, by drawing on shared experiences as recent immigrants to Ireland, Nimpa's questions to other migrants were more pertinent and the answers longer and more comprehensive than those devised by the Irish presenters in the 2003 series. Nimpa's input into the 2004 series was significant in other ways as well. His previous experience had developed his skills and abilities in radio production, which he was then able to transfer to Different Voices (interview with Nimpa, 26 May 2005). In addition to presenting, and to finding and interviewing people for the programme, he also devised the shape of the programme and its running order alongside Connaughton, and also suggested several of the series' programme topics. In addition to 'Different Churches, Different Beliefs', Nimpa also suggested interviewing Senegalese musician Youssou N'Dour
and Congolese musician Papa Wemba for *Different Voices*, the latter interview conducted and broadcast entirely in French.

In the 2004 series, *Different Voices* retained the magazine format and usually structured each programme around a single topic, increasingly one of migrant interest. However, there were fewer programmes produced for the 2004 series and the time slot was reduced from an hour to a half-hour, with *Different Voices* broadcasting between 7 – 7.30pm on Saturdays instead of 7 – 8pm as in 2003. Topics in autumn 2004 included a comparison between different faith groups and services in the Cork area; a focus on the experiences of refugees from Europe and Africa in Ireland; a report on Eastern Europeans in Ireland after EU expansion in May 2004 and reports from the ‘Understanding Islam and Integrating Ireland’ conferences. The 2004 series concluded with a music programme, which included interviews with N’Dour and Papa Wemba. Nimpa’s French language interview with Papa Wemba took place later in the programme and lasted about 4 ½ minutes. Thematically, the emphasis largely remained on documenting difference rather than engaging with specific issues and problems. Again, a claim can be made for an attempt at furthering public understanding through programmes such as ‘Different Churches, Different Beliefs’, which describe ‘ordinary’ people’s experiences, in this case in relation to religious practices, along similar lines of inquiry as the programmes in series three about Moore Street, Dublin-based multiethnic sports initiatives and emerging migrant communities in semi-rural pockets of Ireland. As in the previous series, those programmes focusing on organised conferences which specifically address issues of race and migration on an international level were informative in a general way,
serving to increase public awareness of issues facing migrants in an international and human rights context.

The idea to occasionally conduct interviews in French was Nimpa’s, but it had Connaughton’s support, and both Connaughton and Nimpa saw the inclusion of French language interviews continuing in the (then provisionally scheduled) 2005 series. The occasional use of French within the programme provides an additionally linguistic avenue for migrant articulation as well as greater access to programme content for Francophone listeners. French is perhaps more widely used than English amongst the majority of African migrants, particularly those from Angola, Senegal, the Congo and Cameroon. Nimpa’s first language is French, and most of the interviews he has conducted for Different Voices were originally conducted in French and later translated. I asked Nimpa if using French instead of English on air was his idea. He replied:

Of course it was my idea. French is my first language, and many of these immigrants that I would be speaking to do not speak English, you know? So most of the time I did interview in French and then did a translation, and then just explained what they were up to. And then I thought maybe I could leave some French on the programme, you know, because the name is ‘Different Voices’. We don’t have only the Cork accent or the Dublin accent in Ireland now, you know. We have many immigrants who speak many languages and with different accents.

(Interview with Nimpa, 26 May 2005)

The final programme of the 2004 series of Different Voices, broadcast on 18 December 2004, featured a rare Irish interview with Youssou N’Dour, who played Dublin’s Vicar Street venue in November 2004 with Fathy Salama’s Cairo Orchestra. Connaughton confirmed that N’Dour had previously been unavailable in Ireland for interviews:
On one of the programmes we did an interview with Youssou N'Dour, and that was purely Guy being very driven, in that he wanted to get an interview with Youssou N'Dour. There were no interviews going with Youssou N'Dour; Youssou N'Dour was not doing any interviews. But Guy, and I greatly admired him for it, decided like many who work in this business, that he wasn't going to take no for an answer. And he made sure that he doorstepped him on the night in Vicar Street, and if I had a highlight from the last series, it was that.

(Interview with Connaughton, 3 May 2005)

Conducted by Nimpa, the interview is marked by a notable friendliness between the two men, probably at least partly drawn from their relative common interest in and experience of Africa, both as their home continent but also conceptually as seen from a migrant's perspective abroad. Both Nimpa and N'Dour come from countries in or near West Africa, Cameroon and Senegal respectively, so they have a region if not a nation in common. Two of Nimpa's questions were broad in scope, inviting a potentially wide range of responses; 'What is your message to the youth of today [about becoming musicians]?' and 'Was Youssou N'Dour born a musician or did he become a musician?' Similarly, N'Dour's responses were straightforward but colourful, and hence doubly accessible. As part of a discussion about his recent visit to France, singing in support of the Senegalese community resident there who previously fought for France, N'Dour comments: 'Music is power. I can use it to support or to encourage justice, or to denounce some bad things.' Twice in their easily flowing conversation Nimpa's comments almost seamlessly overlapped with N'Dour's; in this excerpt they are discussing N'Dour's new album *Egypt*:

[Audio 6; 1:25sec]

N'Dour: *Egypt* is a concept, is an album....First, ‘Egypt’ is a connection between Africans. When I say Africans, I see one picture...
Nimpa: ...from North to the South, from East to West...
N'Dour: ...yes, is Africa. This is my first collaboration between Africans and the content is about Islam.

(Different Voices, 18 December 2004)

Audio 6: 0-35sec

201
The final programme of the last series of *Different Voices* kept to the format of those programmes from the previous series which were devoted to music. In both the 2003 and 2004 series, music-led programmes were limited to the Christmas period and served to convey an inclusive holiday message via the medium of internationally sourced music. In 2004, *Different Voices*’ only entirely music-based programme included music from N’Dour, followed by New Orleans gospel band the Neville Brothers covering a traditional song from New Zealand, and a song called ‘It’s Christmas Time Again’ song by an Irish band from New Ross, Co. Wicklow in support of the Sick Children of Bucharest in Romania charity, which was followed in turn by a choral song by (unidentified) singers from Tirana, Albania. Music by Papa Wemba followed his interview and the programme ended with a personalised, heartfelt holiday sign-off by Nimpa, part of which is transcribed here. Nimpa’s holiday farewell can be heard in full in the audio excerpt: [Audio 7; 1:18sec]

Thank you very much for your support and cooperation throughout this programme. I was absolutely delighted to welcome you every Saturday on *Different Voices*. You are all part of my 2004 good memories. The human being has no power to stop the time. May almighty God guide you along the year with all your projects. May you find happiness and satisfaction in all your initiatives. Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year 2005 to all immigrants. To all my colleagues, and students from Cork university and all my Irish friends. That’s all from me and Marcus.\(^1\)

*(Different Voices, 18 December 2004)*

**Audio 7: 15 – 53sec**

Nimpa addresses migrant communities directly in his farewell message, providing a message of pragmatic support in his encouragement of future activities such as ‘initiatives’ and ‘projects’. Nimpa invested his goodbye message with affection and sincerity, which in turn served as a positive signature ending for the 2004 series. Through Nimpa’s presentation style and his access to programme contributors, the
programme attained a more tangible identity as a programme directed at migrant communities, not least because Nimpa’s voice was a migrant voice.

While *Different Voices* was produced from its inception until its demise by Connaughton, Nimpa’s input into the programme provided several tangible results; a voice migrant audiences could identify with, because his was not an established white Irish voice as was usually heard in the Irish public sphere; greater access to the heard concerns of other migrants living in Ireland; the potential for a more comprehensive on-air exploration of those concerns and, most importantly, the emerging provision of a space where members of migrant communities could voice those concerns, with Nimpa providing a focal point for migrant access, both ideological and actual. Nimpa asserts that *Different Voices* has provided a place for immigrant issues to be aired and addressed, if not debated:

Oh yeah, the feedback is incredible. It was very, very good. I got text messages and letters and phone calls after each programme telling me how they feel about it, you know? And the feedback in general was very good. And they are a bit disappointed that the programme finished. They feel that they have been given a room, you know? A window of opportunity to talk about what they want or how they feel or how they have been treated.

(Interview with Nimpa, 26 May 2005)

Formally *Different Voices* retained an illustrative approach to representing difference by foregrounding it as difference, but the positive response of migrant communities that Nimpa describes here, drawn at least partly from his own input to the programme and its resulting accessibility and increased relevance, signifies a shift in focus from passively depicting and exoticising difference for settled Irish audience consumption, to appealing to migrant listenerships and at best providing a platform for migrant voices - the ‘room’ that Nimpa describes.
Connaughton is aware of the incongruity of his role as a white producer of a ‘multicultural’ show, particularly in relation to future programmes. He describes his role as series producer as he sees it:

My sense of the programme developing is that it should belong to the different communities; that I would be purely a kind of series editor with a hands-off approach. So in other words, you’re basically more the community radio model of looking at how individuals within the different ethnic backgrounds want this programme driven, where they see it going. Not me and my middle class, whitey agenda with all my profoundly held views, because obviously that’s what I bring to it, and skills as an editor or whatever. But that’s the way I see the programme really developing. In the short term it definitely will be me playing a similar role to that I’m playing already. But in the long term I would like to see it go that far. It must be driven by those for whom it is a voice. Because they are going to articulate what their experience is, these people.

(Interview with Connaughton, emphases Connaughton’s, 3 May 2005)

However, Connaughton does acknowledge that Different Voices is not yet in this utopian position of effective accessibility, much less universally accessible and accountable to migrant communities as a touchstone programme. On the possibility of implementing a live magazine programme or other live discussion, he is positive but sees impediments:

[I]t also poses a number of difficulties in terms of, who do you leave out? You can’t necessarily adequately cover something like that in a live transmission, because you’re doing the topic and the people listening a disservice somewhat by trying to aim to cover that much in such a short period of time. Whereas maybe if you went for an hour-long programme, you might manage to do so, But again, that’s a judgement call by the individual who may be presenting or producing it.

(Interview with Connaughton, 3 May 2005)

Despite these limitations, Connaughton asserts that if a request was made to his supervisors at RTÉ Radio to launch a discussion programme, it would be granted. At this point he warms to his theme, but still sees potential difficulties:
In a roundtable discussion you could make it work. When you involve an audience, then you become fraught with so many extra opinions, and maybe sometimes not always opinions, but rants. And the difficulty is you've obviously got a sensitivity about individuals who may well have something to say, but you might not necessarily want to reflect their opinion on the night. Because it may be completely contrary to what one is attempting to achieve.

( Interview with Connaughton, 3 May 2005)

Connaughton was clearly invested in and believed in the importance of what Different Voices was attempting to accomplish in representing migrant experience. At the end of the interview as he responded to my question about the future of Different Voices, he reiterated what he called the ‘banner’ for the programme:

I see us as being a service to these communities, so whatever way we can facilitate that. But our banner at the end of the day is celebrating diversity in a changing Ireland. No matter what the approach to that is.

( Interview with Connaughton, 3 May 2005)

With Nimpa’s contribution both in presenting and in his production practice in the 2004 series, Different Voices provided a new, ‘different’ voice to the norm of a white settled Irish voice previously heard on the programme. However Spectrum, RTÉ Radio’s subsequent attempt at multicultural programming primarily kept to a celebratory representation of difference and ‘the multicultural’, but occasionally attempted an interrogation of how a perceived ‘difference’ was experienced by migrants, as will be argued below.

Part Two: Spectrum

The Inception and Remit of Spectrum as an RTÉ ‘Multicultural’ Programme

Spectrum first went on air at 2pm on Saturday, 4 June 2005 on RTÉ Radio One as part of RTÉ Radio’s ‘multicultural season’, which was advertised immediately prior to the
programme’s first broadcast. *Spectrum* in its original format closely resembled *Different Voices* and was initially similarly focused on a multicultural celebration of difference. It adopted a talk-based magazine format comprised of pre-recorded interviews, panel discussions and vox pop responses edited together. However, in September 2005 its initial 13-week run was extended and there was a conscious change to *Spectrum* programmes which will be further explored below. The programme’s content began to move away from an illustration of diversity and towards an examination of social and infrastructural issues affecting migrants and migrant experiences of these. While it remained primarily directed at a mainstream white Irish audience, *Spectrum* increasingly attempted to investigate and explore migrant perspectives in relation to specific issues each week. This move towards increased reportage occasionally resulted in programmes which embodied a movement away from a politics of recognition identified and problematised by Lentin and Hesse, and towards an interrogation which serves as an intervention into the illustrative depiction of migrant experience which characterised the majority of programmes on both *Different Voices* and *Spectrum*.

Broadcasting on Saturday evenings at 7pm, *Different Voices* reached an average of 11,000 listeners in 2003 and 25,000 listeners in 2004. The jump in listenership figures may have contributed to the decision to broadcast *Spectrum* at 2pm initially, a time slot more often allocated to sport coverage on Irish radio. This time slot reached up to 149,000 listeners. However, when *Spectrum* was moved to a 9pm time slot on Sundays in September 2005, audience figures dropped to an average of 11,000 listeners. The last programme of *Different Voices* was broadcast on 18 December 2004; *Spectrum* broadcast on RTÉ Radio One from June through August 2005, briefly
going off the air after the initial 13 programmes before returning in September 2005. *Spectrum* continued broadcasting until December 2008. Advance advertisements on Radio 1 announced the arrival of RTÉ’s ‘new multicultural season’, which comprised three programmes broadcast over 13 weeks: *Breaking Bread*, *A New Ireland* and *Spectrum*, all of which were broadcast in summer 2005. *Breaking Bread* ran for six weeks and went off air on 21 July 2005; *A New Ireland* ran for 13 weeks and went off the air on 31 August 2005. It is unclear if the ‘multicultural season’ was as much of a planned initiative as the advertisements suggested. Aongus McAnally, a veteran radio producer at RTÉ who produced *A New Ireland*, was approached by Lorelei Harris, then-Head of Arts Programmes to produce *Spectrum*. He describes the process:

> Without getting into a discussion of the organisation and how it works on one level, Lorelei said to me I’d love you to work on this new programme, I said, absolutely, I’d be delighted to. So I came on board to *Spectrum*. Lorelei’s very strong on the multicultural in RTÉ and also at the hard level, that it should be groundbreaking, proactive rather than reactive.

Certainly the critics wrote things like, typical RTÉ, like waiting on a bus, there’s none for two hours and then three come along together. In the same way, there’s been a dearth of multicultural programmes and suddenly now they’ve three. I found that quite annoying on one level, in that it would appear to be that nothing you do is enough. If you do one programme on multiculturalism they go, ugh, what’s this tokenism; if you do two they’re going, how intelligent was that to think of two programmes. And as we did three they’re going, did they run out of ideas and decide let’s divide it up? I don’t know. But as far as I’m concerned I think that within the remit of public service broadcasting it’s critically important that RTÉ delivers to everybody who listens.

(Interview with McAnally, 16 December 2005)

With reference to McAnally’s reaction to negative press coverage, it is worth noting Tunstall’s (1993) point about the general experience of television producers with press coverage generally:

> Producers know that newspaper coverage of television is read by the general public, by other print journalists and by politicians. The producer’s colleagues comment on press coverage in corridor conversations; the producer also
knows that the barons at the top of the system see a daily digest of press comment from all newspapers and specialist publications. The barons themselves anxiously scan the press because they know that press comment helps to establish the public image of their channel.

(Tunstall 1993: 13)

In describing the inception of *Spectrum* and his discussion with Harris, McAnally speaks with the institutional voice of RTÉ in his positive reinforcement of the station’s commitment to multicultural programming, in a manner described by Burns (1977) in relation to the BBC production context as embodying a ‘sense of identification with the Corporation’, adding that ‘[t]heir jobs, often enough, obliged them to speak with the voice of the Corporation’ (Burns 1977: 110). It can be suggested that McAnally’s long association with the organisation was such that he naturally identified with its PSB goals, including that of serving diversity. In relation to this identification with organisational goals and ideology, Burns suggests that ‘speaking with the voice of the Corporation’ is the alternative to ‘being lost in anonymous membership of the organisation’ (ibid.: 111). The producer by the nature of his or her work is far less visible than the presenter; identification with the processes of organisational ideology may be a way of reinstating visibility through the identification with the stated PSB goals of a very visible organisation.

While *Different Voices* was produced and recorded in RTÉ’s Cork studio (except when the production team travelled to cover a story elsewhere in Ireland), all three of the new programmes in the ‘multicultural season’ were produced in RTÉ’s Dublin radio studio, RTÉ’s institutional home base for both radio and television. This movement from the relatively small Cork regional studio to the main studios in the Irish capital, and the probable accompanying increase in available resources allotted
to the three programmes suggests these programmes, and their multicultural focus, were taken more seriously by the national broadcaster than *Different Voices* had been. This is also evidenced by the time slots allotted to all three programmes on the Radio 1 schedule. *Spectrum* initially went out at a 2pm slot on Saturday afternoons before being moved to 9pm on Sunday nights in September; *A New Ireland* went out during the mid-morning, at 11am on Wednesdays, a popular slot. *Breaking Bread* was broadcast at 7pm on Thursday evenings. The premise and content of *Breaking Bread* was predicated on the commodification of food and culinary ritual as recognisable symbols of cultural difference. *A New Ireland* was presented by Carrie Crowley, a popular presenter who provided a reassuring and familiar voice to a mainstream mid-morning audience.

From its inception in June 2005 until autumn 2007 *Spectrum* was presented by Melanie Verwoerd, the former South African ambassador to Ireland, who moved to Ireland in 2000. Both Verwoerd and McAnally acknowledge in interview that the programme was targeted primarily at a mainstream audience, defined here as an established white Irish listenership, and served a primarily educative function.

MV: I think we always said it wasn’t intended as a sort of community radio station for immigrants. It was never meant to be that. It was meant to ask the questions to the mainstream Irish audience, so it wasn’t intended to serve immigrant communities, you know. And it’s been interesting because of the responses we got, particularly when something controversial has come up, for example, from the woman in Donegal who called and said she was angry that we have the programme on in the summer when she could be listening to sport.

(Interview with Verwoerd, 9 December 2005)

In response to my question asking who comprises their audience, McAnally describes their targeted listenership:
Initially it was to be to the Radio One audience, and given that the longer that multiculturalism goes on in Ireland we will suddenly have second generation people of ethnic origins all over the place, and they will be the Radio One listener, the Irish listener.

(Interview with McAnally, 9 December 2005)

In their content Spectrum’s early programmes broadly resembled the format used in Different Voices. Programme topics included coverage of various festivals and musical events and interviews with people from different migrant communities. Spectrum’s original remit, as stated at the beginning of the first programme, was celebratory rather than investigative or particularly discursive. Following a brief introduction from the continuity announcer, Melanie Verwoerd provides a short précis of the programme:

Now we have the first programme in RTÉ’s Radio One’s new multicultural series, Spectrum. It’s presented by Melanie Verwoerd.

MV: Hello and welcome to Spectrum. I’m Melanie Verwoerd, and over the next thirteen weeks or so we will be celebrating all aspects of Ireland’s diverse multicultural society. There’s no doubt that the social landscape of Ireland has changed so much over the last few years. And it’s wonderful, to see and hear the colours, the voices, the music, and feel the great energy that is Ireland today.

Coming up in the next hour, the Metro Éireann Multimedia and Multicultural Awards, [excerpt from awards]; a flotilla races up the River Lee [excerpt from previously recorded interviews]; a Lithuanian folk song [excerpt], and divided loyalties, as Ireland takes on Israel in the world cup qualifier this evening. Our phone number here on the programme is 1850 715 150. But first, one of Ireland’s biggest musical successes, whose careers have certainly seen them engage with many different cultures and musical styles. Here are the Corrs.

(Spectrum, 4 June 2005)

While the popular Irish band the Corrs are recognisably Irish and occasionally incorporate the use of Irish traditional instruments in their music, they are also bestselling recording artists internationally. Their inclusion here can be read as a
reference to an Irish cultural product of the same magnitude of Riverdance or Limerick band The Cranberries, if not quite that of U2; however, it can also be read as marking a return to or reinforcement of the Irish mainstream public sphere.

From September 2005 Spectrum began to change the focus of its content. The programme began to incorporate coverage of infrastructural and political issues which directly impacted on migrant communities. Through to December 2005, these items fell into several broad categories. Items dealing with changes or concerns directly affecting migrants within infrastructure or governance included reports on migrants working as doctors or nurses in Ireland, with a separate programme dedicated to each group; the introduction of two new Bills, The New Employment Permits Bill 2005 and the Immigration & Residence Bill; an item on faith-based schools in Ireland; a Gárda Síochána\textsuperscript{16} recruitment day specifically directed at migrants; a report on the deportation of Nigerians from Ireland in October 2005; reports on the Northern Ireland Equality Commission and on the Irish Ferries labour dispute. An overlapping category was that of information provision for migrants. The programme featuring migrant nurses also included detailed information of the requirements for working in Ireland for applicants from outside the European Union. The Gárda recruitment day was announced in an earlier programme of Spectrum and later reported upon on the day itself. An item featuring an African woman who was required to provide her HIV status for an insurance company was followed up the next week with a related item featuring a contributor who worked in insurance and warned against such stated ‘requirements’. Stories about migrants were juxtaposed with items providing concrete information and occasionally contact details for the organisations described. Another category featured reports on international stories, or comment and analysis of
international stories by people directly involved or informed. These included items on the Paris banlieue riots in October 2005; New Zealand’s new government elected in October 2005; Irish and Pakistani responses to the earthquake in Pakistan in October 2005 and a new questionnaire for potential British citizens introduced in November 2005.

A further category focused on discussion and occasionally debate over what constitutes identity. Included in this category are discussion items featuring ‘experts’ on aspects of multiculturalism, including academics, activists and the occasional newspaper columnist. Contributors to these debates included migrant activist and Columban priest Bobby Gilmore, academics Ronit Lentin and Peadar Kirby, Irish Times columnist Fintan O’Toole, historian Louis Cullen and economist Constantin Gurdgiev, while topics discussed by these experts included a debate on the Irish Ferries strikes17 (overlapping in category with the story itself, which was time-specific and particularly pertinent to some sections of new migrant communities) and Ireland’s previous history of emigration. A programme on 6 November 2005 devoted itself to an in-depth exploration of constructions of national identity and citizenship; this topic was introduced by the introduction of a new questionnaire in Britain from November 2005, which potential citizens would be required to complete. In the above programmes Spectrum featured recognised intellectuals, including journalists and academics, from the settled white Irish community as well as other white Irish spokespersons from organisations with a remit to work with and represent migrants and other disenfranchised groups. Spectrum also incorporated items featuring established Jewish and Muslim communities, as well as Ireland’s Travelling community, and on 18 November 2005 devoted a show to Pavee Point, the Traveller
support organisation. Additionally, Spectrum included occasional coverage of ongoing debates around equality in Northern Ireland. However, the persistence with which Spectrum featured 'experts' from the settled white Irish community meant that the voices heard, and represented as embodying authority on 'multicultural' issues remained primarily Irish; again as those heard on the 2003 series of Different Voices.

While Spectrum initially adhered to the illustrative format adopted in Different Voices, the subsequent shift in focus and increase in the areas covered can be read as a move towards greater engagement with migrant communities at the level of infrastructure and a move away from the exoticisation imbued in the concentration on difference. Both McAnally and Verwoerd describe this shift in Spectrum's format and acknowledge Spectrum's celebratory approach to migrant representation; in fact, each describes the programme's 'celebration of multiculturalism' in positive terms:

AMc: The initial brief was to be celebratory of multiculturalism rather than issue-driven. It was a celebration of the music, the culture, the food, so we would have talked to people about various festivals, there was one in Kinsale, a Moroccan festival in Temple Bar, so it would have been magazine-type driven with not as many of the harder issues that we would have now since September. That was the initial brief and through the summer we would have been talking to people; we did a programme in Limerick and one in Athlone, we went to the Holy Centre, the direct provision centre, we would have talked to people who were living in direct provision, we would have talked to the groups who are dealing with multiculturalism.

That was the first few months of the programme. Then it transitioned in September into a much harder programme dealing with a lot of the issues. The programme at the moment would be dealing with stronger, harder issues like deportation, like visas, like work permits, racism, a harder edge. So I think that even within itself it has changed over the last 3 months, going from magazine to harder issue-driven programme-making.

(Interview with McAnally, 9 December 2005)

McAnally's first sentence is indicative of the polarisation between this celebratory approach and one which is, in his words, 'issue-driven'. His subsequent description of
the contrast of earlier *Spectrum* programmes featuring coverage of cultural products, festivals or other migrant-specific events with later programmes engaging with issues of legal and residential status for migrants charts the changes in *Spectrum*’s content. While a change in format to include interrogation of infrastructural and governance changes directly affecting migrants is in itself progressive, the context in which *Spectrum* continues to be produced remains somewhat curtailed by lingering attitudes discernable in RTÉ’s production context, as exemplified in some cases through a persistent carelessness in language use when describing new migrant communities and related issues, stories and concerns.

MV: Well, we started off by celebrating multiculturalism. And that was quite easy in a way to deal with, because it’s great, you know, you just get everybody from different cultures, and it’s also something that I recognise from South Africa. It’s saying it’s not a problem, it’s not a curse, it’s actually something to be celebrated because it’s actually a great gift, because this is what the globe’s all about.

So I still think it’s that. We’re still trying to say that multiculturalism isn’t, say, a problem. It’s a challenge, not a problem or something you need to tolerate or try and build tolerance to. It’s something that you should have a far more positive or proactive attitude outlook on, and celebrate it and say this is great, this is interesting, and get a bit of a buzz from it.

But our remit has changed slightly in that we are now asking more, not so much what is lacking, as it comes up, but what is the society that we want to create in Ireland. Can we agree on that and if we do agree then what does it take to get that society, where are we falling short. So those are the sort of questions that we’re asking. Obviously there’s sometimes the critical analysis of things, such as the Immigration Law recently or the work permit laws. So that’s the critical...and sometimes there’s the celebratory side, you know, it’s okay, don’t panic, it’s actually okay.

(Interview with Verwoerd, 9 December 2005)

The latter part of Verwoerd’s response incorporates the potential for critique through her stated attempt with *Spectrum* to examine ‘where are we falling short.’ Verwoerd draws here from her political experience in the Republic of South Africa to frame her
discussion of multiculturalism. Clearly the political and societal contexts of each
country are very different; thus the ways in which multiculturalism is manifested in
each country also differ significantly. A detailed comparison of Ireland and South
Africa’s use, understanding and application of multiculturalism is well beyond the
scope of this research. A starting point would be an assessment of the very different
needs of each: South Africa has urgent, ongoing problems with health care and
remaining inequity which multicultural initiatives are established to combating.
Verwoerd’s experience as a former Member of Parliament in South Africa and of
South Africa’s multicultural practices and the discourses surrounding them inform
both her comments above and within her contribution to the programme. She
consistently frames multiculturalism in positive language, possibly because
‘multiculturalism’ has a more urgent currency in South Africa.

*Spectrum*’s Christmas programme, necessarily broadcast on Christmas Day as it fell
on a Sunday in 2005, reverted to a focus on food, music and festive rituals across
migrant communities, although Christmas was the only holiday discussed. The
programme, like most *Spectrum* programmes, was pre-recorded. McAnally discussed
the process of putting programme content together for the Christmas *Spectrum* show:

I just felt that it was a night for something not too heavy, and that it should be
a celebration of the multicultural Ireland and different nationalities. Originally
we were looking for studio eight (the biggest), but couldn’t get it because it
was booked for the Riverdance company, so we got studio one. We were
trying to get it on the sixth of December which was the little Christmas of
some of the countries so they would have actually been celebrating their
Christmas on that day, so we thought that it would be nice. So it emerged
between myself and Melanie and Alan Torney, the researcher, that we would
take four or five or six different nationalities, get three or four or two people in
from each one, somebody who could sing or play guitar. On the basis of six
nationalities we’d have 8 – 9 minutes each, with a song and a sense of their
Christmas, both at home and the one they would have here in Ireland. I don’t
think it’s the night to do serious issues as we face the future of
multiculturalism in Ireland.
In relation to migrants settled in the hosting country, Robins discusses a perception in research into migrant media use that migrants eventually begin turning away from diaspora or transnational media in favour of the host country’s produced programming. He argues this perception is itself derived from an assumption of integration through increasing use of host country media:

The assumption is that, as new generations of migrants become progressively “acculturated” into the host culture, then what they regard as their holding environment will inevitably switch, to become different from that of the parental generation – and so, therefore, will their patterns of viewing.... Even in this more accommodating approach, then, what still seems to be operative is the perspective of integration, into one or other community.

(Robins 2006: 148)

As media from home countries is increasingly accessible via satellite or the internet, the appeal of the host country’s media for migrants who settle appears to go beyond actual accessibility and towards a project of cultural and ideological integration. McAnally incorporates an assumption of eventual media integration in his stated belief above that migrants and their families will gradually come to be or RTÉ listeners. His statement also reinforces an aspect of RTÉ’s nation-building project; incorporating the education of new listeners within the national broadcaster’s projection of Irish nationhood.

In relation to programme content more generally, Shaw expands on what she sees the function of mainstream multicultural programmes to be:

They all serve something. The Irish Times is doing something like “meet my new neighbour”. Anything that creates a sense of knowing the other is great. Largely that’s aimed at the indigenous population. All that content is aimed at us [white Irish], because the majority population here actually exists quite
happily, as in most societies, with having absolutely no interconnection at all with the other. And they were lovely programmes, I thought they were all beautiful, but my understanding of those [programmes] as forms of communication is that they’re aimed at the indigenous population.

And that’s true. You have to communicate with both. Most of that content I thought was about communicating with the white Irish community, to help us make a transition into a multicultural Ireland. And I don’t say that lightly. It’s part of the public broadcaster’s role, to help us as a majority population to make an adjustment into multiculturalism. But that’s very different to what the other conversation [a previous discussion at time of interview, about migrant-produced programmes] is about.

(Interview with Shaw, 11 November 2005)

Shaw’s identification of (at least) two separate audiences has an echo in RTÉ’s ‘Guiding Principles’ document (2006), which repeatedly uses two phrases to describe the ongoing fulfilment of its mission statement as discussed above: ‘RTÉ, shaped by its past, will be flexible enough to adapt to the future’ and ‘RTÉ will focus on holding existing and attracting new audiences.’ One way in which RTÉ frames its commitment to representing diversity is through a dialectic embodied between the two statements which allows for programmes directed at established, settled, white Irish audiences, as well as for programmes directed at newer, more diverse communities. This schism serves to divide these audiences in RTÉ’s ‘Guiding Principles’ rather than allowing for potential common ground across them, as programmes featuring settled white Irish experience and stories clearly outnumber those featuring and foregrounding migrant stories.

While *Spectrum* continued to become more politically engaged in its recurring attempts to examine infrastructural and governance issues affecting migrants it was still limited by an over-reliance on a broadly defined and uncritical use of ‘multiculturalism’, both conceptually and as a stand alone term. There was a
discernable shift in content, moving from a passive, celebratory approach to representing migrants between the summer and autumn programmes in 2005, particularly the two programmes featuring migrant nurses and doctors, respectively (*Spectrum*, 18 and 25 September 2005) and the programme examining different perspectives around the debate on male circumcision, a practice increasingly sought by some African communities (*Spectrum*, 9 October 2005). Yet *Spectrum* returned to a more reductive, illustrative approach to representation of diversity in programmes celebrating Irish migration patterns, as related by an Irish historian (*Spectrum*, 20 November 2005) and a discussion on the nature of national identity which privileged a white male voice among its four speakers (*Spectrum*, 6 November 2005).

**Language and Authority: Presenting Spectrum**

On *Spectrum*, as in *Different Voices*, ‘multiculturalism’ is frequently discussed as a phenomenon in itself. Indeed, questions around what constitutes identity, race and community arose more frequently in *Spectrum*, perhaps due to the greater discursive space it dedicated to discussion and debate of precisely these issues. Again, as with *Different Voices*, these discussions were still usually conducted between members of relative social elites instead of taking place at grassroots level. However, these recurring interrogations of perceptions of identity and multiculturalism usefully contribute to a climate in the public sphere wherein not only are these questions discussed, but the language and vocabulary for doing so circulates more widely and grows in familiarity to listeners. Some of these discussions are more compelling than others, but even the fact that they recur is a step towards a greater engagement with the concerns of diversity, albeit as discussed by elites in the mainstream.
Presenter Melanie Verwoerd’s experience with multiculturalism as it is manifest in South Africa informs the questions she asks and her choice of words. While her links in autumn 2005 were sometimes written by programme producer McAnally, she also devised and asked her own questions when interviewing a subject. In addition to Verwoerd’s primary role as presenter, she took on the responsibilities of a journalist in her interviews with programme contributors, especially when outside the studio. Verwoerd’s style of presenting is lively and engaging and often incorporates inclusive and optimistic phrases such as ‘rainbow world’ and ‘the new Ireland of the 21st century’. In contrast, other of her word choices on Spectrum sound archaic: ‘native’ (Verwoerd on Spectrum, 9 October 2005), for example, in reference to an African man who trained in the formal circumcision of male infants. Such reductive word use occasionally undermines her credibility as a former politician with experience of diversity, and as a journalist on a multicultural programme. However, it is also true that word usage in South Africa in relation to cultural diversity differs from that of Britain and the US (and naturally from other countries as well). In this context, Verwoerd may simply be using terms she is most familiar with, although ultimately as a presenter on a self-defined multicultural programme in Ireland her role demands culturally specific sensitivity and accuracy in language use.

The questions Verwoerd asks are often simple and direct. She regularly inserts her own perspective and opinions into the programme narrative whilst interviewing or when providing an overview of events, often freely expressing her point of view on terminology used or customs described. Such a direct line of questioning results in direct answers, which can result in more informative radio. Her access to and interviews with the show’s contributors sound easily mediated and her questions are
readily answered. As noted above, much of *Spectrum* is pre-recorded, so awkward moments can be (and usually are) edited out. However, from what I observed in studio (both a recorded interview and a programme edit), those contributors Verwoerd interviewed seemed comfortable and forthcoming. Yet Verwoerd’s directness and language use can sometimes appear naïve, perhaps deliberately. Her recurring insertion of her viewpoint into the programme can be read in several ways. When she candidly articulates her viewpoint on the stated issue, admits her frustration with a situation on air (as occurred during the programme about male circumcision on 9 October 2005) or indicates her scepticism of critical terms, she offers a point of identification for the listener unfamiliar with critical language in relation to multiculturalism, which provides one way into understanding the issues discussed. The naivety she expresses on air, whether consciously or unconsciously, contribute to this effect.

Further, Verwoerd’s on-air persona can be contradictory. Occasionally she critiques a particular term or phenomenon, often providing a pithy if simplistic reading. The following example comes from a programme, described briefly above, focused on discussion of what constitutes national identity, and exemplifies her naivety. Verwoerd is responding here to Peadar Kirby’s recognition of an identity position predicated on activism and shared perspectives, rather than on nationality. Her view that Ireland remains a homogenous country is transcribed here; the audio clip begins with Kirby speaking and incorporates the ensuing panel responses to Verwoerd’s assertion. [Audio 8; 2:27sec]

...in Ireland, there isn’t a lot of difference. I mean, in other countries, like Britain and I think to some extent in the US, there’s also a class issue related to culture, in people coming in from other cultures and so on. In Ireland it’s
Harly developed, leaving space for multicultural doubt
continues to be meaningful. In this sense, Verwoerd’s critique is warranted, but is
20 November 2005), Ongoing scrutiny of these terms is essential if they are to
(Verwoerd on Spectrum, 6 November 2005) and developed (Verwoerd on Spectrum,
unreasonably potentially undermined. The critique of these terms, multilingualism,
disparages one, those terms are subsequently thrown into question and their critical
serves to undermine her statement. When the questions a term or occasionally
implied, yet Verwoerd’s reference is to use more critical and precise language also
of information and increase diversity, with the suggestion that information should be
This question seems as odds with Verwoerd’s previously articulated stance in support
(Verwoerd on Spectrum, 6 November 2005)

Currently
on a cultural level a bit of a euro scenario, you know, all have the same
going to define Ireland from Britain from France. I mean, isn’t it going to be
world, if we all just allow cultures in everywher. Is there anything that’s
But the question I just have is that, isn’t it going to become a really bland
being somewhat reduced;
the same programme seems to contrast to some of her previous statements as well as
inward information was generally corrected. Another statement made by Verwoerd in
assumption that Ireland had been previously homogeneous prior to the most recent
called on this assumption on the above programme by all three contributors, and her
disputed by Lenth and McAleer (2002), Verwoerd was immediately, if generally,
always been homogeneous prior to recent information into Ireland, a perception
This statement reinforces a widely held but erroneous perception that Ireland has

Andhre 8: 25 – 33, 2005
(Verwoerd on Spectrum, 6 November 2005)

homogonous. [sic]

fairly easy to say that, because if is, despite the change in society, fairly
Verwoerd criticises the word ‘developed’ in an item dealing with the Equality Commission featuring an interview with Bob Collins, Director General of RTÉ until mid-2005, when he became head of the Northern Ireland Equality Commission. However, her critique is not expanded on nor is a substitute term suggested.

We’ve spoken a lot now about the historic or the well-known divides in Northern Ireland. But of course Northern Ireland, like most of the globalised, particularly the developed, I hate that term, or first world, also now has to deal with multiculturalism and multiracialism.

(Verwoerd on Spectrum, 20 November 2005)

McAnally makes the argument that the guiding principles in programme making are entertainment and education; these, he says, constitute the bottom line (interview with Aongus McAnally, 16 December 2005). A similar argument could apply when describing Verwoerd’s contradictions as presenter; that they make her more ‘human’ and thus more accessible to settled white Irish listeners who are themselves confused by the various meanings of ‘multiculturalism’ or ‘developed’ in relation to the North and South. Broadly therefore, Verwoerd functioned as an effective presenter even while she embodied and thus possibly furthered, the contradictions which characterise the way ‘multiculturalism’ is represented on RTÉ and is framed within its overarching nation building project.

Cultural Sensitivity on Air: A Balanced Interrogation?

A Spectrum programme discussing the circumcision of infant boys as an established cultural ritual combines several powerful narratives in its content, creating cultural and ideological intersections which are thought-provoking and moving, not least because of the controversial topic. Combining local viewpoints and medical
contributions and including an interview with a practitioner of male infant circumcision, this programme incorporates representations of multiple, contradictory perspectives, lending itself to analysis precisely because of the ways in which these are presented and framed within the programme’s structure in relation to a controversial, culturally specific activity. This programme, broadcast 9 October 2005, facilitates the expression of different opinions on the issue which provide further insight into the cultural and ideological thinking of the various contributors. The programme was recorded on location in Waterford city in Co. Waterford, just after the local trial of Osagi Ogbinedion for circumcising a male child, Callis Osaighe, who tragically later bled to death. The programme’s structure incorporates a ‘vox pop’ at the start which serves to introduce the issue by providing multiple, often conflicting local points of view, then moves on to in-depth interviews with medical practitioners and a human rights organisation’s spokesperson speaking against the practice. The final interview is with Ogbinedion. How these multiple utterances are put together and edited produces the programme’s impact for the listener.

What is risked when covering a potentially emotional or politically sensitive story is generating a simplistic public response. Even when each ‘side’ of a story is told with reference to multiple sources representing different political positions on the issue, all reportage, consciously or unconsciously, ultimately incorporates the agenda of the broadcasting station or organisation. This can result in a simplistic mass response, achieved through what Bourdieu (1998) describes as the combined effect of maximised pressures acting upon the journalistic field and the maximisation of collective emotion, which then feeds upon itself, reinforcing its impact. The process is complex and certainly a range of responses emerge following any politically or
of communication. sweetheart next interviews a representative of the Humanities
parents who seek make informal communication amount for this through various channels
in Ireland, this discussion includes reference to an underlying system wherein
Jewish doctor and a Muslim doctor about their experiences of preceding communication
conducted at the hospital is straightforward and safe. sweetheart also speaks to a
reasons is not allowed. The doctor explains, and emphasizes, that the procedure
who refuses the hospital's stated claim that communication for religious or cultural
in contribute their views on the case. She speaks to a doctor at Waterford Hospital
reports from the consultative and from the spheres of Waterford, where she asks people
features local and expert response to the verdict and its implications. sweetheart
power. The programme focuses on the consultaion of the trial of Ossag Ogbemudia and
which can in turn be predictable on the contributed occupying disparate positions of
representation of what Hughes (1994) calls, "sympathetic participation in talk radio,
relationships between participants in talk radio provides further tensions through the
articulated by both migrant and Irish speakers. Additionally, the dilettante
conflicting perspectives usually illustrate where opinions on contested issues are
violation of human rights. The programme's bringing together of multiple and
communication of human issues, which is framed very closely as cultural and a
communication of human issues, which is framed very closely as a cultural and
The Waterford Programme brings together perspectives on the sensible issue of the
impact as the influence of radio helps bridge the sense of immediacy for the listener.

specifically, formally unique context for stories which potentially carry a high emotional
highly emotional mass responses. Additionally, the medium of radio provides a
although the journalistic field are also at work in the creation, and refining of
emotionally sensitive Programme; Boudon's point here is simply that the processes

Argument only - when it is obvious that there are different opinions.

Mr. H. response to questions from ordinary people in the street. Programs like these must be presented for what they are, an unscientific random slice of the public. There must never be a claim of empirical accuracy in relation to vox pops.

**Option:**

Indicating the possibilities inherent to the vox pop, for discussion response of public

Mr. H. should be aware of the possibilities of manipulating responses in vox pops and

Mr. H.'s guidelines addressing precisely this point, showing that program makers

create a situation in which a vox pop represents the use of vox pops in the programming cycle. Mr. H. includes instructions regarding the use of vox pops, all other concern which is pre-recorded for radio broadcasts, can be subject to selective

interests, particularly those who deliver controversial responses. All vox pops, like

communication locally hold views on an issue to a wider audience. They are most

effective when a few lone vox pops, where an interpreter approaches people on the

street and asks them a specific, issue-based question, can be an effective way to

then as a regular feature. Vox pops, where an interpreter approaches people on the

following: Both Specimen and Different Voices used vox pops only occasionally rather

follows. Both Specimen and Different Voices used vox pops only occasionally rather

The program is introduced with a monologue by Verwood describing the scene at

Vox pops, alongside local African voices.

Vox pops alongside local African voices.

Vox pops alongside local African voices.

Vox pops alongside local African voices.

Balance is achieved and largely achieved, with local Irish voices contributing via

as well as within several Jewish and African communities. A representative

identification of circulation as a common procedure within the Jewish community

policies of representing minority communities in Ireland, in part through the

of minor media circulation on the programme serves as an attempt to bridge a

Opportunity, effectively ending the programme with his words. Addressing the topic

Association of Ireland who is virtually anti-circulation, and finally interviews
Further, it is important to remember the constructed nature of a radio programme. Vox pops in particular, despite the knowledge that responses have probably been edited, can be perceived by listeners as embodying ‘natural’, spontaneous responses. Several contrasting responses were broadcast as part of the vox pop taken, which were introduced by Verwoerd. Responses are shown in the order broadcast. [Audio 9; 1:57sec]

MV: Elsewhere in Waterford city, people were talking about the issue.

I don’t think it should be allowed anyway. I know they do it in their own culture, because there’s probably heaps of them that die then over there with the way they’ve been doing it. They do it to girls as well like, over there (young Irish woman).

Yeah, I’ve been circumcised (Irish man).

I just think it’s barbaric really. It’s the families doing it to the kids themselves, like. It’s wrong, isn’t it? (young Irish woman)

Most people that I would know went to the hospital after giving birth to a male child. They are given up to a year before the child gets circumcised. But most the parents, they don’t have the patience to wait for the year. They want it to be done immediately (African man).

If it’s done properly like, it’s grand. But not people who are not practiced to do it. That’s wrong, like (young Irish woman).

If they don’t have a professional there to watch over what they’re doing, yeah, if they want to do it at home, or if they want to do it themselves, that’s their right and all that kind of thing, because of the fact of their religion or whatever, but they need a professional there to make sure that it’s going properly, and like they’re using the right utensils (young Irish man).

Yes, I circumcised my son in Ireland, yeah. Not in Nigeria. I have three boys and they are all circumcised. When the doctors do it, it’s safe [sic], than the traditional way. It’s better you take your son to the hospital, you make an appointment (African woman).

In Africa, we have old mens [sic]. Every baby they take it home, and then later they call the old man to cut the thing from the baby. They don’t care about if the baby died or something like that. They don’t care. It’s something they are doing always (African man).
I think that because it’s their religion they should be allowed to have it done, in a hospital (Irish woman). In a proper place, yeah, exactly (another Irish woman, nearby).

I know it’s their culture, but I don’t think it’s right. Really I think it’s desperate. We don’t do it. If you’re living in somebody else’s country you’ve got to respect their culture. That’s how I feel about it (Irish woman).

(Spectrum, 9 October 2005)

Just before Verwoerd’s climactic (within the item’s narrative) interview with Ogbinedion, she interviews Dick Spicer from the Humanist Association of Ireland. Spicer’s description of male infant circumcision includes terms such as ‘barbaric’ and reiterates the somewhat brutal phrase ‘cutting off bits of children’ several times.

[Audio 10; 2:54sec] According to Spicer,

DS: We felt that if someone wants to get circumcised, it should be a decision when they reach maturity, but that to take young children and cut bits off them is absolutely barbaric and should be outlawed, and it shouldn’t be allowed in any publicly funded hospital.

MV: How do we deal with cultural issues though?

DS: Cultures have to be judged according to their degree of civilisation. Just because it’s another culture doesn’t mean it’s right or doesn’t mean it should be allowed.

MV: Who determines what is civilised?

DS: Well, western democratic culture.

MV: Is civilised?!

DS: Well, it certainly promotes the rights of an individual. And a child is an individual. That’s how I would judge any culture: does it respect the rights of an individual. A child should not have bits cut off it in the name of some culture.

MV: Isn’t there a real risk though by saying that if you ban it, you just drive it underground?

DS: You could say that about anything. Human sacrifice. You could say it about female circumcision. You could say that about a whole rake of things. But you don’t take that attitude. You say something is right, or something is
wrong. If it’s wrong you do not allow it, you do not promote it. And if you make allowances in one case, you’re on a slippery slope in the other.

MV: And people who argue that there is a religious or a biblical foundation for it?

DS: So what? And that is what we said to the Department of Health.

(Spectrum, 9 October 2005)

Verwoerd’s clear dismissal of Spicer’s opinion is evident in the incredulity of her response. Yet she too seems to disapprove of male infant circumcision for infants, expressing her frustration with some of the responses soon after her interview with Spicer:

Where does one draw the line? I’m feeling a bit frustrated with people just sort of uncritically saying, “Well, it’s culture, you know, so it’s culture and religion.” But at the same time there is no consent from the child’s side.

(Spectrum, 9 October 2005)

In this statement, Verwoerd presents her own opinion on the issue and with reference to the responses she has heard, which goes against a recognised code of practice in journalism of impartiality and balance. Objectivity is central to reliable journalist practice; additionally it is centrally provided for in RTÉ’s remit as part of the legislation framing the national broadcaster’s practice. Verwoerd additionally provides a white, albeit South African, point of identification for a mainstream Irish audience, which could therefore serve to situate audience response to the item’s content as well as subject.

Verwoerd’s interview with Osagi Ogbinedion is broadcast at the end of the programme. The interview demonstrates Ogbinedion’s attempt to balance his beliefs and his experience with Irish laws in relation to the practice of male infant
circumcision, in the country where he and his family have settled. Ogbinedion has children in Nigeria, has married an Irish woman and is now living in Ireland. What follows is a partial transcript; the full interview can be heard on the audio track.

[Audio 11; 4:01sec]

MV: I know that you’re now married to Kathleen, who’s an Irish woman. If you have any boy children here, would you have them circumcised in hospital?

OO: That is another difficult question you are asking me. It is like, what am I doing. I am giving him to someone else to do it. You feel like, I’m not qualified to do this thing. I will try and respect the law of the land. If I do it I’m not breaking the law. Because it’s my culture. But I will always respect the law, the Irish law..... Audio 11: 8-47sec

OO:.....Circumcision is not a witchcraft practice. Most Irish, they believe circumcision is witchcraft. But it’s not about witchcraft. God almighty knows it’s not a witchcraft practice..... Audio 11: 2:18-2:27sec

MV: .....People say [when the process is described to them], it’s maybe not witchcraft, but it’s very barbaric. What would you say to them?

OO: You see, whatever the black world is doing, Africans are doing, the undeveloped world is doing, the western world always call it barbaric. No matter what we are doing, they look at us as barbaric, they look at us as, as second class citizens of the world. So that is the main reason. They feel superior. The white people think they are superior. That I believe. They think whatever black people are doing, it is all barbaric....

.....The problem is most of the western world, they don’t read Bible, they don’t believe in the Bible. All they think is what they think, not the way other people think. Which I’ve said more than once. It is wrong. It is very, very wrong.

(Spectrum, 9 October 2005)
Audio 11: 2:42sec – 3:58sec

Ogbinedion’s responses also embody his perspective on how some African practices are framed in the ‘western world’. The interview, as seen above and can be heard on the audio excerpt, promotes an impression that his decisions were faith-based. It is made clear in the programme that Ogbinedion was cleared of the charges of ‘reckless
endangerment' which were brought against him. Ogbinedion and Spicer share an emotive use of language, although their positions are ideologically opposed. The juxtaposition of the two interviews provides two dramatically contrasting perspectives, which nonetheless have the evocation of emotive language in common. However, as noted, the programme ends with Ogbinedion's heartfelt words, describing in some detail what informed his decision to carry out the procedure.

Alibhai-Brown (2000) describes the danger of cultural relativism when discussing human rights in the context of multiculturalism, critiquing 'multiculturalism's approach to rights': 'Traditional multiculturalism promotes the right of everybody to live within their own cultures, and this privileging of group and community rights extends to immunity from criticism from those outside the culture (Alibhai-Brown 2000: 73-74). Helen Shaw, former Director of RTÉ Radio provides a holistic description of what should comprise a multicultural programme:

I think that you need all of it. You need migrant-produced programmes, you need community, you need exactly the same stuff that the indigenous community get. As a white, Irish born woman, I cannot genuinely say, no matter how much work and research has gone into it, I cannot claim that I understand a migrant black person's view. I have to recognise that they're operating in a completely different set of needs and cultural beginnings to me.

(Interview with Shaw, 11 November 2005)

Certainly Spectrum in autumn 2005 did not include significant migrant participation in the production process, as Different Voices did in Guy Nimpa, both in his role as presenter, which introduced a point of identification for migrant listeners and as researcher and contributor to the show's content. Verwoerd was replaced as Spectrum's presenter in autumn 2007 by Polish presenter Zbyszek Zalinski, but the
programme as of spring 2008 was produced by a white Irish woman, Nuala O’Neill (see Fig. 2).

‘Multicultural’ Programmes Within the National Frame

Occasionally and at their best, both *Different Voices* and *Spectrum* move beyond a celebration of difference and towards creating a nationally framed broadcasting space for migrant community articulation, both programmes at times providing a space for discussion and debate in which members of migrant communities and settled white Irish communities participate. Both programmes, in line with the aims of PSB, consciously set out to inform; as Kosnick notes above from a wider European perspective, these programmes follow a recognised PSB format by reporting on current issues in the public sphere. Yet both programmes persist in primarily depicting ‘difference’ instead of exploring migrant experiences. Both series serve to document not only aspects of migrant life and experience in Ireland but to mark a moment of migration history, when migrant communities and settled Irish communities were working through how to negotiate new communications crossroads; in this case, those provided by the airwaves. While both *Different Voices* and *Spectrum* effectively document some experiences of recent and ongoing inward migration to Ireland, they do so ultimately within the discursive and ideological cultural frame of the national broadcaster’s established strategies of primarily communicating and performing a national culture characterised by a normative white, settled Irish subject position.

In relation to the ways in which European nations historically defined and represented themselves, Anderson (1991) describes the emergence of ‘languages of power’ across
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Zbyszek Zalinski
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Europe, displacing the linguistic diversity which previously flourished. The language of power evolved following the expansion of print media across Europe, as ‘print capitalism’ assembled Europe’s various diverse vernaculars in use into simpler forms which could be read by more people. Anderson argues the new print languages paved the way, ideologically, for growing nation-consciousness through the creation of new, unified means of communication, which incorporated a ‘new fixity’ within print language which would persist in printed form and thus lend itself to historical and other written accounts of the region. The circulation of these in turn would ultimately contribute to the project of ‘nation-building’. ‘Languages of power’ replaced the previous administrative vernaculars previously used (Anderson 1991: 44-46). The combination of these factors served to reify the emergence of a sanctioned language of power, which served as a unifying force paving the way for the development and expression of ‘nation-ness’.

The emergence of the ‘novel and the newspaper’ provided two forms of ‘print-capitalism’ and introduced the concept of print, or media, as commodity (ibid.). Anderson argues that the shared habit of daily reading the newspaper historically reinforced a sense of unified community:

[The newspaper reader, observing exact replicas of his own paper being consumed by his subway, barbershop, or residential neighbours, is continually reassured that the imagined world is visibly rooted in everyday life.

(ibid.: 35 – 36)

The emergence of the ‘language of power’ alongside the emergence of the unifying project of shared use of mass media provided the ideological framework for nation-building. The movement towards a regional linguistic singularity identified by Anderson provides the historical context underpinning the primacy of a single
language used by a given nation as its ‘language of power’. Ireland is officially bilingual, with most public signage in both English and Irish. However, Ireland’s ‘language of power’ is indisputably English. Anderson’s arguments here provide an ideological and historical context through which to read RTÉ’s practices as a national broadcaster. Listening to radio, like reading newspapers, is historically predicated on habit; radio too works to unify its listenership. Anderson further describes the activity of reading newspapers:

It is performed in silent privacy, in the lair of the skull. Yet each communicant is well aware that the ceremony he performs is being replicated simultaneously by thousands (or millions) of others of whose existence he is confident, yet of whose identity he has not the slightest notion. Furthermore, this ceremony is incessantly repeated at daily or half-daily intervals throughout the calendar.

(ibid.: 35)

Anderson’s analysis of print media use here can also be applied to contemporary radio consumption practices. The primacy of radio as a cultural medium in Ireland has meant that an established representation of a concept of Irish nationhood has been broadcast and perpetuated, and has an entrenched place in settled white Irish hearts and minds. RTÉ’s radio representation of an increasingly heterogenous Ireland remained limited to an hour of dedicated ‘multicultural’ programming per week, until December 2008, when Spectrum ceased broadcasting.

Robins (2006), posits several key questions about the future of broadcasting policy in transnational Europe, where he argues issues are arising that transcend the national framework:

What are the cultural implications when sizeable migrant communities cease to watch the national channels of their “host” country for cultural diversity strategies and policies? Does the concept of “minority” programming cease to be adequate for addressing audiences that have until now been categorised in
this way? How should multiculturalist policies in broadcasting be re-invented in the age of transnational broadcasting?

(Robins 2006: 155)

The Irish Public Broadcasting Charter (2004) provides for RTÉ’s representation of ethnic diversity, as does the national broadcaster directly in its ‘Statement of Commitments’ (2006) and through *Different Voices*, *Spectrum* and the short-term ‘multicultural season’. Yet on RTÉ Radio migrant representation remains framed and contained within multiculturalist policies of representation. Following Anderson’s epigraph at the start of this chapter and as argued in previous chapters, the Irish nation conceives of itself through its history and historiography, and via its adopted national language of English: Ireland’s ‘language of power’, to use Anderson’s phrase. In producing programmes about new migrant communities in Ireland, the nation via its broadcaster represents itself as officially ‘open’ to and accepting of these new communities; in relegating coverage of migrant issues to dedicated ‘multicultural’ radio programmes, RTÉ effectively limits and contains the representation of migrants. The following chapter explores the possibilities for migrant-produced programming outside of multiculturalism’s project of containment in the context of local community radio, examining the evolution of new broadcast spaces for migrant articulation and debate within the structures of community radio and the facilitating strategies enabling migrants to produce, as well as present, radio programmes.
Notes

1 Rather than availing of RTÉ’s nationally accessible FM frequency however, Radio One World was broadcast for 18 months on the national medium wavelength band, albeit during the primetime slot between 7 - 9pm Monday through Friday.

2 Arguably all media provides the opportunity for this kind of free PR; however, even a moderately vigilant and/or scrupulous editor or producer can easily deflect such free advertising. In the case of the opportunities potentially provided by Different Voices, many organisations featured on the programmes may well be involved in useful and effective work. Yet RTÉ’s role as state broadcaster should ideally prevent any privileging of one organisation, by time allotted or other means, as should a general code of practice which prevents this from happening. Tunstall (1993) comments: ‘It does not escape….producers’ notice that politicians-in-power and public-relations personnel are always thinking up new ways to obtain soft media coverage’ (Tunstall 1993: 48).


4 Connaughton states clearly that the focus of Different Voices is not investigative reporting, which is why the production team were unaware of labour issues with GAMA which have subsequently been raised and now settled within the Irish courts after an eight week strike by Turkish workers for the company (interview with Connaughton, 3 May 2005).

5 All programmes are listed on pages 357 - 364.


7 The programme featuring Simon Northam (2003) is an exception; Nigerian-born Northam now lives in the UK, not in Ireland.

8 Spellings of all names given here are approximate, discerned phonetically from repeated listening to the Moore Street programme under discussion.

9 Obviously, editing for broadcast can change the meaning of remarks made out of context; similarly, my transcription of extracts here is itself edited for brevity and clarity, but it is fair to say my editing on paper has the potential to alter the meaning of what was initially said and edited into the programme. Conscious of this, I have endeavoured to replicate these extracts either in their entirety or attempted to encapsulate their original meaning as accurately as possible.

10 Browne and Onyjelem (2007) comment that Cliona O’Carroll represented the ‘unthreatening voice of a ‘nice Irish woman’, following previous African presenters on Different Voices at its inception in 2002 (Browne and Onyjelem 2007: 193).

11 The reference here to ‘Almighty God’ could be read as a parallel to the Angelus, broadcast by RTÉ every evening at 6pm. For further analysis of the role the Angelus plays in the Irish public sphere, see Cormack, P. (2005).

12 Different Voices listenership figures provided in an email communication to me from Alan Kay, Audience Research, RTÉ, on 24 June 2009.
Specrurn listenership figures provided in a phone conversation with Gareth Ivory, Audience Research, RTÉ, on 10 June 2009, and in an email communication to me from Alan Kay, Audience Research, RTÉ, on 24 June 2009.

Harris is Editor of Features, Arts and Drama at RTÉ Radio One (February 2009.)

In reference to McAnally’s reaction to seemingly negative press coverage, it is worth noting Tunstall’s (1993) point about the general experience of television producers with press coverage generally:

Producers know that newspaper coverage of television is read by the general public, by other print journalists and by politicians. The producer’s colleagues comment on press coverage in corridor conversations; the producer also knows that the barons at the top of the system see a daily digest of press comment from all newspapers and specialist publications. The barons themselves anxiously scan the press because they know that press comment helps to establish the public image of their channel.

(Tunstall 1993: 13)


The Irish Ferries strike took place in November/December 2005 and centred around the company’s decision to replace Irish workers with Eastern European workers, who would be paid less and offered considerably lower conditions of employment.


At this time Spectrum was being produced by Ronan Kelly while McAnally was on leave for two months, returning in November 2005.


Under ‘Aims and Objectives’ the Humanist Association of Ireland (HAI) remit reads as follows, noting that the HAI represent a significant minority in Ireland:

[T]he HAI provides support and representation to people who seek to live full responsible lives without religion, assisting in the provision of secular ceremonies (see also below) of births, weddings and funerals, publishing a quarterly journal The Irish Humanist, maintaining an informative website and making constant endeavours to voice the Humanist and secular viewpoint in both the print and broadcast media. In addition, the HAI makes appropriate submissions to Government, organises seminars and workshops and contributes to cultural life. In short, Humanists are positive, gaining inspiration from our lives, art and culture, and a rich natural world. It is worthy of note that those who do not avow any religion now form the largest ethical minority within the country, greater in fact than the other four minority
Christian denominations combined - Church of Ireland, Presbyterian, Orthodox and Methodist (National Census 2002).

http://www.humanism.ie/website/ (accessed 1 June 2009)

22 In response, Alibhai-Brown proposes the establishment of a Human Rights Commission, to replace the Commission for Racial Equality and the Equal Opportunities Commission (in the UK), arguing that 'there can be no sacrosanct cultures or spheres within them and no pressures to conform automatically to the dominant culture' (Alibhai-Brown 2000: 74).
Chapter Four

Migrant-produced Programming on Dublin Community Radio

Today, however, the question of the “who” can no longer be swept under the table. Under current conditions of transnationality, the inclusiveness condition of legitimacy cries out for explicit interrogation.

(Fraser 2007: 21)

This chapter looks at how community radio facilitates migrant self-representation and participation in programme production and presentation. In Ireland community radio has established itself since 1995 as a location for the sustained production and broadcast of migrant-produced programmes. As discussed in Chapter Two, community radio lends itself structurally and ideologically to the production of programmes made by and for their target communities, however those communities are defined. This chapter examines how two Dublin community radio stations facilitate and sustain migrant-produced radio programmes, and in particular how these programmes enable migrant self-representation and the articulation of community situatedness, and encourage community interaction. Part One focuses on the institutional context of migrant-produced programmes embodied within the structures and station remits of two Dublin community radio stations, Anna Livia FM (now Dublin City FM) and North East Access Radio (NEAR FM). Both stations actively facilitate migrant-produced programming, in the provision of training and resources as well as of regular slots on the station schedule. Part One examines both stations’ institutional practice with a view to analysing how their structures, licence remits and licence renewal requirements contribute to the ongoing facilitation of the production of migrant-produced programmes. I argue that community radio provides
opportunity for migrant self-representation through facilitating migrant-produced programming; thus my analysis is informed by Campion’s (2005) report on ethnic production practices and the ways in which ethnic representation in the public sphere through mainstream media is contained and limited. Campion’s analysis demonstrates what is left out of mainstream multicultural programming in relation to ethnic community and self-representation.

Part Two develops the exploration into community radio’s opportunities for migrant-produced programming into a case study of the migrant-produced African Scene, broadcasting on Anna Livia FM since 2005. This case study incorporates the impact of the production context of Anna Livia FM, which broadcasts African Scene, with analysis of selected programme content which demonstrates and embodies strategies of migrant participation and articulation. As in the previous chapter’s analysis, this approach argues that a rigorous exploration of how African Scene functions necessarily incorporates an understanding of institutional and production contexts alongside selected programme content, so that the content is not read divorced from the structures which produce it. I further argue here that the articulation strategies located in African Scene are integral to a paradigm shift towards a transnationalism evolving in layers rather than in discrete, if overlapping, public spheres. Consequently my analysis incorporates and invokes Naficy’s (2001) concept of an accented mode of cultural production, arguing that within conditions of transnationality identified by Fraser (2007), such a transcultural mode of production provides the most direct means of migrant identity articulation. I draw from Fraser’s (2007) critique of a ‘transnational public sphere’, alongside Squires’ (2002) typology of
the counterpublic to frame my analysis of *African Scene*. Selected *African Scene* programme content is analysed in an attempt to identify, examine and critique avenues of migrant participation and strategies of migrant articulation incorporated on the show. Avenues for participation include community building on air, together with the provision of a forum for discussion of migrant issues and experiences, and for opportunities to gain broadcasting experience and to promote migrant events, businesses and activities. Strategies of articulation include creating and sustaining migrant collective identities, alongside critiquing mainstream media representations of migrants and creating a form which allows for and at best facilitates effective discussion.

**Part One: Community Radio and Migrant-Produced Programmes**

**Two Dublin Community Radio Stations: Anna Livia FM and NEAR FM**

The Irish community radio sector has been expanding, with 19 community and community of interest stations licensed as of October 2008 and a further call for ‘expressions of interest’ in new community broadcasting licenses issued by the BCI in September 2008, the first such call since 2005. As of spring 2006, while migrant communities were still represented in only limited ways in the mainstream Irish public sphere (on radio, television and in print) two community stations in Dublin, Anna Livia FM and North-East Access Radio (NEAR FM), had been broadcasting multicultural programmes since the mid-1990s. In addition to magazine programmes focused on multicultural issues produced and presented primarily by settled Irish, these community radio stations also broadcast migrant-produced and presented programmes targeted at specific migrant communities, often in the first language of these communities. The
inception of these programmes in 1995 corresponds with increased inward migration to Ireland from that time. While NEAR FM and Anna Livia FM incorporated migrant-presented and targeted programmes for several years, community stations in suburbs such as Blanchardstown, Tallaght and Lucan were developing migrant-presented programming as of spring 2005.²

Both Anna Livia FM and NEAR FM are subject to community radio licensing guidelines set out by the Broadcasting Commission of Ireland (BCI), although they have different licenses; NEAR FM has a community license, whereas Anna Livia FM has a Special Interest license, the only such radio license granted in Ireland. Browne differentiates between geographic and community of interest licenses, noting that ‘community of interest’ in this context ‘included institutional (colleges and universities, activity-oriented clubs and associations, trade unions, etc.), religious, and cultural (specific language services, groups with strong cultural affinities)’ (Browne 2005: 89). Anna Livia FM, as part of its Special Interest remit, features diverse cultural content; its schedule represents coverage of different cultural forms, from an array of music genres to coverage of the arts and the Dublin live music scene, to migrant-produced programmes, as discussed in this chapter.

In many ways Anna Livia FM corresponds to the community radio license model, specifically in the allocation of its resources and its training, staffing and production practices. The key difference between the licenses here is that Anna Livia FM, due to its Special Interest license, has a strong signal which broadcasts to all of greater Dublin.
Anna Livia FM, renamed Dublin City Anna Livia FM in 2006 and then Dublin City FM in 2008, therefore remains uniquely situated in its city-wide remit and stronger signal allowing listeners across the city to access its programmes. Additionally, it has a wide remit on the advertising it can accept and broadcast; its catchment area is not primarily defined geographically so it can advertise city-wide goods and services. Anna Livia FM is based in the East Wall area of Dublin city, located about two miles from the city centre, and broadcasts on 103.2 FM. The area is just northeast of the relatively new financial centre on the city’s north quays, developed and built in the late 1990s when the ‘Celtic Tiger’ was in full swing. The station is located just south of Eastpoint business park, an internet technology (IT) enclave built around the same time, reflecting Ireland’s then much celebrated success as a base for international IT investment and labour. However, the East Wall area itself, one of the oldest parts of Dublin, remains a residential, primarily working class neighbourhood mainly inhabited by a white Irish community. This community in particular is that which Anna Livia FM’s remit additionally requires it to represent, although as Ireland’s sole recipient of a Special Interest license, the station’s remit extends further than a standard community license. In previous geographical incarnations in the 1990s, Anna Livia FM was based on Grafton Street, the commercial shopping street in Dublin’s city centre, then in Griffith College in Portobello, another established Dublin neighbourhood just south of the city centre. Anna Livia FM’s premises in 2006 included three studios and an open-plan office with several desks, a phone and a single computer workstation.
Anna Livia FM states the following commitment to representing diversity on its website (see Fig. 3):

Our aim at Dublin City Anna Livia FM is to entertain and inform as broad a range of people as possible. However, there are also more specific groups of listeners who have been largely ignored by other commercial radio stations, to which we can provide a service, which is simply unobtainable elsewhere. These groups would include Community Groups, Ethnic Groups, Schoolchildren, historians, and hobbyists, Niche Music Enthusiasts, Women's Groups, Gays, Dublin Sport Enthusiasts and Older Listeners.

Anna Livia 103.2 FM provides Dublin listeners with a unique radio station that reflects the lives and aspirations of the city's inhabitants, with a broad range of programmes that will inform, challenge and entertain them. Anna Livia 103.2 FM's commitment in providing Open Access Radio in conjunction with training to the general public is unique by providing Dublin Listeners with effective control of their own radio station. 

This statement is the final two of three paragraphs on Anna Livia FM's About Us webpage. The first paragraph reads:

Dublin City Anna Livia FM aims to provide a radio service, which is primarily, talk based with the overall objective to provide a platform for Dubliners to voice their concerns, opinions and interests. Program material is sourced from local communities, special interest groups, local authorities and to a limited extent, national and international public service broadcasters, who reflect the values and ethics of DCAL FM.

Anna Livia FM lists six programme categories on its website: Sport, Special Interest, News and Current Affairs, Music, Arts and Entertainment, and Ethnic. In Spring 2006, Anna Livia FM was regularly broadcasting two promotional messages, or 'promos', to advertise its 'Ethnic' programmes, with each promo bookended by a station identification message (station ID) which reflects how the station posits itself as a facilitator of 'ethnic' programmes:

Every week Dublin City Anna Livia FM 103.2 presents over seven hours of ethnic programmes for and by people from Dublin's Russian, Chinese and other
103.2 Dublin City Anna Livia FM Online

About Dublin City Anna Livia FM

Dublin City Anna Livia FM aims to provide a radio service, which is primarily talk based, with the overall objective to provide a platform for Dubliners to voice their concerns, opinions and interests. Program material is sourced from local communities, special interest groups, local authorities and to a limited extent, national and international public service broadcasters, who reflect the values and ethics of DCAL FM.

Our aim at Dublin City Anna Livia FM is to entertain and inform as broad a range of people as possible. However, there are also more specific groups of listeners who have been largely ignored by other commercial radio stations, to which we can provide a service, which is simply unobtainable elsewhere. These groups would include Community Groups, Ethnic Groups, Schoolchildren, pensioners and hobbiests, Nickie Music Enthusiasts, Women's Groups, Gays, Dublin Sport Enthusiasts and Older Listeners.

Anna Livia 103.2 FM provides Dublin listeners with a unique radio station that reflects the lives and aspirations of the city's inhabitants, with a broad range of programmes that will inform, challenge and entertain them. Anna Livia 103.2 FM's commitment in providing Open Access Radio in conjunction with training to the general public is unique by providing Dublin Listeners with effective control of their own radio station.
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Fig. 3
communities, brought to you in association with Western Union: fast, reliable worldwide money transfer. Available through our internet streaming, these programmes can be enjoyed all around the world. New Dubliners, new voices.

Original ethnic programmes for and by the people from Dublin’s Russian, Chinese and other international communities, covering all aspects of their new lives and reflecting their exciting cultural diversities. Dublin City Anna Livia FM: New Dubliners, new voices.

These promos are read out by an Irish man with a Dublin accent, situating the information about migrant-produced programmes within a localised Dublin context, which can be read as reinforcing Anna Livia FM’s wider ‘community of interest’ remit. Programmes listed under the Ethnic category (see Fig. 4, and Fig 5 for a look at the station’s schedule) in autumn 2006 included: a self-described ‘Russian language show’, previously called The Russian Show, Chinatown Radio (in Mandarin), African Scene (in English), the Korean Show (in Korean) and four Polish interest programmes: Polish Voices, Polish Evening, Polophonia and Polish 120h. All of these programmes were broadcast in the evening in half-hour or hour-long slots between 7 - 9pm, with the exception of the Korean programme, broadcast on weekend mornings, as was The Russian Show (which appeared to be a separate programme from the Russian-language programme on the weekday schedule). Slots are continually maintained for ‘ethnic’ programmes. Anna Livia FM has been broadcasting The Russian Show for over five years and Chinatown Radio for almost as long, with each show retaining the original presenters, Sergei Kouznetsov and Oliver Wang respectively. In April 2006, the station also started broadcasting Europe 25, an English-language series of programmes focusing on a single EU programme each week. Interestingly, Europe 25 was listed under ‘Special Interest’ programmes on Anna Livia’s website rather than as an ‘ethnic’ programme.
## Dublin City Anna Livia FM Online

### Schedule

**TO SEE SEPARATE DAY SCHEDULE PLEASE CLICK ON THE DAY YOU WISH TO VIEW**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
<th>Sunday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:00</td>
<td>Live Driv</td>
<td>Live Drive</td>
<td>Live Drive</td>
<td>Live Drive</td>
<td>Live Drive</td>
<td>Live Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00</td>
<td>Live Drive</td>
<td>Live Drive</td>
<td>Live Drive</td>
<td>Live Drive</td>
<td>Live Drive</td>
<td>Live Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Good Morning Dublin</td>
<td>Good Morning Dublin</td>
<td>Good Morning Dublin</td>
<td>Good Morning Dublin</td>
<td>Good Morning Dublin</td>
<td>All Time Greats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00</td>
<td>Leading Bed (0)</td>
<td>Boulevard</td>
<td>Europe Today</td>
<td>Out &amp; About</td>
<td>Nature's Path</td>
<td>All Time Greats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30</td>
<td>Entertainment Show</td>
<td>Classic Choice</td>
<td>The Joe Show</td>
<td>All In A Song</td>
<td>Classic Country Gold</td>
<td>All Time Greats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00</td>
<td>Entertainment Show</td>
<td>Classic Choice</td>
<td>The Joe Show</td>
<td>All In A Song</td>
<td>Classic Country Gold</td>
<td>All Time Greats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30</td>
<td>On Computer</td>
<td>Senior Times</td>
<td>Leisure Activities</td>
<td>Network</td>
<td>Tear Gas</td>
<td>Tea Gasle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00</td>
<td>Good For You</td>
<td>The Parlor Review</td>
<td>Relationship Doctor</td>
<td>Life Coaching</td>
<td>The Parlor Review</td>
<td>Sounds of The Cinema</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30</td>
<td>Tear Gasle (0)</td>
<td>Bus On</td>
<td>Relationship Doctor</td>
<td>Life Coaching</td>
<td>Development Show</td>
<td>Sounds of The Cinema</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00</td>
<td>The Magazine Show</td>
<td>Light Lunch</td>
<td>Wood Songs</td>
<td>That's Entertainment</td>
<td>Magical Melodies</td>
<td>Entertainment Show</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30</td>
<td>The Magazine Show</td>
<td>Wood Songs</td>
<td>That's Entertainment</td>
<td>Magical Melodies</td>
<td>Entertainment Show</td>
<td>Nostalgia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00</td>
<td>Paths of Sound</td>
<td>Polish Voices</td>
<td>Game Show (0)</td>
<td>Horror (0)</td>
<td>Classic Rock</td>
<td>On The Ball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:30</td>
<td>Paths of Sound</td>
<td>Polish Voices</td>
<td>Game Show (0)</td>
<td>Horror (0)</td>
<td>Classic Rock</td>
<td>On The Ball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00</td>
<td>Live Drive</td>
<td>Live Drive</td>
<td>Live Drive</td>
<td>Live Drive</td>
<td>Live Drive</td>
<td>Live Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:30</td>
<td>Live Drive</td>
<td>Live Drive</td>
<td>Live Drive</td>
<td>Live Drive</td>
<td>Live Drive</td>
<td>Live Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00</td>
<td>Live Drive</td>
<td>Live Drive</td>
<td>Live Drive</td>
<td>Live Drive</td>
<td>Live Drive</td>
<td>Live Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:30</td>
<td>Live Drive</td>
<td>Live Drive</td>
<td>Live Drive</td>
<td>Live Drive</td>
<td>Live Drive</td>
<td>Live Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00</td>
<td>Live Drive</td>
<td>Live Drive</td>
<td>Live Drive</td>
<td>Live Drive</td>
<td>Live Drive</td>
<td>Live Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:30</td>
<td>Live Drive</td>
<td>Live Drive</td>
<td>Live Drive</td>
<td>Live Drive</td>
<td>Live Drive</td>
<td>Live Drive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Fig. 5**
Anna Livia FM’s website briefly included an online discussion forum with a section dedicated to ‘ethnic’ programmes; however as of April 2006 that forum had experienced no activity. Also in April 2006, both Anna Livia FM and NEAR FM introduced the same bought-in hour-long programme, *Euroquest*, which focuses on different stories relating to various EU countries each week. Anna Livia FM also broadcasts two hour-long Irish language programmes per week: *Bothar an tsleibhte* and *An Clar Cultura*.

NEAR FM, or North-East Access Radio, operates from a community centre in Coolock, a primarily working class neighbourhood in Dublin’s residential north side, which also houses several other local community initiatives. Amongst these is the Media Co-op, an umbrella organisation which runs media training workshops as well as incorporating NEAR FM and an affiliated television station. NEAR FM broadcasted on 101.6 FM, a frequency with limited reach with a primary listenership area of northeast Dublin city.¹⁰ Unlike Anna Livia FM, NEAR FM has only moved premises once, into its current newly-built home which, as befits a training facility, is well equipped with several studios and updated recording technology. NEAR FM does not list its programmes in separate categories on its website, but a look at the schedule (see Fig. 6) demonstrates a similar breadth of programmes to those on Anna Livia FM. Like Anna Livia FM, NEAR FM has broadcast long running migrant-produced programmes and continually dedicates regular slots for migrant programmes on the schedule.

NEAR FM was founded in reference to the principles of community development, emerging from a collective community radio movement in Ireland, the National
Association of Community Broadcasting (NACB), which had its beginnings in the late 1970s and grew in the 1980s from a shared recognition of the value of community radio as a resource for community development. (See Fig. 7 for current station profile.) Thus from the start NEAR FM actively sought to facilitate not only community involvement and participation, but to create an alternative form of programming which reflected and reinforced its informing principles of community empowerment and participation, with both the station but also with larger, global issues which were broadly addressed by the station’s core ideology (Byrne 2007). Additionally members of the community radio movement organised the fourth AMARC conference, which took place in Dublin in 1990.

NACB identified two types of community radio, defined by Byrne (2007) as ‘those associated with a geographical location and those to serve a community of interest (Byrne 2007: 18). Byrne notes that urban community radio often found it difficult to establish itself within a locality, whereas rural community radio had an easier time carving out an identity for listeners and the locality. Those urban community stations that asserted themselves most successfully and maintained a presence and listenership in the community were those which ‘saw themselves more as community building projects and less as radio stations’ (ibid.: 19). These stations interacted and engaged with their surrounding communities around development issues. Hence NEAR FM was established with an informing principle of community building within its remit. Byrne describes the process of setting up NEAR FM:

This is the story of a journey that was marked by incomprehension, both by the community activists and the legislators. But it is also a tale of stubborn determination to clarify what democratic technics [sic] might look like in practice, what genuine access to media could provide and how such a model might deliver
Near 90fm is an BCI licensed, communally owned, not-for-profit project. It is operated by a democratic co-operative, open to all organisations and individuals in Dublin North East.

Franchise Area:
Dublin North-East
Chairperson: Vincent Teeling.
Station Manager: Sally Galiana.

Audience Details:
The geographical community living in the area covered by the service.

Programme Policy:
Programming incorporates a positive emphasis on areas such as facilitating and supporting community development, providing access and providing a platform to a wide range of local groups.

Broadcasting Hours:
24 Hours a Day

Fig. 7
an entirely different form of communication. We came to realise that we were not, after all, filling a niche between public service and commercial media. We were creating an entirely new space for citizens to appropriate their media and in the name of a more participatory democracy.

(Byrne 2007: 18)

Byrne speaks from within a persistent argument within discussion around community radio and how it is variously defined. Broadly speaking, community radio is described as either emerging from and founded on community development initiatives, with an emphasis on promoting equality, empowerment and social inclusion, encouraging collective actions and local participation, and focusing on process as well as programme as product (Byrne 2007).

In autumn 2006, NEAR FM programmes produced by migrant communities, as they appeared on the schedule on the station’s website were: *Quartiers Francophones* (in French), *Acérate al Sur* (in Spanish) and *Polska Tygodniowka* (in Polish). Another programme, *Médias du Monde*, serves as an overview to international media from a French perspective. Additionally, the station has a live feed each weekday morning to Radio France Internationale. NEAR FM also broadcast two magazine programmes in English addressing multicultural issues: *Global Solidarity* and *Majority World*. Both are broadcast live then repeated the following day. NEAR FM’s community license from the BCI requires the station to include some Irish-language programming; NEAR FM complies with *Ar Muin na Muice*, a half-hour long programme broadcast twice daily during the week. The station’s ‘Programme Policy’ statement incorporates their stated commitment to the representation of diversity. The following is included under ‘Programming Policy’:
Programming incorporates a positive emphasis on areas such as facilitating and range of local groups.12

Sally Galiana, Station Manager and Programme Director at NEAR FM, is well situated to articulate a migrant perspective; she came to Ireland in 1995 from Madrid, Spain, and subsequently worked as an advocate for migrants’ rights in Ireland. Galiana describes NEAR FM’s approach from its inception:

From the very beginning of the radio station in 1995 there was always an interest in the new communities coming into Ireland, the ethnic groups, migrants. One of the main things that happened at the time, one of the things I remember, was in 1995 the numbers of people coming in [to Ireland] really increased and there was a lack of information for those groups. And from the point of the view of the local communities, to get to know what was going on, what these groups were about.

(Interview with Galiana, 27 March 2006)

Both stations are required by the BCI to update their schedules four times a year, although the overall programme content and scheduling doesn’t appear to have changed radically between 2005 and 2006 for either station, according to statements in interviews with both Galiana and Mick Hanley, Station Manager and Programme Director at Anna Livia FM.13 Another look at both NEAR FM’s and Anna Livia FM’s schedules in spring 2008 reveals that several migrant-produced programmes remain on air, including African Scene, The Russian Show and the Russian Language Show, the Korean Show, Polish Evening and Polish 120h on Anna Livia FM; and Quartiers Francophones and Polska Tygodniowka, as well as the addition of Islam in Focus on Monday evenings.14 Both stations are required to maintain a 60/40 ratio in overall programme content across the schedule, consisting of 60% talk to 40% music (Interview with Hanley, 1 April 2006).
Both stations incorporated live streaming on their respective websites by 2006, which according to the above programme promo on Anna Livia FM means that ‘these programmes can be enjoyed all around the world’.

In relation to the schedule, regularly updated in line with BCI community license requirements, as of June 2006 multiethnic programming was not specifically stipulated in the BCI regulations for community radio licenses, although, as noted in Chapter Two, it is stipulated in the appendix under the AMARC Charter for Europe. With regard to representation of diversity, the BCI include the requirement to represent all members of the community in the station’s catchment area as part of the community station licensing process. The programme directors at both stations insist that multicultural and/or multilingual programmes by and for migrant communities are necessarily within their remit of providing radio programming for all members of the community represented by the station. Hanley describes Anna Livia FM’s practice in regard to multicultural programmes:

The whole idea really is to try and integrate the ethnic communities with the Dublin community, as we see it, more so than the Irish community, because we’re more a community radio station. In terms of the multicultural programmes, we try and get them in blocks, we try to get them all in and around a similar time. And we try and get them in all really.

(Interview with Hanley, 1 April 2006)

Galiana describes how intrinsic multicultural programmes are to NEAR FM’s remit:

You have to look at the people in NEAR FM, the Board, who have been directing NEAR FM since the beginning, to realise that these are people who have really an interest in equality, in looking at different communities living one by the other but not having any kind of exchange. We want to create a bigger kind of community where one will benefit from the other. That’s very much what interculturalism is.
Byrne (2007) suggests NEAR FM embodies the alternative possibilities and potential of community radio. As has been seen, community media is defined as focusing on, and thus is limited to, the representation of the interests of a locality (unless the station is a Special Interest station, in which case it serves a community of interest not geographically bounded), and therefore overlaps very little with national media at the level of scale. Where national media is faced with the challenge of equitable representation of diverse regions within the nation, community media need only balance diverse groups within the community represented. While rooted, geographically and historically, in a tangible locality, Byrne argues community radio can effectively link the local to the global, via shared experiences, approaches and the development of networks. Such links not only build and strengthen access to and awareness of global issues and concerns, but furthers a project of democratising media. As Byrne observes: ‘While democratic media is essentially local in outlook, it needs to be global in aspiration, using information technology to link the villages of the world’ (Byrne 2007: 26).

For a multicultural programme to be broadcast on either station, it must first go through the assessment process of any new programme, which is as follows. The programme must first be proposed by someone who has already been trained by the station. That person or group then submits a proposal for a programme to the committee who assess it at the next meeting. The decision is then taken whether or not to put the programme on air. If it is approved, it may be entered into the schedule in the next quarter, as community radio station scheduled are updated four times a year. Slots are maintained for migrant-
produced programmes on both stations. With *The Russian Show* on Anna Livia FM, the programme came about more organically, following the suggestions of a Russian volunteer trained initially on the sound desk.\textsuperscript{18}

Almost all of the multiethnic programmes on NEAR FM and on Anna Livia FM are not broadcast in English but in the languages of the communities addressed. However, Anna Livia FM formally introduced a policy in spring 2006 whereby about 10 minutes per ‘ethnic’ programme is to be broadcast in the English language, as Hanley explained:

> What we’re looking at on the other programmes [in addition to *Europe 25*, already broadcast in English], is that they include English in their programmes; the Chinese, the Russian .... and the Polish programme, we’ve asked them to include English. The thing is, they let the English-speaking Dublin community know what’s going on in their area, as regards entertainment, things that are happening, events that are coming up, include the odd piece that would mean something to us here. That way we know, we learn, about their culture.

(Interview with Hanley, 1 April 2006)

The inclusion of an English-language section to each multiethnic programme would serve to open up programme content and information to English-language audiences, including, crucially, settled white Irish communities. Migrant-produced programming would consequently serve to provide insight into migrant daily life to the established Irish population—the same function *Different Voices* and particularly *Spectrum* sought to fulfil—combined here with articulation of migrant concerns and experience from migrants themselves.

It is necessary to balance migrant-produced programmes against each other in the interest of equitable representation and participation of each community. This is an issue for
Anna Livia FM more than it is for NEAR FM, as Anna Livia FM as of June 2006 featured more programmes targeting specific migrant and linguistic communities. In any case, the space carved out in both community radio stations, each historically committed to migrant-produced programming, provides an alternative to the smaller and much more mediated space allocated by RTÉ.

The migrant-produced programmes described above generally retain many recognised characteristics of community radio programming. Due to relative lack of resources (especially as compared to a commercial station), in many cases a programme’s producer is also the presenter, who is also the researcher. In Ireland, almost everyone working in community radio is a volunteer; hence turnover can be high as volunteers find producing and presenting a programme too difficult to fit in alongside a full time job for very long. While many volunteers value the experience acquired and enjoy the process of programme making, many will find doing so long term unsustainable if they are in full-time employment or have other responsibilities claiming their time. All of these factors have an impact on the programme structure and content, as van Vuuren (2006) argues in her work on community radio management structures:

[R]ecognition of their commons orientation suggests that community radio stations are best understood and evaluated from the perspective of their community development functions. These include the quality and management of volunteers, the sector’s training capacity and the nature of the various networks of which community broadcasting is a part.

(van Vuuren 2006: 390)

Production practice on community radio is characterised by limited resources, particularly when compared to commercial radio. Yet the programmes which emerge in
this context can transcend the apparent restrictions imposed by fewer resources. Limited access to studios for further recording or editing, due to heavy studio use, means fewer programmes are pre-recorded. A programme going out live communicates an immediacy that is more exciting to listen to and potentially provides a space for spontaneous on-air debate. A less formal programme structure, typified by a less rigid running order, further allows for spontaneity; for example, someone being interviewed on air is less likely to be cut off due to time constraints or the need to broadcast an ad at a scheduled time. An informal presenting style can certainly come across as less polished than the standard found on commercial radio and the presenter can be perceived as lacking authority. Yet the same factors can mean that an unpolished presenter can offer a particularly authentic style and delivery which is effective on its own terms.

In relation to the recurring question: ‘is the emphasis on community or on radio?’, introduced in the discussion of contested definitions of community radio in Chapter Two, the practices at NEAR FM and Anna Livia FM comprise elements of both. The provision of broadcast training both empowers community members who take it up, and ensures a standardised knowledge and basic experience of broadcast practice by all presenters-producers on both stations, who in theory must complete the training course offered before they can work on any station programme. As identified in Chapter Two, community radio was predicated on a ‘bottom-up’ approach both to broadcasting and to facilitating and encouraging community development. Both Anna Livia FM and NEAR FM provide training in production, which each station insists is mandatory for everyone who produces and/or presents on the station. The training crucially provides trainees with
the skills they need to put together a radio programme, which they can put to use in making programmes for the station and at the same time acquire experience and refine and improve their production skills, which in turn makes them more employable as media practitioners beyond the confines of the station.

**Characteristics and Contexts of Migrant Representation in Broadcasting**

Campion (2005) conducted a comprehensive study of migrant and ethnic media practitioners working in British media to discover and dissect the limitations of ‘multicultural’ programming in Britain. The report, *Look Who’s Talking: Cultural Diversity, Public Service Broadcasting and the National Conversation* (2005), draws from interviews with 102 British media practitioners on the topic of multicultural programmes or the lack of same in Britain. Campion’s project, as revealed within these interview transcripts, identifies what is problematic about existing multicultural programmes on television and radio in Britain and investigates the degree to which programmes might be improved when produced by members of migrant or ethnic communities. Of course, in relation to representing both new and established migrant communities, Britain is differently situated to Ireland, due in part to its established history of inward immigration from previously colonised and postcolonial countries, and the diverse settled communities which subsequently emerged there. Campion’s interviews and subsequent conclusions are drawn from across British television as well as radio, and incorporate drama and comedy as well as talk-based programmes. I have isolated those observations which particularly apply to radio talk programmes, as well as those which apply more broadly to the making of multicultural programmes more generally.
Campion describes the climate in which her research was conducted:

Every year broadcasters announce new initiatives to promote what is currently known as cultural diversity, good intentions are voiced everywhere, occasional programmes seem to signify progress but turn out to be only a flash in the pan. People from all sorts of marginalised groups remain hungry for meaningful representations of themselves and their lives from television and radio.

(Campion 2005: 5)

This statement clearly illustrates the gap between ‘good intentions’ and the broadcast reality of insufficient or insignificant representation of migrant experience. With regard to the language used in discussions about multicultural programmes, one presenter interviewed for Campion’s report defines the concept of ‘cultural diversity’ thusly:

Actually, it’s a meaningless term. All of culture anywhere in the world by definition is diverse. [The concept] has a five-year lifespan and will be replaced by something else. Its premise is difference so they will have to come up with a term about difference.

(Presenter, cited in Campion 2005: 23)

The pragmatic approach and informed scepticism of Campion’s report are by-products of her ‘bottom-up approach’ (ibid.: 5) wherein she interviews practitioners in both television and radio production, across all levels of production; from this observational standpoint Campion notes that progress on diversity (in broadcasting) ‘starts at the top...then stops’ (ibid.: 13). It becomes clear, as can be seen in the statements above, that there is a significant gap between stated policy or institutional promises (in this case, those made by the BBC or Channel 4) and programming practice.
Campion describes a tendency observed by many respondents to report mainly negative stories about minorities in the British media, as embodied in the phrase ‘we’re bad news’:

Many interviewees commented on the way that minorities only entered the consciousness of the broadcasters and, hence the nation, at times of tragedy or conflict....Their fleeting visibility alerted the nation to their existence under the heading “problem” but did little to help them be seen as equal participants.

(ibid.: 27)

In reference to this tendency and in relation to the possibilities inherent in ethnic self-representation, Campion suggests the following:

When people from under-represented groups are allowed to shape their own agenda (or are facilitated to do so by producers and interviewers with insight and sensitivity) it was agreed that radio programmes are a fantastically powerful means to getting to know each other. But at present opportunities to hear under-represented British voices are usually outside of the routine programmes on national networks: in one-off features, phone-ins or a handful of dramas or readings where original voices bubble up and take you into their world. Those moments remain rare in mainstream radio.

(ibid.: 36)

As can be seen from this statement, migrant practitioner agency is at least doubly important; migrant media practitioners need to be able to represent themselves and their community, themselves to themselves.

Community or local radio is identified in Campion’s study as providing a potential alternative to the ‘multicultural’ programmes produced in the mainstream public sphere. However, a recurring criticism of local or localised radio programmes is a perceived lack of professional standards in their production and presentation. Campion identifies six
areas where British local radio programmes, designed specifically to target migrant or settled ethnic communities, lack a perceived professionalism:

They are usually peripheral to the mainstream output and this often appears to be reflected in their pay.

Their programmes often do not appear to be subjected to the same editorial rigour as the rest of the station's output.

The programmes are creatively unambitious.

They often lack basic broadcast skills such as interviewing technique.

They often do not come from the local area so do not always seem to understand the audience they are serving.

Few appear to have opportunities to develop and move into other areas of broadcasting.

(ibid.: 37)

These criteria, listed in reference to community or local radio, are useful in their identification of specified areas within a production context where professional standards of practice are perceived to be low. Community radio and local radio can be overlapping categories, as when a local station is broadcasting with a community licence. A 'local' station can be conceived of in empirical terms, described as a station with a transmitter which only covers the immediate geographical vicinity, as well as in terms of station remit. Local stations, by definition, must incorporate coverage of the locality and community, whereas 'community radio' can incorporate both community stations with a remit including local coverage, and 'community of interest' stations.

Campion's (2005) report differentiates between nationally produced 'multicultural' programmes and locally produced programmes directed towards migrant or ethnic
communities. Research by Cottle (2000) covered overlapping areas, contrasting the responses of ethnic minority broadcast practitioners working in the BBC with the perspectives of ethnic minority broadcast practitioners working in independent or community-based organisations. Cottle found that, in contrast to the felt restrictions voiced by his respondents at the BBC: ‘A stated aim across many community-based organisations....is to enhance the confidence of minority ethnic individuals and communities in order to increase access to, and active participation in, media production’ (Cottle 2000: 111).

Once space has been created and named for migrant-produced programming, what name do we give to the programmes themselves? In Canada, writes Langer, the official term is ‘ethnic broadcasting’ (Langer 2005: 122) and Browne (2005) uses the term ‘ethnic minority media’. Langer identifies other terms: third language radio, heritage radio, minority media, international programming (Langer 2005). Langer uses third language programming most often in his analysis. I would argue that the term applies specifically to those programmes broadcast partly or entirely in a language other than that of the mainstream public sphere of the hosting country; a programme category which will be examined in Chapter Five. The varied spectrum of critical terms in use indicates there is not as yet a clear consensus or agreement on the defining characteristics of migrant media. This in turn suggests that, aside from Browne’s (2005) comparative international study, many other case studies have been locally specific.
Langer (2005) draws a similar conclusion to Campion’s in his study of diverse multicultural radio programmes in Toronto and Vancouver, Canada: ‘By the standards of publicly funded national radio or commercial radio, community broadcasting is chronically poor, relying on listener subscriptions and a mostly voluntary work force’ (ibid.: 121). Further, in what is admittedly a very widely drawn comparative study, Browne notes:

Although ethnic minority audiences seem willing to tolerate less than “fully professional mainstream” standards as an ethnic service is in its growing period, there is some evidence of expectation that those standards will improve over time. However, there also is a desire that productions recognize and exhibit specific ethnic minority cultural characteristics, and that mainstream language productions with subtitled or dubbed translations substitute figures of speech, proverbs and other “markers” of ethnic minority language practices. Productions that are regarded as close copies of mainstream “models” are not particularly welcome.

(Browne 2005: 172)

Locating Migrant-Produced Radio in Theories of the Counterpublic

As observed in Chapter Two, community radio has a capacity for ‘alternativism’ which can emerge from the localised space it occupies within the public sphere and through the vernacular of much community radio programming, which departs from a standardised, professionalized commercial style and comprises instead special interest and community focused programming. Within community radio stations not dedicated to serving a single ethnic or migrant community, ethnic and migrant produced programmes form a further strata of alternative programming. I attempt here to situate migrant-produced programmes within community radio in the theoretical context of Fraser’s (1993) critique of a
transnational public sphere, with reference to Squires’(2002) typology of the counterpublic.

Fraser (1993) first coined the term ‘subaltern counterpublic’ in arguing for the necessity of a separate, ‘other’ public space in which a critique of the mainstream public sphere could be situated by those marginalised by it (Fraser 1993: 14). The broader term ‘counterpublic’ was first introduced by Felski with reference to feminist publics (Squires 2002: 450). As a critical term, ‘counterpublic’ has been used fluidly in discussions of alternative publics; its central and original meaning is a description of a public that is counter to the mainstream. Yet ‘counterpublic’ also inherently assumes an oppositional, potentially binary position by the prefix counter-. While Fraser usefully describes the often necessary oppositional stance taken by communities marginalised by the mainstream, Squires (2002), equally necessarily, complicates Fraser’s (1993) reading, broadening an examination of the potential of counterpublics as read through their differing functions of articulation and critique. A risk remains that ‘counterpublic’, in its wide and varied usage, begins to lose specific critical currency, much like the term ‘transnational public sphere’ is beginning to, as argued by Fraser (2007) in her reworking of her 1993 argument. Hence a tangible exploration of the discrete functions and areas of articulation of the counterpublic, as understood and utilised by Squires, is necessary to further clarify the meanings and potential applications of the concept.

In her reworking of her earlier public sphere critique, Fraser (2007) introduces complex proposals for transnationalising the public sphere, identifying a problematic dichotomy
between the requirement for marginalised groups without equal access to ‘communicative arenas’ to participate fully in political life; and the fact that those spheres are conceived as fundamentally representative of the mechanisms inherent to a sovereign or territorial state, so intertwined with the functions of that state as thus defined. As has been seen, Irish radio programming about (but not necessarily for) migrants is polarised in the ways Fraser describes and in accordance to the stubborn centrality of the nation in cultural expression identified by Robins (2006). This polarisation is embodied by RTÉ’s project of containment of difference and its circulation in the mainstream public sphere, in contrast to migrant-produced media created and circulating in the counterpublic of the localised community sphere.

Squires provides a useful typology for effective counterpublics in her recognition of the need for more than a single black public sphere, such as that advocated by some theorists in relation to the black public sphere in the US, where the concept was developed in clear opposition to a mainstream which marginalised the black community to the point of invisibility (Baker 1995; Dawson 1995, cited in Squires 2002). This plurality of spheres naturally extends to other groups not provided with significant access to the dominant public sphere, enabling discussion extending to a migrant public sphere. Squires recognises this ongoing plurality by acknowledging the centrality of interaction as much as identity in defining and conceptualising counterpublics:

Differentiating the “dominant” public sphere from “counterpublics” solely on the basis of group identity tends to obscure other important issues, such as how constituents of these publics interact and intersect, or how politically successful certain publics are in relation to others.
Squires further identifies the need to differentiate between public spheres using other criteria:

Salient aspects of public spheres [under scrutiny] might include the following: the history of their relationships to the state and dominant publics; how diverse is a particular public sphere; what sorts of institutional resources are available to the collective; what these institutions’ relationships are to the political, economic, and media institutions of the dominant society; and how their modes of communicative and cultural expression are different from those of other publics and the entities within political and economic society.

The above analysis extends Squires’ emphasis on interactivity by breaking it down into different relationships, external (between publics and state apparatuses and other institutions) and internal (diversity within each sphere); relationships both intrapublic and interpublic. A focus on institutional infrastructure and available resources allows for a holistic analysis which emphasises the ‘outside’ of the public sphere, as it were, making sense of what forms it and supports it before turning inwards to examine content. Van Vuuren’s (2006) close reading of hierarchies of management in Australian community radio further develops this infrastructure-focused approach. The contributions of both station managers above provide some pivotal insight into programming policy at each station as it relates to the creation and continued broadcast of migrant-produced programmes.
Squires’ typology can be balanced with Langer’s (2005) organisational categories, themselves drawn from Bourdieu’s concept of the field of journalism as described by Cottle (2003) and forming a media ecology of multicultural radio:

The micro-level – organisational settings where broadcasters encounter and/or shape modes of production and relations with new technologies, colleagues and outside sources including audiences;

The meso-level – structures of organisational culture, corporate strategy, editorial policy, and genre forms;

The macro-level – spheres of regulation, technological change and competition shaping the operation and output of media organisations locally and globally.

(Langer 2005: 124 – 5)

These categories usefully isolate the levels and mechanisms of power and influence informing the production context of multicultural radio which can apply both to programmes produced within and for the mainstream and those produced by members of migrant communities outside of the mainstream public sphere, within the counterpublics Squires depicts.

Squires’ exploration of the functionality of the public sphere is predicated on a typology of counterpublics, formulated to address the avenues of enquiry laid out above. She charts each category through its response to primarily external phenomena; dominant social pressures, legal restrictions and similar forces from the state. The three responses she delineates are enclave, counterpublic and satellite. As each sphere is defined and typified as a response, fluidity and overlap between types are inherent to this characterisation (Squires 2002). The ‘enclave’ in this typology is a safe space, characterised by
membership consisting of a single group or community with few material, political or legal resources, with a remit to 'preserve culture, foster resistance and create strategies for [the] future' (Squires 2002: 458). 'Counterpublic' as defined here is a separate phenomenon to the larger, overarching understanding of counterpublic as it circulates in public sphere analysis described above. In Squires' typology, the 'counterpublic' is signified by increased communication between the marginal and dominant public spheres; reclamation of dominant and state-controlled public spaces' strategic use of enclave spaces; access to greater resources than the enclave; a remit to 'foster resistance; test arguments and strategies in wider publics; create alliances; persuade outsiders to change views; perform public resistance to oppressive laws and social codes; gain allies' (ibid.: 460). Finally, the 'satellite' is characterised by voluntary, deliberate separatism; consolidation of resources for group use, with a remit to maintain group identity and strengthen its institutions (Squires: 2002).

Viewed through the prism of Squires' typology, African Scene embodies characteristics of the counterpublic in that it is produced solely by members of the African community; it is used primarily by members of that community; it incorporates possibilities for resistance through enabling and encouraging a forum for critique and discussion of racist representations in the public sphere. A dualism characteristic of community radio also applies here, illustrating forces potentially pulling in different directions, as outlined in van Vurren's model:

Community broadcasting’s function clearly operates at the two levels identified by Fraser - as an implicitly public activity contributing to the market place of ideas, but also as a private sphere of democratic will formation with a restricted membership. Thus, while community broadcasting offers a channel for minority
groups to agitate and influence the larger public sphere, these groups are impelled to keep the lid on internal dissent and present a more or less unified voice to the broader society.

(van Vuuren 2006: 388)

The agitation impacting on the larger public sphere which is characteristic of Squires’ counterpublic is located in African Scene’s regular critiques of the mainstream public sphere’s treatment of migrant issues, as well as in the show’s responses to other issues affecting the migrant community.

Part Two: African Scene

Structure, Sponsors and Speakers

African Scene’s two producer-presenters occupy a transnational space within which they speak from at least two cultural perspectives: as Africans and as residents of Ireland. They additionally speak from the transitional position of being migrants. Each of these perspectives informs the production of African Scene, programme content and their presentation style. Inherent to their presentation is what Naficy (2001) has identified as ‘accented’ production, characterised by production practices which emerge from these braided cultural perspectives as well as by the experiences of migration.

African Scene began broadcasting Thursday evenings on Anna Livia FM in March 2005 and was extended from a half-hour to an hour after six weeks as a result of listener requests for a longer programme. (Interview with Lizelle Joseph and Olatunji (T.J.) Idowu, 23 May 2006). It occupies a popular slot on the radio schedule: from 8 - 9pm. It
has been presented and produced for most of that time by Olatunji Idowu and Lizelle Joseph. Idowu, who calls himself T.J. and is referred to as T.J. on air by Lizelle, describes the show’s inception:

I started with a chap called Victor. Victor did radio at Ballyfermot College. We actually started it together, we came to Anna Livia together and we met with John [McEvoy, Production Manager], we met one of the “big men” [the station manager before Hanley]. So we started it with the aim of informing the African community and kind of integrating into the Irish society. So we were thinking of what to do. We package entertainment, information, education, interviews, highlight issues and debate.

(Interview with Idowu, 23 May 2006)

Lizelle began working on the programme as co-producer and presenter when Victor had to leave the show due to increased work demands:

We were in the same class anyway, so I knew T.J. from the college. And I knew they were doing the programme. At first I suggested I help them out with research but then the college all got too much and then he and Victor did it and then later on I joined them.

(Interview with Joseph, 23 May 2006)

The *African Scene* webpage on the Anna Livia FM website includes the following description of the programme and its aims (see Fig. 8):

* African Scene creates a platform for Africans in Dublin to debate on issues that affect them. It serves as sources for education, information and encouragement to Africans in the city. The show is also a medium for entertainment featuring some of the best African music. African scene bridges the gap between the African community and the people of Dublin.

Both producer-presenters moved to Ireland from different African countries several years previously. Lizelle Joseph is 27, from Cape Town, South Africa, and has been living in Ireland for four years. She studied performance, dancing and drama in Cape Town and is
African Scene creates a platform for Africans in Dublin to debate on issues that affect them. It serves as sources for education, information and encouragement to Africans in the city. The show is also a medium for entertainment featuring some of the best African music. African Scene bridges the gap between the African community and the people of Dublin.

The programme won the Media Multicultural Awards (MAMA awards) last year - for aiding integration and promoting multiculturalism in Ireland. The award was organised by Metro Eireann and supported by RTÉ and Irish Times.
now studying journalism at Ballyfermot College in Dublin. Olatunji Idowu (T.J.) is from Nigeria and lived primarily in Lagos, where he studied mass communication, journalism, marketing and PR. He describes himself as in his 30s and has been in Ireland since 2000. In addition to English, he speaks Yoruba and what he calls ‘street’ or ‘pidgin’ English as it is spoken in Nigeria. Lizelle speaks English and Afrikaans.

My interviews with T.J. and Lizelle took place at the Anna Livia FM studios, where I was additionally able to observe the resources allocated to station producer-presenter. The station building incorporated two studios, a small ‘driver booth’ for the sound engineer with a phone line, a large room which could be used for meetings and a reception area. The meeting room also contained an internet station, in the form of a PC on a desk, and a landline on a table nearby. The existence of two studios meant that a programme could be pre-recorded and/or edited at the same time as another programme was going out live. In addition to the allocation of a studio for scheduled live programmes, the second studio space could be booked in advance using a rota system. This second studio was usually booked well in advance. T.J. and Lizelle always arrived at least an hour, if not two, before broadcast to consolidate programme content they had developed during the week. Additionally, they sometimes carried out preliminary programme research at Ballyfermot College, where both were studying journalism.21

This study’s analysis of African Scene incorporates programmes running over 11 weeks in spring 2006, from 16 March to 1 June 2006. Selected programmes discussed here are explored further because they particularly articulate African migrant experiences and
migrant interrogation of Irish life and infrastructure. Topics from the spring programmes range from time-specific stories including an Easter programme featuring a historical outline of the Easter Rising in conjunction with Ireland's 90th anniversary of the Rising; responses to Anti-Racism Week; the annual MAMA awards for multiculturalism in the media and the start of the 2006 World Cup. Some of these topics are potentially of interest to white Irish listeners, other migrants and the African community alike (the history of the Easter Rising; Anti-Racism week; the MAMA awards) while other topics are of specific interest to the African community (the World Cup programme focused on the five African teams and their chances). Another programme about community initiatives for migrant communities in Clondalkin in Dublin could potentially appeal to the broader migrant community in Dublin.

Additional topics of specific interest for the African community included a focus on corruption in Nigeria and proposed changes to its constitution; discussion of hip-hop culture from the perspective of two young African musicians working in Dublin and the opening of a model agency specialising in African women models. Occasional 10-minute reports on African news were broadcast on several African Scene programmes but were not necessarily built into the regular running order; they didn't appear at a set time each week. Topics of general interest incorporated into part or all of a programme included treatments for dyslexia, the importance of holidays for well-being and two newspaper reviews. While the latter is a popular item concept in both commercial and community broadcasting, on African Scene during this period the newspapers review became a springboard for critique and debate over representations of migrant communities in the
mainstream public sphere. There is a notable change between the spring 2006 programmes and those programmes broadcast in September; the later programmes are more engaged with specifically African or African migrant issues, moving away from topics of more general interest, such as the benefits of travel, Irish history or World Cup coverage. In response to my question as to whether their priority was the African community, Lizelle describes *African Scene*’s perspective on addressing broader migrant issues on the programme:

> We see ourselves all as immigrants, so whether we’re black, whether we’re white, whether we’re Polish, at this moment in time in Ireland we are all under the same blanket, regardless of the colour of our skin or our nationality.

(Interview with Joseph, 23 May 2006)

Like the other ‘ethnic’ programmes broadcast on Anna Livia FM, *African Scene* is sponsored by Western Union international money transfer, the ad for which combines a promotion of these programmes with the mention of Western Union as their sponsor, as noted above. A further advertisement for Western Union is read out live each week on air by T.J. in Yoruba, usually about 20 - 30 minutes into the programme. Western Union has proliferated in Ireland alongside the rise in inward migration, logically enough, as it provides a recognised money transfer service under a globally familiar brand name. Other ads regularly broadcast just prior to *African Scene* focus on vocational higher education and are specifically targeted at migrant listeners. Ads for courses at Griffith College, which are primarily vocational, are regularly played prior to the programme. An ad for FETAC runs as follows: ‘Improve your chances of working in Ireland with a FETAC qualification. We offer courses in English and computers at Dundrum College for the following September’ (broadcast just prior to the start of *African Scene*, 6 April 2006). In
September 2006, *African Scene* started broadcasting ads for Afro Cargo International, an African company focusing on Nigerians in Ireland wishing to send goods to their family and friends in Nigeria. The ad ran as follows, usually following a song played during the programme:

Remember those clothes, shoes, electric goods that you have in storage for your relatives in Nigeria? Why don’t you send them through Afro Cargo International, the number one company that delivers from Ireland to Nigeria. We will collect the luggage from your door in Ireland and deliver it to your door in Nigeria at affordable prices.

We are fast, efficient and reliable. Put a smile on the face of your relatives. Visit Afro Cargo today; we do it the professional way.

(*African Scene*, 21 September 2006)

With its message directed to members of the Nigerian community, this ad clearly targets some members of the African community as a potentially viable market, as well as embodying a particular implication of increased economic status for those who can afford to send goods in bulk to Nigeria.

*African Scene* incorporates strategies which encourage listener and community loyalty and encourage discursive critique of the mainstream media’s representation of migrant communities, thus providing points of identification for migrant listeners within the dialectical approach of its two presenters. T.J. and Lizelle occupy two distinct positions of articulation. They speak from the situated positions of their respective countries (Nigeria and South Africa), from their subject positions as Irish migrants and finally from their gendered positions. Lizelle in particular demonstrates a strong sense of social justice in her selection of possible topics. The programme focused on Nigeria was primarily
presented by T.J.; Lizelle names her favourite programme to work on as one she produced about HIV and AIDS in Africa, a topic she supports passionately, in conjunction with World AIDS Day on 1 December 2005. Generally speaking, Lizelle articulates a big picture overview in her presentation style, whereas T.J. focuses more on daily life experience. This emerges especially clearly in a programme about the perceived necessity of holidays, where T.J. advocates a holiday as essential to personal well-being and Lizelle pragmatically points out the difficulties in saving for a holiday and acquiring visas for travelling.

Lizelle and T.J. recognise that their sparring on-air dynamic makes the programme more effective:

T.J.: People ring sometimes and say, okay, I agree with that. They always are going to agree with Lizelle because she is going to throw it back into their faces (both laugh).

L: I think it is also where we come from, and I have a different opinion of everything, everything, everything. You know, I always think T.J. is a typical African man, the way he argues about things, and for me that is just a no-no.

(Interview with Idowu and Joseph, 23 May 2006)

T.J. agrees he is ‘more easygoing’ than Lizelle. Additionally, Lizelle has a clear preference for the kind of programmes she wants to make: ‘I like programmes that revolve around empowering women. That’s my big thing, so I like anything that has to do with that, giving people a voice and empowering people’ (Interview with Joseph, 23 May 2006). In her stated commitment to broadcasting political stories, Lizelle’s approach as producer demonstrates a recognition of the programme’s potential for critique, as can be seen in the broadcast discussion on racism and the representation of migrants in the
media, below. Broadly, T.J. and Lizelle agree on most issues covered on the programme, but their recurring tendency to argue provides the programme with an added freshness, energy and unpredictability, further fuelled by on-air caller contributions. The number of contributors in spring 2006 still relatively small, although there were several regular callers to the show.

As discussed above in relation to community radio practice more generally, informal presentation and use of running order are typical of the basic production values of volunteer-run community radio stations. In a departure from the objectivity and balance advocated as part of professional journalistic practice, T.J. and particularly Lizelle have strong opinions, especially around issues of racism, which they articulate on air as part of discussions with callers or simply between themselves. T.J. and Lizelle’s delivery is unmediated and unrehearsed, and consequently produces a clear sense of the immediacy inherent in the pleasure and excitement of listening to live radio. Although very occasionally it incorporates pre-recorded interview packages, the bulk of African Scene is broadcast live. Debates between its presenters are unscripted and unpredictable and callers almost always go directly on air once their call is taken in studio.

**Speaking Critically from Inside the Community: Call-in Practice and Migrant Participation**

As African Scene has evolved, T.J. and Lizelle have consolidated their contacts and built networks, and topics have subsequently emerged from these connections. Lizelle explains the process of building contacts and networks:
We reach out to other multicultural organisations, like Metro Éireann; we reach out to them. And other people and organisations that work with the communities help us to get news. I think that part was the most difficult thing. Trying to get to the people, trying to get the news and things, not knowing where to go.

(Interview with Joseph, 23 May 2006)

However, she notes some organisations are less forthcoming:

Some are very forthcoming. They would grant you an interview or they would come in. But I don’t know; most of the people say “we’ll call you back” but then they’ll never call back within the time we need … we have had that a lot.

(Interview with Joseph, 23 May 2006)

Lizelle here identifies problems with access to selected institutions or organisations. Research and interviewing prior to a programme broadcast is necessarily conducted subject to absolute deadlines: working from a community radio station often entails a lack of privileged access to certain organisations or governmental bodies which journalists from commercial stations or from RTÉ could often take for granted. Spokespeople for the organisation may feel the audience may be too small for their comments to have a significant impact.

A key element of African Scene’s impact is its realised potential for critique of the dominant public sphere, specifically the mainstream’s depiction and representation of migrant communities. This critique can take the form of on-air discussions and debate with callers-in to the programme, who are often members of the African community. The programme’s capacity for critique is derived from factors including Anna Livia FM’s strong signal, the use of English as the primary language of the programme, consistent contribution from callers into the programme and T.J. and Lizelle’s own informed
critique of Ireland’s mainstream media. The latter two are themselves the result of a combination of contributing factors. A central barometer of any successful radio programme is the degree of public response it receives. Public feedback and comments are a measure of listener loyalty; those who regularly respond to a programme via phone calls, texts or emails indicate that they support and therefore enjoy the programme’s content, and also act on a (reinforced) faith that their responses will be read and ideally responded to in kind.

In a commercial radio station with greater resources, researchers would field the calls, assessing each for its suitability before putting the caller live on air. *African Scene* is broadcast live each week; in the studio, in addition to T.J. and Lizelle, a volunteer sound engineer ‘drives’ the sound desk and takes calls. Callers are put live on air directly after the engineer has confirmed that they want to comment on the programme. The caller’s name is provided for the first time simultaneously to T.J., Lizelle and the programme’s listeners, as calls are not screened prior to being broadcast. The process of fielding callers is less demanding than during a popular commercial radio programme as the volume of callers is not very high; the highest number of callers per show in spring 2006, I noted, was six. The practice of allowing callers to speak directly on air without mediating or screening potentially leads to dull or off-topic conversations, or even obscenity; crucially, however, it also imbues other listeners with the confidence that if they were to call in, their call would be answered and responded to in turn, live on air. In the case of *African Scene* during this period, each caller had a positive contribution, even if it was simply acknowledgement of a job well done by T.J. and Lizelle on the programme.
Most callers to the show are members of the African community, although Lizelle explains there have been Irish callers as well:

There’s a range of people that call. We had Irish callers, especially when we were talking about the deportation issue, with Kunle. There was an Irish person that called, and sometimes we would get mainly Nigerian people but also other African people that were tuned into the radio. I think that probably a lot of people don’t get the frequency so well, so that would kind of throw us off that people wouldn’t really be listening. We want to work towards getting a bigger platform, so that more people can tune into the radio station, the programme.

(Interview with Joseph, 23 May 2006)

The contribution from callers is central to the programme. Callers typically give positive feedback on the programme, usually thanking T.J. and Lizelle for their ‘good work’ on the programme. Typical responses include: ‘You have made sure we as Africans are heard’ (African Scene, 13 March 2006) and ‘I want to thank you guys. You’re doing a very good job trying to promote the African image … we appreciate what you guys are doing there’ (African Scene, 4 May 2006).

Often callers want to comment on a point raised by T.J. or Lizelle or to contribute their own opinions to the on-air debate. These contributions are further facilitated and encouraged through the ongoing dynamic between T.J. and Lizelle and their tendency to take opposite sides in discussion, which opens up a discursive space between their usually opposing viewpoints, creating a dialectic space in which the caller can contribute his or her own opinion. Callers’ contributions are also tacitly encouraged simply by virtue of their comments not being curtailed on air. If a caller is articulate, s/he (although it is almost always a he) will often be allowed to speak their mind for a few minutes on air,
usually actively contributing to and often broadening the scope of the debate initiated by T.J. and Lizelle. As a result, *African Scene* has several callers who regularly contribute informally to the show. Importantly, caller contributions have the potential to significantly shape at least part of each programme, a practice aided by a fluid adherence to running order. Generally discussions don’t go far off-topic despite often becoming heated (although not usually hostile) as usually the caller, T.J. and Lizelle end up agreeing on the issue. However virulently they express themselves a consensus is often achieved. The number of callers depends on the topic under discussion. The greatest number of callers (six) during a single show took place during a programme featuring information about a modelling agency which represented African women. This programme was amongst the more interactive, as most of the callers wanted further information about the agency and about an upcoming talent show planned by T.J. and Lizelle as the first ever *African Scene*-sponsored event. In this case, the programme functioned as a meeting point for members of the community, in which they exchanged information, promoted community business and passed on contact information.

The potential access provided by call-in radio shows embodies a democratisation of the public sphere. Call-in shows can be a mainstay for local and community radio, as they are inexpensive to produce. Lewis and Booth describe how local radio stations use the call-in show more often than national radio for precisely this reason, as the call-in show provides opportunities to get the ‘community talking to itself’ (Lewis and Booth 1989: 102). They point out that the ‘phone-in is perhaps the closest most stations get to access broadcasting allowing as it does public expression of normally private concerns’ (ibid.). Yet the
The practice of call-in radio goes further than providing significant access for listener participation on air or facilitating a stimulating, potentially unpredictable discussion. The call-in show provides a tangible bridge between private, domestic space and public space, as described by Hutchby (1994): ‘the talk takes place at, and at the same time constructs, a mediated interface between these spheres’ (Hutchby 1994: 8).

Topics inviting critique occasionally recur on *African Scene*. A review of the day’s newspapers is a semi-regular item covered on *African Scene*, usually heard on a show alongside another topic which hadn’t taken up the full hour allotted to the programme. The newspaper review often incorporates criticism from both T.J. and Lizelle levelled at simplistic or derogatory representations of migrants and migrant communities similar to those identified by Campion’s study. Usually Lizelle initiates these critical discussions. Another factor prompting critique can emerge from coverage of a related topic; a discussion of the MAMA awards, multicultural awards sponsored by *Metro Éireann* and RTÉ, turned to a discussion about the lack of publicity surrounding the award ceremony and award winners. *African Scene* hence provides a valuable opportunity and location for informed critique of mainstream representation of migrant communities, which is in turn heard by and responded to by members of the African migrant community in Dublin. Critical discourse is further informed by Lizelle and T.J.’s own training in journalism at Ballyfermot College; the critique emerges from their subject positions as migrants and their professional training in journalism.\(^{25}\)
The following excerpts are also notable for the identification, recognition and interrogation of terms and phrases which have been commonly used in the public sphere to describe aspects of a multiracial Ireland. An *African Scene* programme broadcast on 6 April 2006 examined negative representation in some depth alongside an exploration of African identity and racism as experienced in Ireland. Early in the programme T.J. and Lizelle informally discuss racism as they encounter it in the media and in heard anecdotes in daily life. The show featured a review of the day’s newspapers. A discussion emerges from T.J. and Lizelle’s analysis of two stories: the first with a headline reading ‘Ireland of the Unwelcomes’ detailing examples of racism experienced by migrants and the second about a woman, described as Nigerian, accused of hitting a small boy after she saw him kissing a small girl in a playground and who was subsequently charged and given a suspended sentence. Prompted by a brief description of the first story, Lizelle addresses the topic of racism, which was discussed at some length of the programme on 23 March 2006. [Audio 12: 2:30sec] Part of this discussion is transcribed here:

....Racism is something that will never go away, no matter in what form. People will always be trying to fix it and you know, make it better, but for some reason it is always there. Because how often have we not brought up the subject, because it is... an ongoing thing here.

*(African Scene, 23 March 2006)*

**Audio 12: 40-55sec**

This is the initial, thematic introduction of the topic during this programme. Following the description of the story about the Nigerian woman given a suspended sentence, Lizelle criticises the foregrounding of ‘Nigerian’ in the article’s description of the accused woman, in the process critiquing the tendency of simplifying migrant news stories in the context of Campion’s (2005) criteria: ‘We’re bad news’:
L: What pissed me off about that article is that they wrote “a 37-year-old Nigerian.” Firstly, she’s a woman, give her the respect as a person, you know? I hate that. You always find that in the paper. They never refer to a person as a person or a woman. It’s always “the Nigerian.”

T.J.: Yeah, you still have to at least add the gender.

L: Exactly. Or her name. Respect her as a person, not just “the Nigerian”.

T.J.: Yeah, I think that is ridiculous too.

L: Yeah, and it’s another way of bringing prejudice into people’s minds, because they read the article, they see what the woman did. They kind of connect it: Nigerian, Nigerian: bad; black is bad.

T.J.: And that is stereotyping isn’t it?

L: Yeah, of course!

(African Scene, 6 April 2006)

The above discussion is immediately accessible. Lizelle’s impassioned delivery effectively introduces the topic in emotive but articulate language. The pithy exchange articulates Lizelle and T.J.’s unequivocal opinions on racist media representation of migrants, and by extension the view of the programme. This frank, accessible airing of opinions is characteristic of community radio and inherent to its production of locality. Additionally, the discussion of media representation of migrants serves to ‘agitate’ the larger public sphere as described by van Vuuren (2006), thus functioning as a critique of that representation.

Following coverage of two further stories and mention of the upcoming MAMA awards, the discussion is revived later in the programme by two separate callers. First, Lizelle speaks to Yemi, who has rung the show:
L: I was just saying that something that makes me very angry is that they always refer to the person as a Nigerian instead of giving a name.

Y: To be honest I share your view. This has been going on for a long time and I think it is high time someone brought it to the attention of the authorities. They are trying to promote racial disharmony, if you get my drift. [References the original story] If it was an Irish woman they wouldn’t say “Irish woman smacks child”.

T.J: A woman would have been a woman, isn’t it.

Y: It shows that the press here is not so serious. That shouldn’t be making headlines. [Asks after show’s progress.] Thanks so much for the platform.

(African Scene, 6 April 2006)

A second caller, Arigo, is identified by T.J. as a regular contributor to the show. He too addresses the topic of racist media representation. What appears below is a partial transcription; the full discussion can be heard on the audio track. [Audio 13; 4:03sec]

A: ....I do agree with the last caller there. The Irish should look for better news to promote and to report. If you bring up, if you start bringing up issues about a Nigerian lady... a lady is a lady, irrespective of colour or nationality.... Why should it be that a Nigerian smacks a kid and that goes in the news?

T.J. Lizelle was even very particular with the use of words there....

A: I want to agree with Lizelle, you can’t really deal with racism. To some extent I believe that people are just ignorant, it’s not that people can’t deal with it, but people just use an opportunity to basically avoid something. That’s what they’re doing.

T.J.: Something just came to my mind, sorry to cut you short there Arigo... If we believe or think that it [racism] is something that cannot go away in society, just live with it, go on with your life, ignore it, isn’t it.

A: I like me now, I can’t be bothered with it.

L: Exactly. That’s the right attitude.
A: That’s the way I live it. I can’t be bothered with it. That’s the way I live it; I can’t be bothered. If anyone tells me “Yeah, you’re black”, I tell them “Look, this is the best tan you could ever have”....

A: ....So basically if I get funny comments like that I just throw it back.... I just say it’s not my fault you are ignorant of the facts of life....

T.J.: Yeah. Some people can have different accents, some people can have different colours and all that.

A: Exactly. That’s what makes the world unique, like. That’s why you have Irish, why you have Americans, you have Nigerians, you have Kenyans, that’s what makes the world unique: black, white, Asian. It makes the world unique. If you cannot appreciate that fact then well, I do not know what to say. Basically. You guys are doing a very good job, keep it up.

(African Scene, 6 April 2006)
Audio 13: 1.18-3.49sec

The above excerpt expresses frank opinions on experienced racism which are rarely heard in mainstream Irish radio. Listener access to these articulated experiences is a key element of community radio, where opinions, as noted above, are expressed unmediated and unrehearsed, or even scheduled, directly on air. What is interesting about the above interaction is that the presenters and caller reach a consensus, rather than regulating the caller’s comments and further structuring them in opposition to the hosting presenter. Hutchby (1994) identifies a recognised structure to each call into a phone-in radio show, noting in his analysis that many callers phone in to articulate their ‘personal opinions on public matters’ (Hutchby 1994: 7), which are often in opposition with those being expressed by the presenting host live on air.

In addition to being lively and engaging, the above discussion illustrates several of African Scene’s articulation strategies. It serves as an effective critique of a single story, identifying the obvious stereotyping which features in the story but also crucially
recognising the story itself as a metonym for other mainstream reporting on migrant stories and the attendant assumptions found in migrant-related coverage. The opinions aired reference the invisibility of white Irishness as the dominant identity circulating in the mainstream public sphere during discussion of how the woman who is the focus of the story is framed first and foremost as Nigerian, rather than by her occupation or where she lived in Dublin. The discussion also reveals personalised responses to racism as experienced in Ireland and strategies for coping with it. The show’s potential as a forum is recognised and acknowledged by the first caller, Yemi, when he thanks T.J. and Lizelle for the ‘platform.’ At the programme’s end, Lizelle acknowledges the programme’s potential and capacity for ongoing debate over issues such as racism, which she asserts is addressed repeatedly on *African Scene*. During the period in which I listened to and recorded the show, the issue of racism was discussed in three different programmes over 11 weeks; the first discussion evolved as part of a programme looking at Anti-Racism week; the second two discussions came out of the newspaper review segments. However, it can be inferred from Lizelle’s foregrounding of the topic of racism for discussion both above and on the programme broadcast on 23 March 2006 that she intends to continue to feature discussions on racism on the show.

A further capacity for critique is realised through the delivery style of *African Scene*, which combines the informality characteristic of community radio with the accented, culturally nuanced delivery of the presenters. As was the case with Nimpa’s accented presentation on *Different Voices*, T.J. and Lizelle’s Nigerian and South African accented delivery serves to immediately situate and reinforce their subject positions as Africans.
and also as part of the wider migrant community. The informal, accessible presentation style typical of community radio further facilitates a conversational atmosphere on African Scene, gradually encouraging regular callers to the show, and once on air, an informal forum. The community mode of production, with its capacity for organically prolonged discussion and debate, in turn lends itself to Lizelle and T.J’s delivery style. If migrant cultural production is becoming ‘increasingly significant’, as Naficy argues (Naficy 2001: 3), he posits that this mode of production is centrally characterised by migrant or transnational accents. Where the dominant style of cultural production is considered to be universal and hence incorporates homogenised accents which are prevalent in the mainstream public sphere, the cultural texts produced by ‘diasporic and exilic subjects’ are deliberately differently accented. This accent as described by Naficy is derived from the displacement of the cultural producers and their ‘artisanal production modes’ (ibid.: 4). Thus accented delivery here functions as a metonym for a specifically accented mode of production. Because these accented texts are ‘simultaneously local and global’ (ibid.), they are interstitial in nature and resonate against prevailing cultural production practice. Consequently they can effectively signify the transnational conditions of diaspora and exile in their reference to the dominant modes of production, but also signify that subject position itself through the articulation of transnational identity. Through these strategies, the ‘local’ radio programme African Scene becomes effectively translocal, embodying an articulation of both a localised migrant position, speaking about local events and coverage, and a transnational subject position which articulates opinions from a transcultural perspective. Thus the presentation style in itself can constitute a critique.
*African Scene*, in its performance of migrant experience, articulates that experience within an overarching transnational public sphere informed by a fluid and shifting sense of the transcultural migrant identities and experiences of its producer/presenters. By transcultural, I mean what the word literally signifies: cultural articulation that is shaped by transnationality and the resultant experiences of migrants which then inform cultural production. Robins (2006) situates a ‘transcultural perspective’ in direct relation to the limits of the national imaginary in a multiethnic Europe:

> In order for a transcultural perspective to be able to emerge, it is first necessary to acknowledge the limitations of the national *imaginaire* - and in societies that have always organised their worldview on the basis of this *imaginaire* this will, indeed, be a difficult acknowledgement to make. We will have to confront the difficult-to-confront possibility that national logic might now actually be inhibiting more innovative cultural possibilities.

(Robins 2006: 19)

**Transcultural Articulation and Institutional Critique**

Issues covered by Irish daily newspapers and subsequently discussed on *African Scene* included Irish governmental debate and lobbying in the US in spring 2006 regarding the legal status of Irish immigrants illegally resident there, which provided the basis for a debate over representation of migrants’ rights in the US and their recognition in Ireland; a comparison which illuminated the stark contrast between the celebration of Irish immigrants in the US and the much less privileged position of many migrant groups in Ireland. On 25 May 2006 *African Scene* began with an item about dyslexia and its effects on children and adults. However, the discussion soon turned to the Irish immigrants in the
US following an article describing Minister Dermot Ahern’s comments on a proposed Senate vote which would determine whether those immigrants would be allowed to remain and reside in the US.25 Lizelle introduced Minister Ahern’s statement asserting that the plight of the illegal Irish in the US was not the same as that of the Afghan refugees who had protested the previous weekend in St Patrick’s Cathedral in Dublin. She bristled at ‘that word illegal’ and disagreed there was a difference between the two groups:

L: Illegal would be illegal, no matter what language, no matter what country. The meaning of the word is the same, regardless of who you are or where you are.

T.J.: And the Minister said there is a difference because they [Irish in US] have been there for a couple of years and they have family and they have been contributing to society.

L: Yeah, and it says in the paper that the Irish immigrants in America are entitled to be in America and there is no possible way that we can compare the illegal immigrant in Ireland to the illegal immigrant in America.

T.J.: What is the difference?!

L: I don’t know, I really don’t know. It blows me away that there can be a difference between illegal immigrants here and illegal immigrants in Ireland. If you are illegal, you’re illegal.

T.J.: I think it’s, this is my own opinion now, I think it is hypocritical to be campaigning for illegal immigrants in America and not doing the same for illegal immigrants here.

(African Scene, 25 May 2006)

Lizelle’s tangible exasperation provides an accessible point of identification for those listeners who may share her frustration. When she articulates her anger at examples of inequity, she encourages empathy from listeners who may feel similarly, which in turn encourages their continued listenership and loyalty to the programme. In the above
extracts, both T.J. and Lizelle move away from established codes of impartial practice in journalism, instead participating in the discussion from their own stated perspectives; as T.J. states, ‘this is my own opinion now.’

A caller stating his name as Achab rang in to comment at some length about the questioned status of illegal Irish immigrants in the US:

A: I think it is a very funny situation, the government getting themselves involved in the whole thing. Because one, they’ve decided, I listen to the news and I don’t think they’re calling them illegal immigrants, they’re calling them “the undocumented”, trying to make it seem as if there are not illegal immigrants in other countries as well. I mean, the fact the government is getting themselves involved in this is very, very funny. Because Ireland has its own share of immigration problems as well here, and the way they’re taking it is not the way they expect the Americans to take it themselves. I mean they don’t want the Americans to feel as if the people are coming down there to live there. And meanwhile it is a major issue in Ireland again, the way they deport people, the way they treat people from other countries, and talking about what they are called, the undocumented, even here in Ireland people who are not asylum-seekers, they call them asylum-seekers as well.

T.J.: Yes, yes. In a way, trying to damn people who come from other countries, they still call them asylum seekers. People find it difficult to actually differentiate the immigrant workers from the asylum seekers and refugees.

(African Scene, 25 May 2006)

The above indicates the degree to which callers are invited to express their opinions and the extent to which callers are engaged in ongoing conversation with T.J. and Lizelle. The issue is followed up by T.J. and Lizelle:

T.J.: Do you think that the government should consider other illegal immigrants as well, if they get through with the lobbying in America?

L: It would be unfair if they passed, if they allowed the illegal immigrants in America to remain and become citizens and they don’t do the same thing in their own country.
Here Achab’s views are supported and all three united in their expression of scepticism at what is perceived as government hypocrisy. At the end of Achab’s call, T.J. says ‘Achab voicing his own opinion’ presumably for clarification; yet his on-air contribution lasts for just over five minutes, which is a long time for an impromptu caller, indicating his opinion was valued in the context of the show. This provides further encouragement for other potential callers and reinforces the on-air function and atmosphere of a live forum for the discussion of the issue of separate categories of immigration. This debate illustrates what Spivak terms an ‘uneven permeability’ (Spivak 2003: 17), arguing that the seeming fluidity of borders and their crossing promoted by the project of globalisation disguises a remaining inequity in the privilege required to negotiate these borders, depending on which nation or continent you come from. As she writes: ‘I have remarked …. that borders are easily crossed from metropolitan countries, whereas attempts to enter from the so-called peripheral countries encounter bureaucratic and policed frontiers, altogether more difficult to penetrate’ (ibid.: 16).

What is evident in the above broadcast is that terms including ‘asylum seeker’, ‘refugee’ and immigrant workers’ are still used interchangeably to some degree in the mainstream public sphere. Similarly Lizelle’s objection to ‘that word illegal’ and the subsequent discussion which describes an official discourse positing Irish migrants in the US as ‘undocumented’ in direct contrast to ‘illegal’ migrants in Ireland articulates migrant perspectives on a problematic discourse of polarisation. At a public debate on multiculturalism in Dublin in autumn 2006, sponsored by Metro Éireann and the National
Consultative Committee on Racism and Interculturalism (NCCRI), Lentin described the reworked use of ‘community’ as a ‘glowing’, positive term to describe migrant groups, possibly replacing ‘immigrants’ as a blanket term applied to all migrants, new or settled.

In problematising ‘the local’, Hall (2000) argues that:

Here we find the “return” of the particular and specific - of the specifically different - at the centre of globalization’s universalist, panoptic aspiration to closure. “The local” has no stable, trans-historical character. It resists universalism’s homogenizing sweep with different, conjunctural times. It has no fixed political inscription….It emerges at many sites, one of the most significant being that planned and unplanned, compelled and so-called “free” migration, which has brought the margins to the centre, the multi-cultural disseminated ‘particular’ to the heart of the metropolitan western city.

(Hall 2000: 216 -7)

As an example of the reworking of a single, key term, Hall’s (re-) definition is indicative of wider changes in language uses in tandem with a multicultural project and in response to or against it. Terms such as ‘illegal’ and ‘undocumented’ serve to signify stages of the process of ‘documenting’ and regularising migrant status in the hosting country. Yet, as illustrated in the 25 May broadcast, both these terms are loaded when used in official discourses of polarisation.

Community worker Lucy Pepra, a repeat guest on African Scene, describes the connotations of the word ‘interculturalism’ she encounters, in reference to an intercultural celebration in Clondalkin she is helping to organise: ‘You know, when people say “intercultural celebration”, the thing that jumps into their mind is non-nationals: “Oh, it’s for immigrants, people from different countries”’. But it [the celebration] includes the
Irish community as well' (African Scene, 14 September 2006). The connotations Pepra describes resemble meanings popularly attributed to ‘multiculturalism’: in other words, anything relating to race or ethnicity. Pepra’s demystifying comment usefully describes how interculturalism circulates anecdotally while indicating that the reductive inference of ‘non-nationals’ does not exclusively apply. As such, Pepra’s explication provides another migrant articulation of how a term often applied to migrant communities is perceived from a migrant standpoint.

A programme featuring coverage of the Metro Éireann Media and Multicultural Awards (MAMA) on 18 May 2006 incorporated critique on two levels; from the presenters themselves in an in-studio discussion following a series of pre-recorded interviews, and from an institutional perspective, in comments made in a pre-recorded interview with the Director General of RTÉ, Cathal Goan, on the role of the media in promoting multiculturalism, enabling an institutional critique. This programme was one of the few in African Scene during this period that wasn’t entirely live. Instead, interviews and speeches were recorded at the awards and later edited into a package. In the resulting conversation with Goan T.J. is effectively interrogating the position of the mainstream media from the point of view of a community broadcaster. The interview begins with T.J. asking Goan about RTÉ’s involvement in the MAMA awards: [Audio 14; 2:39sec]

T.J.: Why is RTÉ involved with the MAMA awards?

CG: Because I think it’s very important for the national public broadcaster to be involved with and identify itself with a changing Ireland, and to be involved in increasing awareness of the rapidly changing nature of our society and also, not pretending in any way that this is a cozy change, that there are issues for people, there are people who are uncomfortable, that there are people who are not able to cope with change, and the best way that hopefully we can contribute to
accommodating these issues is by exploring them through identifying with MAMA and also making programmes on radio and television that reflect the changing Ireland.

T.J.: ...Some of us have won awards tonight. Do you think that it’s an open door for us to get into Irish media and practice as journalists?

CG: I honestly don’t know the answer to that. I mean, I think that there are, that there has to be a change in the accents and in the physical features of the people who make radio and television programmes. Is it going to happen quickly, is it going to happen more slowly; my sense is that it’s beginning to change now. I think we’re probably a bit slow at it, I think we need to make a more concerted effort in the future. But that doesn’t mean it’s going to be an open door. I think one of the things that you must have appreciated here this evening is that it’s not all plain sailing, there are people who have reservations, there’s no point in pretending we’re going to wave a magic wand and it’s all going to change overnight. But the commitment is there to begin the change and I think that’s important.

T.J.: Yes, Ireland, multicultural Ireland. How do you envisage Ireland in the future?

CG: I don’t know. I mean honestly I have a sense of a country in great change. I’d be a fool to predict the future. But if we don’t talk about issues and if we don’t look at things and have debate it could be a very bad place. But if we confront [sic] the issues and if we talk about them and if we’re involved in things like this in a much more continuous and visible way, on the one hand people can retreat and on the other they can agree to see each other’s differences and exchange and celebrate. I would prefer the second and I think RTÉ has a major role to play in that.

(African Scene, 18 May 2006)

As seen in the previous chapter, RTÉ increased its emphasis on multicultural radio programming in summer 2005 with three new programmes focused on multicultural issues. Goan calls for further debate above, something also encouraged in African Scene. Goan seems to be speaking here from a holistic perspective, qualifying his views and drawing from a settled Irish viewpoint which may include ‘people who are uncomfortable’, suggesting a polarisation between that segment of the community and
others in favour of increased multicultural broadcasting. This interview depicts a temporary overlap between the dominant public sphere as exemplified by a representative of the national broadcaster and one comprised of multiple counterpublics in the form of *African Scene*. The form of the interview allows for less debate than the free-form live discussions on *African Scene*; however, it still marks a relatively rare crossover between spheres. The interview is framed by the MAMA award ceremony itself; the combination of sponsorship from *Metro Éireann* and RTÉ itself creates a temporary space for more overlapping of public and counterpublic.

In its ongoing critique of the mainstream and focus on issues facing migrants, *African Scene* locates itself in Squires’ (2002) typology of alternate public spheres as embodying aspects of the counterpublic while retaining aspects of the enclave. Additionally, amongst migrant-produced programmes on Dublin community radio, *African Scene* has a greater potential reach than non-English language programmes and it regularly addresses issues relevant to the larger migrant community as well as those of specifically African interest, which further supports its location within a counterpublic as conceived by Squires.

**Migrant Broadcasters Claiming Professional Agency**

An article in *Ireland in 2006* magazine, published annually by *Metro Éireann*, highlights the ongoing difficulty for members of migrant communities in Ireland to practice as journalists in the mainstream, noting that ‘the Irish media is a virtual ethnic minority free zone’.

In contrast to the posited mainstream Irish media in the article, both the magazine and the *Metro Éireann* newspaper occupy a counterpublic representing a wide
migrant community. Migrant journalists working in the Irish mainstream are few and far between, and those that are employed either work primarily in features in print or on television (such as Shalini Sinha, as seen in the previous chapter) or report exclusively on multicultural issues on a freelance basis. Polish-language media has perhaps been the only migrant-produced media to enter the mainstream public sphere, with the emergence of the Polski Herald, a weekly addition to the Herald newspaper group, which ran from November 2005 until January 2009. Kerr (2007) and Titley (2008) further examine Polish participation in print media in Ireland, and explore a perception that Polish migrants are represented in Ireland as 'good' or particularly accessible migrants, on the grounds of their cultural similarities to the Irish; in addition to hailing from north-western Europe, both cultures are predominantly white and Catholic.

As noted, T.J. and Lizelle won the MAMA award for Student Broadcasters at the 2006 MAMA awards ceremony. They both enjoy working in radio, hope to bring their programme to the mainstream public sphere and see the award as valuable recognition of their ability to do so - a belief that is apparent in T.J.'s question to Director General Cathal Goan. Guy Nimpa, the former presenter of Different Voices, would be their counterpart in the mainstream public sphere in his role at RTÉ Cork. Nimpa has also worked in community radio in University College Cork, so shares T.J. and Lizelle's experience in community radio (interview with Guy Bertrand Nimpa, 26 May 2005).

With reference to the Ireland in 2006 article, Lizelle Joseph is sceptical of the arguments put forward about the difficulties for migrant journalists working in the public sphere:
There was an article on journalists working within the Irish media; they say the problem for journalists working in the Irish media is that they wouldn’t have the knowledge of the history or Irish things, but that’s kind of a lame excuse, don’t you think? Because myself and T.J., we’ve been studying within Ireland; that would give us a step up. And another thing is that, I find for myself if I want to make a success then I will learn about the country, I will take it on myself to open up to these other areas, to educate myself. So that kind of excuse is just too much for me.

(Interview with Joseph, 23 May 2006)

In addition to providing a template for accented radio in facilitating migrant production and the articulation of migrant community concerns, *African Scene* fulfils a further function from the point of view of its producer-presenters: a potential point of entry into careers in mainstream Irish media. Through their work on *African Scene* T.J. and Lizelle have gained experience alongside their formal training in journalism at Ballyfermot College giving them an advantage over less experienced graduates. Their MAMA award serves both as recognition for their contribution to the articulation of migrant community topics and issues, and as further feedback, at industry level, of their abilities in radio production and presentation.

Campion (2005) described the response of those practitioners she interviewed who identified as Black, Asian or otherwise non-White:

Many interviewees described this desire to contribute to the evolving cultural identity of Britain and felt they should have the right to do so. Their comments resonate with contemporary ideas about social justice and cultural citizenship, that beyond the civil, political and social rights of citizens in a democracy there is a fourth right, to participate in shaping the nation’s cultural life.

(Campion 2005: 11)
There is an ongoing need in Ireland for migrant-produced programmes to bridge the gap between publics, where one public sphere (the mainstream) represents an Ireland depicted and articulated almost exclusively by settled Irish as against multiple overlapping counterpublics which represent and are represented by members of Ireland’s migrant communities. There is further an increasing need for migrant journalists and media producers who can speak from within migrant communities, articulate their situatedness as migrants and report firsthand on the stories emerging from these communities.

**Multifaceted Strategies of Migrant Media**

In envisaging the form a transnational public sphere might take, Nash (2007) argues it would need to incorporate participatory parity alongside wider representation to include grassroots perspectives and those of the economically disadvantaged, as well as ongoing translation across the languages of all those so represented. This investigation into the function as well as the form of *African Scene* as representative of migrant-produced programming, participation and articulation, forms one part of a wider critique which object is proposed above. In her emphasis on participatory parity, Nash’s argument attempts to move beyond the territoriality associated with public spheres, and possibly with public sphere theory. In a transcultural constellation, Fraser and Squires’ theorising of counterpublics with transnational capacities is perhaps already attenuating. Fraser (2007) admits the difficulties involved in theorising a transnational public sphere:

> It is difficult to associate the notion of legitimate public opinion with communicative arenas in which the interlocutors are not fellow members of a political community, with equal rights to participate in political life. And it is hard to associate the notion of efficacious communicative power with discursive spaces that do not correlate with sovereign states. Thus, it is by no means clear what it means today to speak of “transnational public spheres.”
Navigating transnational media is complicated further when migrant strategies of media use are examined. Robins argues against the assumption that migrants use media targeted at their respective communities 'because they want to be immersed in the culture of their “homeland”' (Robins 2006: 146). Instead, he identifies migrant strategies which are predicated on cultural ambivalence rather than a desire to reinforce a fixed cultural identity:

They may become aware that the cultural community they imagined as being eternal and pre-given in fact turns out to be no more than an imagined - that is to say socially-invested - community.

(Robins 2006: 147)

Robins’ point not only complicates analysis of the functions of migrant media, but interrogates the emotional resonance of ‘nation-ness’: his observation destabilises the notion that migrants carry their homeland intact in their hearts and minds, ready to resurrect it wholesale with the help of migrant targeted or migrant-produced media. He suggests this assumption is indicative of ‘how powerfully the homogenising imagination of national community works to inhibit the perception of new developments and possibilities in culture and identity’ (ibid.). Instead, he argues, migrants approach media use from their position and experiences as migrants, with the attendant survival strategies and complicated conceptualisations of their previous homeland. Robins expands on the contexts of migrant media negotiations:

The complexity expressed by many of our informants comes in part from their condition of involvement in two cultures. But, their insights also come, I believe, as a consequence of what they also experience as their sense of distance from both
cultures. What are crucial are precisely the possibilities afforded them by cultural
distance (which is the antithesis of the stultification afforded by the cultural
intimacy of imagined community). They have a certain freedom to think because
they are not at home in two spaces at once. It is actually their experience - their
double experience - of distance and detachment that enables them to think
between spaces.

(ibid.:152)

It is precisely this complex position that African Scene speaks from, and to. Writing about
community radio’s capacity for facilitating local participation and establishing ‘the right
to communicate’, as enshrined in the AMARC charter, Byrne expands on the right to
communicate, saying this ‘asserts the right for the individual to communicate themselves’
(Byrne 2007: 27). The articulation of multiple migrant perspectives heard on African
Scene exemplifies that right and illustrates community radio’s capacity for facilitating it. I
argue that migrant-produced media can serve as an interrogative phenomenon with
varying degrees of efficacy, depending partly on formal criteria described earlier in this
chapter such as available resources, degree of editorial rigour and incentives towards
professionalising standards of practice for migrant practitioners; the degree to which each
of these are provided is symptomatic of the space provided for migrant programmes
within the context of community media.

Robins argues that transnational broadcasting is potentially subversive:

[I]t seems that particular ethnic, religious, and language-based cultures are finding
in transnational broadcasting the kinds of services that they have been missing in
national broadcasting schedules. Through these transnational developments,
established models of public service broadcasting and of minority programming
are potentially being subverted - models that have been based on the national
organisation of media policy and regulation. The new reality concerns the re-
positioning of minoritised ethnic and cultural groups in the context of new
transnational and diasporic audiences.
Reading this statement in relation to *African Scene* posits it and other programmes produced by Irish community radio by and for migrant communities, as well as community radio stations broadcasting such programmes, as potentially subversive in that they are created and broadcast in an evolving PSB media climate predicated on regulatory systems which recognise and advocate for local, and translocal, cultural articulation.

Broadcasting space for migrant participation and articulation can be expanded in the context of establishing a dedicated multicultural radio station, with an inbuilt policy of broadcasting *only* migrant-produced programmes. Such a station would go beyond facilitating migrant-produced programmes; instead, migrant-produced programmes would be the norm, along with migrant participation and agency as migrant practitioners. The question of what a multicultural station in Ireland sounds like, as well as the processes informing its institutional and production practice, is addressed in the next chapter.
Notes


3 I refer to Dublin City FM as Anna Livia FM throughout, as that was the name the station was broadcasting (and licensed) under at the time of my primary research in 2005 and 2006.

4 The inception and history of Anna Livia FM/Dublin City FM is outlined here:

Dublin City Anna Livia has been licensed as a special interest service since 1992. The first service to hold the ‘Anna Livia’ name operated as a temporary radio service in 1991 when Dublin was the European Capital of Culture (not in 1988). This first service provided the seed for the special interest service licensed by the BCI in 1992. However, while both services shared members, they are different services. The licensing of this service would have taken place in line with the Radio and Television Act, 1988 i.e. expression of interest first and consideration of applications thereafter in line with Section 5, following which a contract would be awarded. Anna Livia’s contract was renewed in 2005 following re-advertisement of the service in 2004. While Anna Livia operates along voluntary lines and is similar to community radio service in terms of funding and other operational activities, the licence from the Commission is a special interest licence which is a commercial licence. Anna Livia does not have to comply with the Community Radio Policy and its performance is not assessed with reference to that policy.

(email from Declan McLoughlin, BCI, 24 July 2007)


8 The first promo was broadcast on 16 March 2006 and the second promo on 6 April 2006. Both promos were broadcast directly before African Scene at 8pm.

9 The greater number of Polish programmes echoes the observation made in Chapter One describing the relative visibility of Ireland’s significant Polish community in the Irish mainstream public sphere, in terms of mainstream media coverage and representation.
As of autumn 2008, NEAR FM had moved frequencies and begun broadcasting on 90FM.

Another programme, *Equality Time*, addresses issues facing disabled people; its inclusion demonstrates NEAR FM’s holistic commitment to representing marginalised communities.


[2] Interview with Mick Hanley, Programme Director, Anna Livia FM, 1 April 2006.


[5] From interviews with Galiana (27 March 2006) and Hanley (1 April 2006).

[6] Process described in interviews with Hanley (1 April 2006) and Galiana (27 March 2006).

[7] Interview with Hanley 1 April 2006.

[8] Using van Vuuren’s model, a further examination of the workings and hierarchy of the two Dublin community stations under discussion could reveal more about each stations’ programming policies and production context; such a discussion is unfortunately beyond the scope of this chapter.


[10] Ballyfermot College of Further Education in Dublin runs a series of established third level media production courses, including two on radio production and one in ‘Print Journalism and Radio’. It served as the training ground for numerous radio presenters on Irish radio, many of which are widely known. See http://www.bcfe.ie/alumni_successstories.htm and http://bcfe.comedio.org/bcfe/courselist.htm (accessed 1 June 2009).


Chapter Five
Towards Transcultural Radio

Globalisation and displacement are the Janus Faces of our contemporary late-modern condition; one necessitates the other. We are living in an interrelated world that increasingly favours horizontality over verticality, multiplicity over singularity, routes over roots, and network over nation.

(Naficy 2007: xiii)

This chapter examines two separate case studies of attempts to create a multiethnic radio station in Ireland, in both cases licensed by the Broadcasting Commission of Ireland (BCI). Part One of this chapter examines BCI licensing criteria and application requirements as part of an exploration into how the BCI conceived of a multicultural or multiethnic radio station in 2004, when it invited applications for a proposed multicultural radio station license. The introduction of a competition for a dedicated multicultural radio service license by the BCI in 2004 has not been repeated and is thus particularly worth scrutiny. Part Two analyses selected output of a Dublin multiethnic radio station which broadcasted under a temporary license in spring 2006: Sunrise FM.

By 2008 radio programmes representing migrants were still broadcast primarily in Ireland by local community stations or by national broadcaster RTÉ. In both cases, as has been seen, the broadcasting station (whether community or mainstream) structures and informs programme production practice through the provision of resources, including training and access to equipment for recording and research and the allocation of a viable time slot in the station schedule. The provision of these resources is necessarily balanced by the other requirements of the station; meaning
that both the national broadcaster and Dublin community stations have not been solely dedicated to multicultural programme-making due to requirements to adhere to a wider remit. As discussed in Chapter Three, ‘multicultural’ programmes produced by RTÉ, in their representation of diversity primarily as difference, have embodied the national broadcaster’s overarching project of reinforcing an Irish national identity predicated on a settled white Irish subject position. Chapter Four’s exploration of migrant-produced programmes on Dublin community radio examined how these programmes were produced in line with a remit predicated on serving a wider community or community of interest. As of 2008, Ireland did not have a dedicated, permanent multicultural or multiethnic radio station, nor did there appear to be a strategy in place at policy level for one to be established. A recognised model for a multicultural radio station across Europe, Berlin’s Radio MultiKulti broadcasted multicultural, although not necessarily migrant-produced (see Morawska 2008), programmes since its inception in 1988. Radio MultiKulti, which was on air from 1988 until 2008, operated as a public service broadcaster from the beginning, and from 2003 was one of several Berlin public service broadcasters under the umbrella of the public service corporation Rundfunk Berlin-Brandenburg (Kosnick 2008: 54). As Kosnick has argued, some of Radio MultiKulti’s programming and editing policies have been problematic in the ways in which they consistently frame migrant-produced programmes or other programmes simply featuring migrant subjects, in relation to and as framed by a German nation-ness (Kosnick 2008). Yet Radio MultiKulti remains an established example of a relatively long-running multicultural service (Morawska 2008).
Partly to posit an alternative to ‘multicultural’ and migrant-produced programmes framed by the overarching project of the station broadcasting them, this chapter will document and explore the informing concepts of performing multiculturalism and transnational articulation as they are manifest in conceptions of a dedicated multicultural radio station in Ireland. The central elements represented as inherent to a dedicated multicultural service are first discussed through analysis of two applications for a multicultural license in Ireland, following the BCI’s 2004 call for tenders for a multicultural station. Part One invokes a close reading of both documents and their discursive framing of migrant participation and practitioner agency, in an attempt to interrogate the discourses employed by the BCI in its application guidelines. The two applicants were consortia: Fáilte FM and Global FM. Each consortia stated their intention of creating a new multicultural station to promote multiculturalism and facilitate transnational participation and articulation in Irish radio. This analysis will focus on the Fáilte FM and Global FM applications, specifically on the language used in reference to representing diversity and the provisions for inclusiveness and proposals for scheduling and programming, and thus further attempt to uncover the informing ethos behind the applications as well as the suggested strategies for balancing the various migrant communities represented.

Part Two focuses on analysis of Sunrise FM, a dedicated multiethnic station twice granted a temporary license, which broadcast from Dublin’s northside. This analysis scrutinises the strategies through which Sunrise FM branded itself as ‘Ireland’s first multiethnic station’, which include multilingual programming or what I term ‘first language radio’. Sunrise FM broadcast for three months in spring 2005 and for a second period of three months in spring 2006 and was the first, and at time of writing
only, realised dedicated multicultural radio (or television) station in the Republic of Ireland, although established on a temporary basis. This critique of Sunrise FM aims to uncover the commercial and community interests informing the station’s scheduling and programming strategies and the ways in which the station branded itself. In interrogating both the BCI application process and the station branding of and programming decisions at Sunrise FM, this chapter attempts to address the questions: how does a dedicated station decide on which communities to represent, and how is equitable access to the airwaves provided for by stated station policy?

**Parity of Participation?**

Both the 2004 applicants for the multicultural license and Sunrise FM embody strategies of migrant participation in radio, expanding the possibilities for participation from presenting and/or producing programmes to the creation of a station dedicated to articulating migrant experience and facilitating migrant community building. The concept of participation is itself contested and fluid in its meaning and circulation, as described by Carpentier (2006). It is necessary to distinguish between ‘participation’ and ‘access’, where ‘access’ refers to the availability of choice and the opportunity to provide feedback (Carpentier 2006), and ‘participation’ implies ‘a higher level of public involvement .... in the production process and also in the management and planning of communication systems’ (Servaes 1999: 85). It is also necessary to further focus understanding of the notion of participation as it is applied with regard to the media, where ‘media participation’ is distinguished as being either ‘in’ or ‘through’ in relation to democratizing processes. As Carpentier explains:

Participation “in” the media deals with the participation of non-professionals in the production of media output (content-related participation) and in media
decision-making (structural participation). These forms of media participation allow citizens to be active in one of the many (micro-) spheres relevant to daily life and to put their right to communicate into practice.

(Carpentier 2006: 88)

Carpentier's observation can be read as referring to audience participation in media spheres for purposes of individual articulation which could contribute to democratic practice through debate. However, the definition applies here through its invocation of the processes of democratisation, and also because those migrants producing, researching and/or presenting programmes aren't necessarily trained professional media practitioners. In the context of training members of migrant communities to produce content for Radio One World, Helen Shaw insists on the importance of training migrant practitioners and adds: ‘what I was encouraging them all to think about was community licenses, to look at making their own, to take control of some of [the process]’ (interview with Helen Shaw, 11 November 2005). In this chapter’s analysis of the components which could comprise a multicultural or transnational radio service, the emphasis on and necessity for practitioner training is a central aspect of an effective radio service.

In Squires’ (2002) typology, within which a public sphere ‘refers to a set of physical or mediated spaces where people can gather and share information, debate opinions, and tease out their political interests and social needs with other participants’ (Squires 2002: 448), she notes the lack of access to participation in public discourse that can be experienced by marginalised groups: ‘[p]revailing social norms may instill fear in citizens of marginalized publics that their ideas would at best be met with indifference, and at worst violence. Thus the ideal of an open public sphere is difficult to realize for oppressed groups’ (ibid.: 449). Within Squires’ broader definition of
alternate publics, this thesis identifies the discursive space of the self-defined multicultural radio programme as its own public sphere. Chapter Four has attempted to locate selected programmes within this typology, which identifies three types of public: enclave, counterpublic and satellite publics. As Carpentier’s and Squires’ assertions make clear, these mediated broadcast spaces provide a necessary location and resource for migrant articulation, participation and practitioner agency.

A dedicated multicultural, or multiethnic, radio service potentially provides a broader, more diverse space which can incorporate overlapping publics within it. As this chapter unpacks the proposed and actual components of such a service, it will also identify how a multiethnic and transcultural radio station can incorporate and balance the diverse cultures articulated within it. As to why a dedicated multietnic radio service is needed, Squires in reference to Fraser’s discussion of the subaltern counterpublic, argues as follows:

In societies structured by inequalities, members of dominant groups have many advantages because they have set the spoken and unspoken rules for public speech. Even if access to public arenas is theoretically granted to all, all will not necessarily be equal within those spaces.

(ibid.: 450)

Part One: License Applicants Fáilte FM and Global FM

Community Service or Commercial Sustainability?

In spring 2004 the BCI called for applications for a new radio station license for a dedicated multicultural service in Dublin. Two consortia submitted applications: Global FM and Fáilte FM. An analysis of the ways in which each applicant group
responded to the criteria set out by the BCI in the application document serves to explore how multicultural or multiethnic radio was conceived by both groups and by the BCI. Through analysis of application categories and the two approaches, one commercial, one community-based, of the consortia applying for the license, I hope here to examine the areas emphasised in the application document by Fáilte FM and Global FM. The spokesperson and Chief Executive for Global FM was Chinedu Onyejelem, editor of *Metro Éireann*, which defines itself as ‘Ireland’s first multicultural newspaper’. The spokesperson for Fáilte FM was Sally Galiana, Station Manager at NEAR FM on Dublin’s north side. Listed as a second contact in the Fáilte FM application was Brendan O’Caoimh, co-ordinator of Pavee Point’s Cultural Heritage Programme, dedicated to retrieving the undocumented history of the Irish Traveller community (Global FM and Fáilte FM applications, BCI, 2004). The Global FM application was based on a commercial license model, whereas Fáilte FM’s application was based on a community license model.¹

Close reading of both applications uncovers a general commonality of purpose, characterised by a stated emphasis on inclusiveness, particularly in broadcast philosophies and programme strategies. Each applicant group employs a discourse of inclusiveness promoting migrant and Traveller access and participation across different sections of the application. Global FM’s application incorporates a clear promotion of the multicultural project alongside a recognition for the increasing necessity for greater migrant self-representation on air, evidenced by the inclusive name ‘Global’ itself and in a proposed station slogan: ‘Dublin’s World Station’. In contrast, Fáilte FM’s message, contained in its Irish-language name meaning ‘welcome’, is less immediately inclusive precisely because it is in Irish, so less
comprehensible to most new migrant language groups. Both applications note that members of new migrant communities have learned Irish; however, including these the number of people living in Dublin who use Irish regularly is arguably still too small for the station name ‘Fáilte’ to have a pervasive meaning to most people living in the city. Yet the intent of inclusiveness in both slogans is evident.

The thematic centrality of inclusiveness is also inherent in each application’s broadcast philosophy. Under its proposed breakdown of programme content, Fáilte FM’s application states: ‘The programmes will have a philosophy of “By, of and for” the listeners. With ongoing consultation we will change the programming as the demand occurs’ (Fáilte FM application, 2004). Accountability to all migrant communities represented by the proposed station is further indicated by the following:

We intend operating the service on the basis of the maxim; “Nothing about us, without us.” We will ensure that each programme dealing with a particular group or issue will be in the control of that group. We will offer access and empowerment with professional guidance.

(ibid.)

Under the ‘Broadcast Philosophy’ heading, Fáilte FM outlines the following aims:

The station will develop a strategy of training and capacity building to promote the following objectives:

To promote the participation and integration of refugees, asylum seekers, immigrants and Travellers within the wider Dublin society.

To engage with the community and voluntary sector and statutory organisations to enhance integration.

To promote public education and information around immigrant and Traveller issues.

To highlight the experiences of asylum seekers, Travellers and immigrants in Dublin.

To encourage the development of immigrant networks.
To protect ethnic cultures and to assist immigrant groups develop [sic] common policy positions.

To create a platform for the exposure and appreciation of Irish and other ethnic music.

To promote the Irish language and the languages of the immigrant and traveller[sic] communities.

To provide media training and access to immigrant groups to enable them to communicate themselves to the wider Dublin community.

To give Travellers and other ethnic minorities the skills and experience necessary to produce radio programming representative of themselves as individuals and as an ethnic group.

To promote interculturalism in Dublin.²

((ibid.)

In both their broadcast philosophy statement and throughout their application, Fáilte FM consistently includes the Traveller community amongst the other communities acknowledged. This inclusion locates the established, although consistently marginalised, community of Travellers in Ireland alongside newer migrant communities. Fáilte FM additionally states its intent of building community networks in their ‘Broadcast Philosophy’ statement; this emphasis on networks can be read as embodying a concrete, grassroots approach to promoting integration. More broadly, the Fáilte FM application actively states the aim to encourage and promote community activity extending beyond the station’s programming, such as encouraging the further formation of community-held policy positions. In the emphasis on community-building and the practice of social justice, Fáilte FM’s application embodies elements of community radio’s ethos of community development.

In their ‘Programme Policy’ statement Fáilte FM frame their proposed output in the form of a critique of Ireland’s mainstream media structures:
We take as our starting point an implicit criticism of existing media, not of existing practitioners within the Irish media sector, but the structures, mindsets and output of media in general. We ask the same question put by Niall Crowley of the Equality Authority:

"Who are the decision makers, the designers, the reporters and the printers within the media organisations? From what societal groups are they drawn? The bulk of these people have a common background and experience. What training do they have in relation to informing their understanding of poverty, exclusion and inequality?" (and immigration?)

(ibid.)

This critique of Irish mainstream media suggests a strategy of critique in Fáilte FM’s approach to representation, and emphasises the difference in available resources across the mainstream and the community sectors.

Global FM represents itself as a facilitator of migrant community activity in its provision of a channel for migrant expression. Its stated ‘Broadcast Philosophy’ reads:

GLOBAL is the voice of the ethnic communities of Dublin while simultaneously providing a vibrant channel for all the people of Dublin to explore diverse arts and culture as well as the issue of migration and international current affairs. It serves as a tool for creating cross-cultural bridges, empowering ethnic minority groups, encouraging self-reliance and fostering a positive outlook.

(Global FM application, BCI, 2004)

Directly below this on the application, a short statement pithily summarises the station’s proposed audience: ‘Target Audience - new Irish, old Irish, the hidden people, the invisible people, tourists, the person beside you on the bus’ (ibid.). In a February 2007 interview, Onyejelem reiterated the phrase ‘the person beside you on the bus’, suggesting this phrase or slogan had become central to his conceptualisation of an inclusive multicultural station. In the application, this sentence is followed by several others each describing different groups perceived to be Global FM’s target.
audience, including old and new migrant communities and ‘international students.’ The Traveller community is also included: ‘various people who have Irish citizenship but also claim separate or varied ethnicity, such as members of the Travelling community’ (ibid.).

The specified fields required within the application document set out by the BCI are themselves replicated within of Fáilte FM’s application. Fields within the application form such as ‘Language Programming’ and ‘Promotion of Talent’ can be read as particularly supportive of a project of migrant participation. These fields are of particular interest because they indicate areas perceived by the BCI as necessary to a multicultural service. The application category of ‘Promotion of Talent’ can be read as an indicator of each applicant’s commitment to migrant participation and agency in programme production, providing a space for the applicant group to identify the concrete methods which would be used to achieve this. Under this section, Global FM’s application reads:

GLOBAL FM is unique in that it is dedicated to minority groups and their interests which are under-represented in the Irish media, and it provides a new platform for untapped talent in Ireland which might not otherwise get a chance to develop in the broadcasting sector. We are hoping to involve people both as contributors on the radio as well as in the production and presentation of various genres of programming. We are certain that this opportunity will bring to the fore people - Irish and non-Irish minorities - who might not otherwise be noticed.

(Global FM application, BCI, 2004)

This statement asserts an intention to hire people inexperienced in broadcasting for the development of their abilities. Fáilte FM’s ‘Promotion of Talent’ statement is consistent with its overarching ethos of the promotion of migrant equity and agency in its mention of an ‘open door policy’: ‘The service will have an open door access
policy for new talent. The music policy above will allow wider opportunities for new
creative talent in new fields’ (Fáilte FM application, BCI, 2004). However, the
proposed hiring practices are not developed further. In contrast, NEAR FM has been
regularly running training workshops for over five years and (as noted in Chapter
Four) has an established history of broadcasting multicultural programmes, and the
Fáilte FM application incorporates mention of assistance from NEAR FM with
training.

In the counterpublic of Irish community radio, migrant-produced programmes have
primarily been broadcast in the language of the migrant community targeted by the
programme. As noted in Chapter Four, these languages have included Mandarin,
Russian, Korean, Polish and Spanish among others. Programmes which are directed at
specific linguistic communities are only occasionally broadcast in English, when
English serves as an inclusive lingua franca as in African Scene. The ‘Language
Programming’ category on the BCI application document appears to acknowledge the
existence of non-English language programming in the criteria provided:

Please set out the proposed policy and practice in relation to programmes in
languages other than English. In particular please indicate whether any
programmes will be broadcast in the Irish language. Please provide an
overview of the duration, frequency, content and sources of dedicated
language programming.

(Heading from the Fáilte FM application, BCI, 2004)

This wording, and the inclusion of the category itself, emphasises non-English
language programmes as separate, although the category title doesn’t explicitly reflect
that ‘Language Programming’ means non-English language programming.
Both Fáilte FM and Global FM acknowledge the need in their application documents for linguistically accessible programming but state generally that English language programming is more accessible to a wider audience, comprised of the settled Irish community and members of new migrant communities who can speak and understand English. Global FM asserts this under ‘Language Programming’:

It is proposed that the principal language of the service be English, but with supplements in major international languages, and in the minority language used by communities in Dublin.³

Education experts have long taken the view that an over-emphasis on immigrants learning English inadvertently devalues their cultures. It is with this understanding of the unique cultural significance of language in mind that GLOBAL will be a multilingual radio station. A ‘Cluas Eile’ if you will.⁴

We will have programmes and segments dedicated to languages, giving preference to people[sic] with the largest number of speakers. These languages would include Mandarin and Cantonese Chinese, Filipino, Polish, Lithuanian, Latvian and Russian, Yoruba, Romanian, Hindi and Punjabi. The use of the major international working languages such as French, Arabic, Spanish and Portuguese will be of benefit to both native speakers and learners. While the station cannot be a broadcast tower of babel we need to recognise the value of other languages.... As broadcast [sic] is an organic process Global will take the steps its audience needs and respond appropriately....Because of our close connections with members of ethnic communities in Dublin, we will have a good sense of what language in a given scenario would be more apt.

(Global FM application, BCI, 2004)⁵

This statement acknowledges a key and potentially contested element of building a multicultural station: the question of which linguistic communities gain the most airtime. A hierarchy of migrant communities and languages thus employed emerges in both the two applications as well as in Sunrise FM’s documentation and practice, as will be discussed in Part Two. The question of which languages, and linguistic communities, are privileged and are included in the station schedule provides a way into understanding the creation of that hierarchy and the ongoing problematic of balancing radio programming and the station schedule with reference to that
hierarchy. Additionally, GLOBAL FM’s proposed schedule includes two slots for the broadcast of English classes on air, which can be read as promoting further education.

In relation to ‘Language Programming’, Fáilte FM states the following:

The policy will be based on demand from the groups. We expect to have weekly programmes in Arabic, Chinese, French, Romania[sic], Russian and some others. There will also be some bilingual programmes for Nigerian communities eg. [sic]

Irish will also feature as part of the multi-lingual integration. Radio na Life, as part of the community radio forum, will have a role to play as they have many non-national Irish speakers, whom we intend to involve. We will also put strong emphasis on bilingualism.

(Fáilte FM application, BCI, 2004)

The proposed broadcasting of Irish-language programming is also provided for in both applications, with both putting forward the argument that some new migrants to Ireland have learned Irish in addition to those settled Irish who learned the language in school.

Fáilte FM’s statement under ‘Presentation Style’ references the centrality of migrant accents within a multicultural radio service:

We will use ethnic voices, speaking naturally. In particular Minority [sic] audience programmes, eg [sic] Travellers, will maintain their normal accents.

Where programmes are aimed at integration and a wider audience, their[sic] will be more emphasis on the clarity of speech.

(ibid.)

The intent here is towards facilitating migrant community articulation through the incorporation of migrant accents and other accents, such as Traveller accents, which connote an ethnicity other to that of the settled white Irish community. However, the
above statement becomes problematic in its mention of the ‘clarity of speech’, where it is not clear if this ‘clarity’ is located in the accent of the speaker or in what is being said. It is worth noting that both applications repeatedly use the terms minorities or ethnic minorities, possibly because these terms retain a discursive currency and have been understood as applying to all ethnicities, new and established alike, in a host or receiving country.

Discourse around the use of multiple migrant community languages in both applications can itself be inherently polarising, as in this excerpt from the Fáilte FM application, from its ‘Brief Description of Programme Service’: ‘These programmes will tell our stories and play our music, sometimes for ourselves in our own languages and other times to the broad[sic] Dublin audience’ (Fáilte FM application, BCI, 2004). Sally Galiana, who coordinated the Fáilte FM application process, is Spanish and self-identifies as a migrant in Ireland; her use of the word ‘our’ here references her migrant subject position. In one sense this is an inclusive statement, as it speaks from within a migrant perspective; on the other, it describes a binary relationship between ‘ourselves’ and the ‘broad Dublin audience’.

The representation of diversity often manifests as overlapping spaces each occupied by each community represented. Central to Squires’ argument is her problematisation of the Black public sphere, referred to by the Black Public Sphere Collective as a singular space; although it is not actually described as such in their analysis, as Squires points out (Squires 2002). Instead, as she and they argue through examples, it embodies multiple collectives of members of the Black diaspora. These arguments are predicated on the Black public sphere and its historical shifts in the US. I propose,
however, that this way of conceptualising the Black public sphere can be used to read a migrant public sphere that embodies similar traits and overlapping collectives. Thus ‘migrant’ can be substituted in the following description of Squires’ conceptualisation of the Black public sphere:

To make this diversity more visible and to recognize that not all people who are classified as Black will participate in all or any Black publics, I propose we speak of multiple Black publics. Thus a Black public is an emergent collective composed of people who (a) engage in common discourses and negotiations of what it means to be Black, and (b) pursue particularly defined Black interests. This definition, although still wedded to the idea that there is a Black social group, does allow for heterogeneous Black publics to emerge, and also for people who do not identify as Black, but are concerned with similar issues, to be involved in a coalition with Black people.

(Squires 2002: 454)

Identifying a singular public sphere, albeit one characterised by multiple, overlapping publics within it, as ‘migrant’ establishes such spaces as being ‘other’ than the mainstream, following Fraser’s differentiation between the dominant public sphere and subaltern counterpublics (Fraser 1993). It remains a binary distinction, where a utopian impulse would eventually lead to transcultural articulation within the dominant public sphere. However, identifying the structures comprising the alternate publics thus described may eventually lead to implementation of those structures within the mainstream public sphere.

A further question emerges following perusal and examination of proposed programming in both applications: how to fairly balance representation and participation of the different communities identified. The question applies to content and scheduling, to choosing the languages used on air; and as an expression of community, to faith-based coverage. Once communities to be represented are named within each application, they are then located inside a hierarchy of representation,
which is brought to bear, albeit in a vague, incomplete manner due to the function of the application to propose future programming, in the representation of different communities within different programming slots or as examples or case studies of subjects and communities to be covered. Many of Global FM’s proposed weekday programmes are based around areas of common interest across migrant communities, inviting listeners and contributors from all communities interested in the subject matter. Programme titles include Your Voice, World Wrap and The Clinic. As described within the application, the first two focus on current affairs within the wider migrant community, with Your Voice in the form of a phone-in show; the last served as an on-air ‘clinic’ for migrant queries regarding Irish infrastructure (Global FM application, BCI).

In addition to linguistically targeted communities it could be argued that communities could also be defined and categorised on the basis of their faith. In January 2007 the BCI received applications for a ‘new quasi-national Christian and Religious sound broadcasting service’, indicating they consider a faith-centred radio service a valid category; in March 2008 the BCI awarded the license to Life FM in Cork city. In its 2004 application Global FM includes space in its detailed proposed schedule for programmes to cover religious events, incorporate prayer or other religious readings, or address spiritual approaches or issues. This proposed content is first introduced by a note in the ‘Programme Schedule’ section stating that a weekly prayer, ‘Khutba Live’ would be played for eight minutes every Friday from an unspecified mosque. An hour-long programme is proposed for broadcast Saturday from 7 - 8pm called ‘Spiritual Talk’ and is described as follows: ‘The weekend religious programmes will invite different peace activists, spiritual and religious leaders to talk about peace,
inclusion, etc. This will be presented with religious music’ (ibid.). Additionally, a programme called ‘Religious Service’ is proposed in the Sunday schedule from 10am to 12noon and is described as follows:

The weekend religious programmes will offer alternating spaces between all the main religious denominations. The main religions practiced in the country - the various Christian denominations, Muslim and Jewish faiths, Buddhism and Taoists, Hindus others [sic] will all receive airtime. In the spaces allocated, there will be religious service, panel discussions, call-ins, preachers, music, reports or any combinations of these.

Although the above describes different faiths instead of languages, it retains the inclusive discourse characteristic of other sections of the application. Global FM’s application further includes programmes dedicated to children and to older people, which contributes to a programming schedule informed by an inclusive imperative (ibid.).

Global FM’s application is consistently informed by discourses of professionalism, manifested in the following areas: a writing style which incorporates inclusive language; recurring mention of access to and use of updated technology in programme production; evidence and mention of audience research; reference to various aspects of professional broadcasting practice, such as preferred presentation and editorial styles and reference to the necessity of branding the station using jingles and promos. The repeated emphases on professionalized production practice is typical of a commercial application. In contrast, Fáilte FM’s application is primarily informed by the suggested need to promote migrant political agency, in the form of building community networks, enabling expression of community arts, establishing space for debate of policy and critique of the mainstream media, amongst other issues. In
interview, Galiana explained that the Fáilte FM consortia requested consideration as a community station, which the BCI agreed to despite initially conceiving of the multicultural license as a commercial service (Interview with Galiana, 1 February 2007).

Global FM’s application was turned down because it was perceived as unsustainable financially, according to Chinedu Onyejelem, the consortia’s CEO at the time of the 2004 application. He explains:

In our own case, they said we were going to lose so much money, it was finance. The programming, they were more than happy with, the programming. So it was just that, financing, they said it was going to lose so much money....Not that it wasn’t viable. They felt that you know losing so much money - this is my interpretation of their letter - losing so much money before you start making money, that something could go wrong in between. That was my interpretation of it.⁸

The BCI stated that general sustainability was a key criterion in assessing both applications,⁹ explaining briefly that:

The Commission’s decision regarding any future multi-cultural service will be dependent on receipt of expressions of interest in providing such a service, spectrum availability and receipt of an application/s of sufficient quality.¹⁰

Both Onyejelem and Galiana have indicated they might be prepared to re-apply if the BCI should advertise a multicultural radio license again.¹¹

Part Two: Sunrise FM: Multiethnic, Multilingual Radio

In its provision of migrant-produced programming incorporating and featuring migrant community languages, Sunrise FM was ideally situated to produce transcultural radio content, by facilitating participatory radio production led by diverse migrant community groups and attracting a diverse migrant listenership. In the
juxtaposition of glossy station branding more characteristic of commercial stations alongside migrant-produced programmes made with the limited resources of community radio, Sunrise FM moves between performing multiculturalism and articulating migrant perspectives. The station’s jingles and promos are glossily produced, providing a consistent message of multicultural celebration, while its programmes, with several exceptions, are broadcast in the languages of the migrant presenters and target communities, facilitating transnational articulation. Although the messages are typical of a multicultural expression of inclusiveness, the word ‘multiculturalism’ is substituted by the word ‘multiethnic’ on all station IDs and promos.

Sunrise FM was conceived as a business venture; Managing Director Irfan Malik, previously an entrepreneur based in London, identified multicultural radio as a potentially viable business opportunity. As such, he was one of a growing group of migrant entrepreneurs who, following the Irish economic boom, perceived Ireland as a location providing new investment opportunities. The brand name Sunrise FM, or the Sunrise Group, is a recognised brand for Asian broadcasting in Britain, with Sunrise stations in Bradford, Birmingham, Coventry, Edinburgh, Glasgow and London. While neither Malik nor the Irish Sunrise FM is affiliated with the British consortium, Malik identified the potential usefulness of the name as a recognised brand for multicultural broadcasting for migrant communities who had come to Dublin from Britain.

Sunrise FM was granted a temporary license spanning a three-month period in spring 2005 and again in spring 2006, broadcasting on weekends only. The BCI contracts for
Sunrise FM from both years refer specifically to an ‘Asian Radio Service’. The station’s first three-month broadcast in 2005 was reportedly almost entirely dedicated to serving Dublin’s Asian community, as indicated by their 2005 application. By 2006 Sunrise FM widened their remit to incorporate and represent more migrant communities in their programme schedule, although programmes dedicated to diverse Asian communities retained the popular evening programming slots.

Under ‘Brief Description of Programme Service’, the 2005 Sunrise Radio application states:

Sunrise Radio intends to provide the Asian community in the Greater Dublin region with a radio station which reflects the views of this varied community. Sunrise Radio intends to broadcast at weekends. The programmes will be entertaining and informative in a mix of languages concentrating on listener participation in both input and output. It will be dedicated to the tastes and interests of this growing community providing a unique in depth service that is not currently available.

(Sunrise Radio application, BCI, 2005)

With its station identification messages (station IDs) Sunrise FM represented itself as more broadly multicultural, with programmes representing various communities including Chinese, Russian, African, Polish and eastern Europeans, as well as communities from the Indian subcontinent. A few of the programmes were broadcast solely in English, such as Welcome to Sunrise, Sunrise Immigration Information, Swap Shop with Asian Choice and Sunrise Week Ahead. Others were bilingual, including Meeting Point and African Eye. Finally, many programmes were broadcast exclusively in the language of their target migrant community, including China This Week, The Chinese Music Programme, Eastern European Eye, Poles Apart, Asian Newsweek, Talking Persia, Arabian Days.
The proliferation of languages heard on Sunrise FM could be seen as, and was marketed as, part of or even inherent to the station’s promotion of multiculturalism. The degree to which programmes broadcast exclusively in the language of their focus community are themselves polarising is discussed above in the context of proposed multilingual programming; although certainly the option of single-language broadcasting serves a democratic purpose. It is further worth remembering however that a proliferation of languages does not indicate, or necessarily promote, mutual intelligibility; a point also made by Spivak (2003): ‘An important infrastructural problem of the restricted permeability of global culture is the lack of communication within and among the immense heterogeneity of the subaltern cultures of the world’ (Spivak 2003: 16).

This lack of cross-communication is not necessarily apparent across multilingual programming. Further, as stated above, a radio station self-defined as both multicultural and multilingual can possibly only exist in the globalised metropolis which attracts immigration from disparate nations and continents. This linguistic diversity, built into station programming policy from the start, further facilitates transcultural radio production.

**First Language Radio**

As previously discussed, the term ‘first language radio’ is suggested by Langer’s (2005) term ‘third language radio’ (Langer 2005: 122), referring to the fact that the language of migrant or ethnic community programmes is often a lingua franca, a ‘third’ language for the broadcasters. For Langer, that country is Canada, which has two official state languages, English and French; his term assumes migrant or ethnic
broadcasters would speak both, in addition to their first language, that of their linguistic community. I coin the phrase ‘first language radio’ here as this study contends that, in the context of relatively recent inward migration to Ireland, many migrant-produced programmes here are in the ‘first’ language of migrant practitioners: the language they grew up speaking.

Although non-English language programmes are immediately and inherently linked by a shared language to the migrant and linguistic communities they address, those migrant-produced programmes on NEAR FM and Anna Livia FM which are produced primarily or solely in the languages of their target communities can lack crossover potential in the mainstream public sphere because they are not as widely accessible. Audiences drawn to community radio often have a specific interest in a particular programme because they have an interest in the topics covered or know the people involved, meaning that even English-language programmes on community radio often have less crossover potential beyond a niche listenership. Programmes not broadcast in English, located for English-speakers into Langer’s (2005) category of third language media, or this study’s ‘first language radio’, are linguistically inaccessible to most settled Irish listeners, as well as members of other migrant communities for whom English is a lingua franca. Problematically, a linguistic aural divide reinforces the polarisation between the dominant English-language public sphere and those counterpublics comprised of migrant-produced programmes in languages other than English. Lewis (2008) notes two separate categories of multiple language broadcasting in community media: polylingualism, which describes the existence of several programmes in a given station, each in a different language, and multilingualism: the use of more than one language in a single programme.17
Accented cultural texts communicate by ‘expressing, allegorizing, commenting upon, and critiquing the home and host societies and cultures and the deterritorialised conditions of the [producers]’ (Naficy 2001: 4). First language radio lends itself intrinsically to this interstitial mode of production because of the fact first language radio broadcasters are, by definition, speaking their ‘home’ language in a different country and within a different linguistic context. Through the practice of simply speaking their own language, they are asserting their national/cultural identity, the articulation of which paves the way for the further avenues of expression described by Naficy.

Anderson (1991) argues that ‘[l]anguages...appear rooted beyond almost anything else in contemporary societies’ (Anderson 1991: 145), noting the ‘primordialness of languages, even those known to be modern’ and suggesting that the birth date of any individual language cannot be definitively traced. Hence, he says, ‘there is a special kind of contemporaneous community which language alone suggests’ (ibid.). If nation was conceived of through language, language is also what defines a community, more deeply and thoroughly than geographical or political borders. Historically, Anderson explains, ‘the major states of Europe were vast polyglot polities, of which the boundaries almost never coincided with language-communities’ (ibid.: 196). As a consequence of substantial inward migration, Ireland has become a polyglot culture, with diverse languages heard in most public spaces. Migrants speaking their first language may be articulating their home country’s nation-ness, but they are also using that language simply to communicate with other migrants from the same linguistic community.
Public Service, Private Enterprise

When Sunrise FM was broadcasting in spring 2006, there was a pronounced emphasis on branding the station, in particular its transnational appeal, during its short tenure on air. Following Chapter Four’s unpacking of how counterpublics facilitate transcultural articulation, my analysis here seeks to identify how Sunrise FM provided a recognised transcultural broadcasting space through branding, sponsorship and scheduling. The ways in which Sunrise FM branded itself are drawn from commercial approaches to station branding through a series of pithy and accessible slogans. In contrast, the messages of sponsorship broadcast by the station resemble community radio practice in their reciprocal support of local businesses, which in turn provide stated support for the station. An overview of Sunrise FM’s schedule serves to illustrate the diverse migrant communities represented on the station and opens up an inquiry into the politics of programme scheduling.

Prior to ‘Census Day’ on 23 April 2006, Sunrise FM (along with commercial and public service television and radio stations) repeatedly broadcasted a public service announcement (PSA) in English, explaining the importance of completing the Census form and detailing the information required. The PSA utilises positive, inclusive language, including phrases such as ‘It’s so important to make sure you’re included on a Census form’; ‘See the bigger picture and be a part of it’. Riyaz Patel, a presenter on three Sunrise FM programmes, reinforced the message of the Census PSA and further encouraged listeners to complete the form by commenting immediately afterwards:
The countdown, the countdown. 23 April, very important day. Make sure you tick the right boxes and remember the information is very, very confidential, so feel free to tell the authorities what they ask of you.

(Sunrise FM, 7 April 2006)

The PSA, and the presenter’s corresponding encouragement to listeners, urging them to take part in the Census, can be read as supportive of participation in the Census, and thus, arguably, of participation in the Irish public sphere.

Sunrise FM reinforced its stated inclusive ethos via a series of repeated station identification (station ID) messages, played repeatedly at intervals throughout each 48 hour weekend broadcast. These included the following statements, broadcast in turn:

Sunrise FM: Your home away from home
Sunrise FM: Your passport to the world
Sunrise FM: Ireland’s first multiethnic radio station
Sunrise FM: Multiethnic radio for Dublin
Sunrise FM: The African voice of Dublin
Sunrise FM: The Indian voice of Dublin

(Sunrise FM, spring 2006)

These messages effectively and persistently reinforce Sunrise FM’s multicultural project, in a wider broadcasting context wherein multiculturalism is understood and represented as the connotation of difference in the mainstream public sphere. The station IDs are in English and broadcasted during non-English as well as English-language programmes. Each promotes a message of non-specific inclusiveness, using simple, accessible terms and phrases with universal, international connotations such as ‘home’ and ‘passport’; words with particular resonance for recent migrants. These messages variously celebrate a universal multiculturalism and denote specific migrant communities. However, each of these station IDs are voiced in the accent of a middle-class Irish woman. Possibly the rationale behind this is to increase accessibility for
listeners, migrant and settled, who hear in that utterance the voice of the mainstream Irish public sphere, which is primarily characterised by Irish middle-class accents. A further rationale could be the aural clarity of the voice, as discussed above in relation to the framing of migrant accents in Fáilte FM’s application, where the perceived idea that some accented voices lacked aural clarity informed their statement under ‘Presentation Style’. Yet in contrast to the use of the Irish female voice, presenter Riyaz Patel, a South African of Indian ancestry, incorporated several of Sunrise FM’s slogans in his programme introduction. [Audio 15; 1:29sec]

In addition to these short and snappy station IDs, Sunrise FM also occasionally broadcasted longer ads for the station emphasising its project of inclusiveness:

Welcome to Sunrise FM. From Ireland to India, from Poland to Pakistan, from Beijing to, from Moscow to Mumbai, from Cape Town to Cairo, from Madrid to Mombasa, nobody covers the world like Sunrise FM.

(Sunrise FM, 23 April 2006)

Join us every Saturday between 6am and 9am for all things African. The Asian Connection: every Saturday from 5pm until midnight and every Sunday from 6pm until 11pm. For all things Polish, join us here on Sunrise every Saturday morning between 10 and 1 and Sundays between 10 and 12. For the latest news and interviews from China, join us Saturday morning between 2 and 3.

(Sunrise FM, 30 April 2006)

In the second station promo above, each sentence is read out by a different voice with an accent correlating to the linguistic community mentioned.

A much longer station promotion takes the recognisable form of a vox pop item. Running just over three minutes, this longer station ‘promo’ details the multicultural aims of inclusiveness and cross community communication represented by Sunrise FM. This ‘promo’ features various differently accented voices describing their
(always positive) reaction to hearing about a new multicultural radio service, usually but not always in response to another voice asking ‘what do you think about this new radio station?’ Most of the voices heard state their name and where they are from; countries named include Algeria, China, Liberia, Pakistan, Poland, Russia, Somalia, Spain, South Africa and ‘South India’. There is also a female middle-class Irish voice. Within the ‘promo’ there is a recurring emphasis from the contributors on the need for dedicated programmes in migrant community languages. Several accented migrant voices contribute the following comments transcribed below, which form part of the extended ‘promo’ which can be heard in full on the audio track. [Audio 16; 3:56sec]

I thought, brilliant, like I heard all the Chinese programmes, like in our own country, news, you know, that is a brilliant thing. I would suggest having more of these programmes, let Chinese enjoy it, because our English not really good. So we need more Chinese to explain all those things.

I like the idea very much because there are so many immigrants that don’t speak proper English yet. I think it is a good idea to get a radio station in our own language and I think we all really enjoy listening to the music and getting new information.

Sunrise is beautiful because it has already done a good job before in here and we would appreciate it if this happened again. It’s great to hear the good songs on it and support advertising as well....

I think something of this nature would be very very important for ethnic minorities in Dublin and in Ireland in general, because there’s nothing like that....

I think that it is very good so that we can enrich the culture among the multicultural here...

I think it’s a really good idea to open multinational, multi-ethnic[ic] radio here in Ireland. It will unite all of us together....

This kind of information in my own language makes me very happy.

(Sunrise FM, 30 April 2006)
The Irish female voice contributes the following endorsement, located amongst the other voices rather than at the beginning or end of the promo:

I think it’s a great idea, I think Ireland is becoming increasingly multicultural and it’s important that the interests and the views of ethnic minorities in Ireland be heard and have a forum and be aired and I’d be very interested to listen to the station myself.

(Sunrise FM, 30 April 2006)

The contributions featured during the promo were overwhelmingly positive, with each voice speaking enthusiastically about the station and the benefits of a multiethnic radio service for Dublin. This overt branding of the station’s multiethnic focus functions as effective publicity for the station in the mainstream public sphere, which Squires identifies as central to the ‘strength’ of a public sphere: ‘The political success of a marginal public sphere is impacted by the institutions a public is able to form, ties (or lack thereof) to political actors in the state and dominant sphere, and the ability to construct effective vehicles of publicity’ (Squires 2002: 457). Further, the Irish Times profile of Malik and the station, which appeared in the paper’s Business section, served as publicity within the mainstream public sphere.18

Where the above messages reinforce Sunrise FM’s stated commitment to multiculturalism, a series of ads for migrant-run businesses serve a more localised purpose. If the frequently broadcast and professionally produced messages of multiculturalism heard on Sunrise FM were designed to circulate and be heard in a mainstream public sphere, the ads for local businesses fulfilled the more precise purpose of simply drumming up consumers. Apparently, the terms of Sunrise FM’s license precluded actual advertising, although station sponsorship was permitted.19 Consequently several local businesses identify themselves as sponsors of Sunrise FM.
Details of these businesses are broadcast sometimes in English, sometimes in other languages. The Medina Asian Food Company, located on Moore Street, advertised in both English and a second language, as did Indian Bistro. Keane Furniture advertised only in English. A Lo-call service broadcasting its sponsorship in English concentrated on a Middle Eastern listenership, although the naming of the countries served can be read as an inclusive message for migrants from those countries:

For the first time in Ireland, a revolutionary way to make international calls to the Middle East. For just a few cents a minute you can call Algeria, Bahrain, Egypt, Kazakhstan, Oman, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia including mobile and Turkey.

(Sunrise FM, 23 April 2006)

The messages of sponsorship from local businesses provide multiple frames of reference and identification for migrant communities living in the area or otherwise familiar with those businesses. Migrant communities are framed as potential consumers through the advertisements replayed on Sunrise FM. The businesses who sponsor Sunrise FM are framed in turn as successful, able to support the station fiscally as well as promoting themselves. These messages of sponsorship are characteristic of a then-emerging wider perception of selected migrant communities as target markets, but also reflect how these communities perceive themselves as potential markets. While multicultural newspaper Metro Éireann attracts advertisements from national businesses such as AIB, Bus Eireann, Dublin Bus, Eircom and O2, Sunrise FM, perhaps because of its temporary status and its community license, was only sponsored for local businesses. The exception was Newstalk 106 FM, which sponsored Sunrise FM’s news bulletins. NewsTalk 106FM is a mainstream, commercial talk radio station based in Dublin which subsequently
broadcast nationally from autumn 2006. Their sponsorship was announced in a simple on-air message: ‘International news: Sponsored by Newstalk 106’.

Both the Sunrise FM promos and the local sponsorship messages function to delineate the parameters of the counterpublic functions fulfilled by the station. One informing method of investigation of Squires’ typology identifies criteria which assists in differentiating between public spheres; as she writes:

Salient aspects of public spheres might include the following: the history of their relationships to the state and dominant publics; how diverse is a particular public sphere; what sorts of institutional resources are available to the collective; what these institutions’ relationships are to the political, economic, and media institutions of the dominant society; and how their modes of communicative and cultural expression are different from those of other publics and the entities within political and economic society.

(Squires 2002: 457)

In its broadcasting of promos which reinforce the station’s inclusive multiculturalism alongside sponsored ads supporting local, migrant-run businesses, Sunrise FM combined a mainstream, even commercial performance of multiculturalism with a transnational support of migrant commercial interests. This bridge-building across mainstream and localised publics is characteristic of Squires’ counterpublic.

**The Politics of Scheduling**

Sunrise FM broadcast each weekend for three months, from midnight Saturday morning until midnight Monday morning. The station’s schedule can be broken down into programme blocks, each block usually consisting of two or more programmes, one after another, representing a community or group of linked communities served. Each 48-hour broadcast was framed by an English language programme, beginning early Saturday morning with *Welcome to Sunrise*, which was on air until 2am, and
finishing with *Sunrise Week Ahead*, from 11pm Sunday to 12am Monday. Both programmes were presented by Riyaz Patel. *Welcome to Sunrise* was followed by *China This Week*, presented in Mandarin from 2am until 4am, followed in turn by *The Chinese Music Programme*, broadcast until 6am.

This was followed by *African Eye*, from 6am until 8am, then *African Roots*, on air until 9am. The next programme was *Sunrise Immigrant Information* from 9am until 10am, presented in English, usually, but not every week, by Riyaz Patel. After this was *Eastern European Eye*, broadcast until 12 noon, followed by *Poles Apart*, broadcast until 2pm. After this was *Radio Plus* until 3pm followed by *Eastern European Musicfest*, broadcast until 4pm, both concentrating on eastern European music and content. From 4pm until midnight on Saturday, programming represented different Asian and subcontinental Indian communities, begun with *Swap Shop with Asian Choice*. *Asian Newsweek* at 5pm was followed by *Talking Persia* at 6pm, which was then followed in turn by *Planet Bollywood* at 7pm. The next programme was *Asian Choice* at 9pm followed by *Asian Remix* at 10pm.

Sunday’s programming fell into the same community programme segments as Saturday’s, with some programmes repeated and with some slight differences in starting times. On midnight on Sunday *The Chinese Music Programme* went on air again for 3 hours, followed by *China Central* at 3am for another 3 hours. *The African Music Box* was on air at 6am followed by *The African Perspective* at 8am. After this was *Poles Apart* at 10am followed by *Radio Plus* at 12 noon and *Eastern European Musicfest* at 2pm. *Swap Shop with Asian Choice*, discussed below, ran for an hour between 4pm and 5pm. This was followed by a second block of Asian community
programmes from 5pm: Meeting Point, Talking Persia, Arabian Days, East Meets West and Bollypopping, which ended at 11pm and was followed by Sunrise Week Ahead.

As can be seen, the communities represented in the order they were broadcast were Chinese, African, Polish, other self-described ‘Eastern European’ and Middle Eastern and subcontinental Indian communities. Primarily English-language programmes such as Welcome to Sunrise, Sunrise Immigrant Information and Sunrise Week Ahead addressed migrant issues generally and were consequently more widely accessible. Swap Shop with Asian Choice was also broadcast in English and served as a broadcast version of a newspaper’s Buy and Sell section, offering an on-air bartering service for listeners. The programme served as an intensely localised radio service in which anything from household furniture to cars to restaurant fixtures and equipment could be bought and sold. The show provided another example of, and opportunity for, local migrant commerce. On both Saturday and Sunday, late morning to mid-afternoon were dedicated to programmes representing the Polish and Eastern European communities, while both evenings featured programmes of interest to diverse Asian communities.

The schedule fluctuated slightly over the three months that Sunrise FM was on air; for example, Talking Persia was moved to a 5.30pm start time from its original time of 6pm. Arabian Days on Sunday nights was replaced by The Purshto Programme. Two new programmes, European Musicfest-Spanish and European Musicfest-German were introduced during the three month broadcast period, replacing the second slot allocated to the Eastern European Musicfest, resulting in a yet more diverse schedule.
Allocating programmes time slots in any radio station’s schedule is always a political activity: some slots are more desirable than others for various reasons. Slots which attract more listeners on mainstream radio are traditionally the breakfast programme; lunchtime and early evening or ‘drivetime’, although specialist programmes can also pull in high listener numbers if they are popular. As a community licensed station not allowed to accept advertising and only broadcasting at weekends, Sunrise FM’s scheduling was not necessarily subject to the pressures informing mainstream commercial stations. However, in its comprehensive representation of diverse migrant communities, the station would be required by its community radio remit to attempt equitable representation of the migrant communities broadcasting on the station. Sunrise FM’s Chinese programming took place effectively in the middle of the night both evenings Sunrise FM was on air. Scheduled during the ‘graveyard shift’ seems undesirable due to reduced listenership and, from the practitioner’s perspective, the hardship of having to be awake and producing and presenting a programme during distinctly unsocial hours. However, evidently the middle of the night is less problematic for the Chinese community than it appears, as many Chinese in Dublin are shift workers who would listen to the show when they arrived home.  

Sunrise FM consistently represented itself as a multicultural station within its glossily produced station promos; the station’s branding serves as a performance of multiculturalism as celebratory and illustrative, emphasising as it does the different countries represented and the variety of nations broadcasting on Sunrise FM. However, in its ‘first language’ programming it facilitates transcultural articulation of migrant experience. The majority of Sunrise FM’s programmes were made by
members of the identified community and produced for that community, as evidenced by the almost exclusive use of the target migrant community language in most of the station’s programmes, although programmes such as Meeting Point broadcast in both English and Persian. This incorporation of ‘first language’ programming can be read as embodying a characteristic of Squires’ typology of the counterpublic. Within this typology, Sunrise FM can be defined as a counterpublic: it attempts to bridge the alternate and mainstream publics; it has access to resources sufficient to enable glossy production values for its jingles and promos; it encourages listener contribution to and participation in on air discussion and debates and attempts also to appeal to a wider audience, as demonstrated by its inclusive English language programming, particularly Welcome to Sunrise FM, Sunrise Immigrant Information and Sunrise Week Ahead. In these programmes presenter Riyaz sometimes raised issues for broad discussion, such as the term ‘non-national’ and where members of migrant communities outside the EU are situated in immigration debates (Sunrise Immigrant Information, 30 April 2006); both of which are informed by his subject position as an Asian migrant from South Africa. Other discussions on Welcome to Sunrise focused on Dublin itself, such as arguing the virtues of the city’s northside versus the southside or the state of childcare in the capital. (7 April 2006).

Sunrise FM moves fluidly between representing itself as a multicultural station, representing diversity for migrant communities and settled Irish listenerships alike and facilitating migrant-produced programmes. Its temporary license obviously limited its development; however as of autumn 2008 Sunrise FM has been the only dedicated multiethnic radio service in Ireland so functions to some degree as a template for future licensees. Hochheimer (1993) has identified three recurring
problems in the sustainability of ‘democratic radio’, which can be read alongside the development of a proposed multicultural or transcultural radio station in Ireland. He argues:

First, it is not always established clearly who is serving whom: small stations in culturally homogeneous areas may successfully act as channels for community members to share information and ideas between themselves - they are “of” the community, not just “for” the community - but more culturally mixed areas, with larger populations, make it difficult to identify and serve all sections of the community fairly: which are the legitimate voices to be heard and how much gatekeeping does there need to be?

Secondly, the precise degree of community participation in the production of programmes can bring problems: the most committed and active can become entrenched, while others, who are perhaps less articulate and with less physical access to the station or with less free time, can become marginalised.

Thirdly, there are emotional, economic and cultural restraints on collective enterprise: stations may reject formal structures, with clear job demarcation, wide variations in pay, and streamlined decision-making, but their preferred model of task-sharing and collective decision-making is both time-consuming and emotionally draining for those involved.

(Hochheimer 1993: 475 – 481)

The questions Hochheimer raises of how best to serve the community/ies in the catchment area, the encouragement of participation as well as the potential restraints, especially those deriving from lack of available resources, can be applied to the institutional context which Sunrise FM was operating within.

**The Future of Transcultural Radio?**

As has been argued, a sustained transnational radio service in Ireland would likely be primarily informed by the principles of community radio, if not developed wholly within the community radio model. Herman and McChesney (1997) describe the community model:

[Community and public access broadcasters] involve public participation and genuine interaction, not vertical and one-way (top-down) communication and highly controlled interaction. They are democratic media in the true sense,
and they regularly provide a community public sphere (which the mainstream media fail to do).

(Herman and McChesney 1997: 201)

However, they also recognise the limits of community radio:

> Although community radio has often done wonders, and holds some promise for democratization of the media, its limits are evident. Quality journalism and entertainment require resources, technical facilities, experience and institutional support; without these, media tend to stay small, local and marginal, even if useful.

(ibid.: 202)

Without adequate resources and crucially without comprehensive training in place, a dedicated transcultural radio service might be less than effective both at facilitating migrant articulation and at reaching and sustaining migrant and settled Irish listenership.

Within the evolution of ‘multicultural’ radio and transcultural radio in Ireland, the aims and agenda of any given radio station can also be considered. For example, Sunrise FM, through its professionally produced station promos, marketed itself for a wider audience through station branding: an approach more characteristic of a commercial station. In Hendy’s (2000) examination of participatory radio he ruefully acknowledges that this form of radio may not be as progressive as initially envisaged:

> “Participatory” radio - whether of the open community-kind or of the more clandestine-kind - is very often not quite as alternative as it might at first appear. The central question, though, is what quantity and what quality of political debate or action does it actually foster? Is it a marginal phenomenon or does it have real cultural impact?

(Hendy 2000: 201)
A dedicated transcultural radio station could provide a wider, more diverse space for migrant community expression, participation and articulation on air. It remains to be seen how that articulation would then circulate and be heard in the public sphere, whether comfortably in the mainstream or at the edges of a counterpublic. If the latter, what measurable cultural impact can such a station have? And is the establishment of a dedicated multicultural or multiethnic station also an acknowledgement of polarised broadcast production (and listening) practices across established Irish and new migrant communities in the Irish public sphere?

In arguing for new ways of framing European cultural policy in relation to transnational media and transnational audiences, Robins suggests:

> A European approach to diversity in the media and cultural sectors must involve an approach that sees diversity not as a problem, but as a resource and opportunity, an approach that can accept diversity - rather than consensus and confirmation - as being at the heart of its project and imagination.

(Robins 2006: 154)

A multiethnic radio station, such as the temporary station Sunrise FM, recognises and utilises Dublin’s diversity as a resource, as evidenced by the station ‘promos’ branding the station as ‘multiethnic’ and by a programme schedule representing that diversity. The ways in which these diverse migrant voices will continue to be broadcast in the Irish public sphere in the future remains to be seen, or indeed heard.
Notes

1 This observation was made in conversation with Declan McLoughlin, BCI, 24 July 2007.
2 Sally Galiana, who contributed to the application, argues that interculturalism is more effective at promoting integration, as she reads it as encouraging inter-relations across communities more explicitly than multiculturalism (interview with Galiana, 27 March 2006).
3 This statement indicating English would be the primary language in a proposed multicultural radio station was reiterated in interview with Onyejelem on 7 February 2007.
4 'Cluas Eile' literally translates from the Irish as 'another ear.' 'Súil eile' was a slogan used by Irish-language public television station TG4 which literally means 'another eye' but also has a meaning of 'another way of looking at things', so 'cluas eile' could also be another way of listening or hearing. This definition, and its relation to the TG4 slogan, was related to me by Gary McMahon in a personal communication on 11 June 2009.
5 It is unclear what precisely is meant by ‘major’ and ‘minor’ languages; however the definition provided of French, Arabic, etc. as ‘working languages’ is potentially a useful distinction, indicating they are used for business discussions and transactions and are consequently probably used by those migrants working in specialist positions in Ireland.
8 Interview with Onyejelem, 9 February 2007.
10 Information provided in an email from Declan McLoughlin, BCI, 24 July 2007.
11 Interviews with Galiana and Onyejelem, 1 and 7 February 2007, respectively.
13 Interview with Al Dunne, Media Consultant, who worked with Malik on the Sunrise FM application and provided some media training; 20 June 2006. Also see Emmet Oliver, ‘Rising Star of Ethnic Radio is Beginning to Sparkle’, Irish Times, 7 April 2006.
15 Interview with Al Dunne, 20 June 2006.
16 Both contracts were titled ‘Asian Radio Service’ when sent electronically as documents via email. Email communication from Jill Caulfield, BCI, 8 February 2007.
19 See O’Boyle 2006; Orarn 2006, and Clark 2005 for discussion of how selected migrant communities are framed as target markets in the mainstream public sphere.
Interview with Al Dunne, 20 June 2006.
Conclusion

Beyond the Polarisation of the Irish Public Sphere?

This research was conceived of as an attempt to chart migrant representation and participation across Irish radio and in the process explore how changes within Ireland as a result of inward migration are manifest in the Irish public sphere. As has been observed, recent inward migration is a result of an unprecedented boom in Ireland’s economy rendering the country a viable destination for migrants. This research first set out to address the question: how are migrants represented in the Irish media, and specifically how is that representation effected within a cultural context posited as historically homogenous? I have argued that ‘multicultural’ programmes produced by the Irish national broadcaster continue to situate migrant representation within a cultural context primarily recognisable to the settled white Irish community. In contrast, Dublin community radio provides opportunities for migrant self-representation on air by facilitating migrant-produced programmes. Thus, the ways in which migrant communities are represented on Irish radio differ depending on the production and institutional context, with a dichotomy clearly evident in the ways in which migrants are represented and facilitated in self-representation across the public service and community sectors of radio broadcasting. It is hoped that this research can additionally be read as comprising a useful analysis of how diversity is represented across Irish radio.
In the process of investigating the above question, this study has usefully invoked a critique of the multiculturalist project and its capacity for commodifying difference (Gordon and Newfield 1996). Consequently, in addition to exploring the question of migrant representation and participation, this research embodies a theoretical examination into some of the ways ‘multiculturalism’ is framed in the Irish public sphere. Additionally, in the recognition of multiple, overlapping public spheres (Squires 2002) and the recognition and evocation of the possibilities of a transnational public sphere (Fraser 2007), this research has sought to identify counterpublics in which ethnic and migrant-produced programming can be produced and heard. The wider implications for the future of migrant and ethnic representation on and participation in Irish radio can be read across at least three contexts: continuing cultural change in the Irish public sphere, increasing options provided by internet and digital radio and the legitimation of community media at the level European policy. These three areas are explored below.

This research has limited its examination of migrant-produced programmes in community radio to Dublin-based radio stations. A further study could be conducted into migrant-produced programmes in community radio around the country. Finally, possibly the largest area of future investigation which suggests itself following this research is an examination of first language radio, which is something that could be undertaken in reference to community stations facilitating migrant- and ethnic-produced programming around the world.
The Aftermath of the ‘Celtic Tiger’

As of autumn 2008, another economic shift has begun to take place in the form of a worldwide economic downtown and a predicted recession, with substantial implications across Irish economic, political and cultural contexts. One immediate result of the economic downturn was the 2009 Budget decision in October 2008 to merge the Equality Authority with the Irish Human Rights Commission, both state agencies whose remit included provision for migrant issues, and to subsume the National Consultative Committee on Racism and Interculturalism (NCCRI) and its functions into the Office of the Minister for Integration in the Department of Justice, Equality and Law Reform. The NCCRI is to continue to exist as an advisory committee but will crucially stop receiving funding.1 These decisions were made as part of a wider rationalization of state agencies, many of which provide support to children, the elderly and the poor, as well as to migrants, effectively constituting some of Ireland’s most marginalized groups.

As argued in the Introduction with reference to Peillon’s (2002) conception of a collapsed economic/cultural paradigm in Ireland, following the economic boom societal critique in the form of calls for public accountability has replaced a prior cultural critique which was more nuanced and less overt. Government corruption previously swept under the carpet has now been held up to the light of day in a series of tribunals, which themselves generate reportage and debate in the letters pages of mainstream newspapers. These tribunals can be framed as scrutinising activity from an earlier time, before the apparent cultural ‘break’. As Gibbons (2002) argues:
It is difficult not to suspect that the array of state tribunals and public enquiries into the underside of modernity in Ireland is motivated by a similar concern, to pathologise as extrinsic to the system circuits of deceit and power that are in fact part of its inner workings. The necessary fiction here is to present these as aberrations from another era, residues of nationalism and parish-pump politics from the days of bicycle clips, Brylcreem and the Ballroom of Romance. But these local networks are by no means alien to the systemic flows of international finance: they are intrinsic to the growth of the Celtic Tiger, rather than its embarrassing pre-history.

(Gibbons 2002: 100)

While the tribunals may have emerged as part of Ireland’s culture of enterprise, the subsequent economic crisis has led to yet louder appeals for public accountability. If Ireland has conceived of itself culturally and historically as a postcolonial nation, with the attendant crises of national confidence combined with the infrastructural and social consequences of a poor economy, the notion of a ‘break’ or disjuncture with this previous national conceptualisation with the advent of the economic boom ushered in a new national identity, at least on the surface. As Gibbons observes: ‘It is not that the “post-“ tag is dispensed with entirely but it is given a new, critical valency, shifting the emphasis from a post-colonial to a global, post-national Ireland’, moving away from ‘the delusions of nationalist historiography, especially at its “faith and fatherland” nation-building stage’ (ibid.: 90).

Yet a utopian, ‘post-national’ Ireland hasn’t fully emerged. Difference remains contained and commodified as ‘otherness’, sometimes marketed and sometimes attacked, in the mainstream Irish public sphere. The voices of the Irish mainstream media remain those of white settled Irish middle-class people. Ireland’s recognised national newspaper of record, the Irish Times, replicates and reinforces a predominantly settled white middle-
class Ireland daily, despite its dedicated but selective coverage of migrant experiences such as the ‘New Irish’ series in 2005, featuring stories about selected migrant communities. RTÉ continues to perpetuate ideological ‘nation-building’ through its programming, focusing primarily on various aspects of settled white Irish life, rural and urban, but markedly less on diverse migrant experiences in Ireland. What is more, the coverage of migrant experience and of settled white Irish experience remains separate in Irish media. Ireland’s dedicated ‘multicultural’ newspaper, Metro Éireann, focuses extensively but exclusively on migrant issues. Metro Éireann’s coverage remains essential, but is focused on migrant experience without integrating sustained coverage of settled white Irish experience. On television and on radio, RTÉ provides separate coverage of migrant life rather than interweaving issues faced by migrants with those affecting white settled Irish people. Ultimately, then, while there is migrant representation in mainstream Irish media, that representation remains limited. Finally, as has been argued, the airwaves where migrant voices can be heard remain localised: migrant-produced programmes continue to be made by migrants for migrants, thus providing a crucial service and avenue for articulation as well as for participation, but they only reach a small, local listenership. Migrant voices can be heard on the air, but they have not been incorporated into the mainstream Irish public sphere.

The persistent polarisation between a settled white Irish public sphere and a migrant public sphere can be read as evidence of historical continuity in the Irish context, rather than evidence of a rupture between an Ireland perceived to be homogenous and the cosmopolitan, post-national Ireland of the early 21st century. As with the exclusionary
ideologies described by Fanning (2002), less has changed in globalised Ireland than is popularly perceived. What can additionally be extrapolated from this study’s analysis of the modes by which migrant communities are represented in the Irish public sphere is that the Irish mainstream public sphere’s commodification of difference as represented by new migrant communities reflects a stubborn, established settled white Irish identity which continues to reassert itself on the airwaves. Dyer (1997) describes how the representation of difference functions within a dominant white discourse, such as that which continues to inform and pervade the Irish public sphere:

"White discourse implacably reduces the non-white subject to being a function of the white subject, not allowing her/him space or autonomy, permitting neither the recognition of similarities not the acceptance of differences except as a means for knowing the white self. This cultural process justifies the emphasis, in work on the representation of white people, on the role of images of non-white people in it."  
(Dyer 1997:13)

After Optimism?

Several questions around representation and participation raised in this research remain open. Will the recognition of community media in EU legislation strengthen Ireland’s already strong community radio sector, providing in turn greater opportunities for transcultural media practice? Conversely, will the Irish public sphere remain primarily spoken by settled white Irish voices? The perspectives interrogated in the 2006 debate investigating whether the mainstream Irish media was ‘hideously white’ suggest this might remain the case, as the debate served primarily to illustrate, if occasionally interrogate, the status quo rather than suggest concrete changes to it. While transcultural modes of production provide avenues of migrant and ethnic articulation across Europe, as
observed by Robins (2006), Kosnick (2007), Lewis (2008) and Morawska (2008), amongst others, will they remain located only in the community media sphere in Ireland? Or will migrant-produced programming begin to be heard more regularly on national public and commercial Irish radio?

Additional avenues of enquiry remain open for further exploration. Hage (2005) argues for the necessity for situated multiculturalisms, noting that: ‘while the same word was being used, it delineated a sharply different social space within each nation-state’ (Hage 2005: 491). This study serves in part as a contribution to a critique of the multicultural project as it functions in Ireland, through analysis of a facet of migrant representation and participation in the Irish public sphere. However, although Lentin and McVeigh (2002, 2006), Devereux et al (2004), Grossman and O’Brien (2007) and Titley (2003, 2008) have explored elements of inward migration to Ireland, migrant representation in Irish media and other aspects of the multicultural industry in Ireland, the territory remains open for interrogation, particularly following the economic downturn and the social and political changes this may bring. Finally, when studying the circumstances and effects of inward migration, it is worth asking: When does a migrant stop being a migrant, or primarily defined as a migrant? Hage (2005) makes the point that ‘On the whole, despite the arguments about people now being increasingly transnationally mobile and so on, most migrants move once or twice in their lives’ (Hage 2005: 469). He goes on to problematise the application of the term ‘migrant’:

Is it not strange that people become associated with something they have done in one or two days for the whole of their lives? Of course, this invites us to think that the reason that people do become associated with such movement is because of its significance in shaping their lives. It is a movement which marks them in a way
that the ordinary everyday movement people engage in when they move around does not.

(ibid.)

While I have used the word migrant throughout this study, as it accurately describes what are for the most part new migrant communities in Ireland, I recognise that the term first and foremost describes an action or activity. New ways of talking about migrant experience will surely emerge in which the migrant is not first and foremost typified by a single activity (albeit perhaps undertaken twice or three times), which will in turn inform how migrant and ethnic communities are framed in critique.

Whether the Irish public sphere has shifted ‘after optimism’ in relation to equitable migrant representation and participation, to use Lentin and McVeigh’s (2006) possibly prescient book title, has yet to be seen. The spirit of enterprise observed by Peillon (2002) manifested in ‘Celtic Tiger’ Ireland, and which informed the establishment and commercially motivated marketing strategy of Sunrise FM has dampened as the economic climate has turned wintry. Similarly, the cultural changes in Ireland which will accompany the economic downturn and the end of the economic boom have yet to fully manifest. The significant reduction of institutional resources allocated to migrants and other marginalised communities in Ireland, as exemplified above, suggests increasing rather than decreasing polarisation across Irish society between migrants and settled white Irish communities. A further symptom of this tendency which is central to this study is the news that Spectrum, RTÉ’s longest-running programme dedicated to representing diversity and which formed one of the case studies in this research, stopped
broadcasting in December 2008. In February 2009 RTÉ confirmed *Spectrum* would not be returning to the airwaves. The station issued a statement saying ‘Now that Ireland’s new communities have become a more established part of Irish society, multicultural concerns, questions and news stories will be integrated into the mainstream daytime schedule when there is a much larger audience listening to radio than at evening at the weekend’. On the one hand, bringing migrant representation, if not necessarily self-representation, to a greater listenership can be read as a movement towards more equitable representation in the Irish public sphere. Former *Spectrum* presenter Zbyszek Zalinski reinforces this in his statement: ‘I believe it’s a very positive development....it gives real representation to minorities, rather than assigning a single programme to them.’ Yet, on the other hand, it is worth noting that while *Spectrum* has featured migrant presenters, it has historically been produced by Irish staff of RTÉ. As has been argued, migrant representation without migrant production can lead to a simplistic representation of difference rather than an in-depth investigation into migrant daily experiences.

The medium of radio has been perceived to be expanding with the advent of digital radio, itself an indication of technological changes leading to greater consumer choice, but also to further, inexpensive opportunities for community groups who could use this increasingly accessible technology for creating community stations. However, Channel 4’s September 2008 decision not to expand their broadcasting services into digital platforms represented a lack of confidence in digital radio as a viable medium, a decision which may have some repercussions for the future of digital radio. Yet internet radio,
which is also relatively inexpensive and is internationally accessible, may well continue
to flourish, offering a wider range of choice for all listeners as well as further
opportunities for migrant- and ethnic-produced radio. A notable example is Berlin’s
Radio MultiKulti, which provided multicultural radio programming from 1994 until
December 2008 and almost immediately re-launched as an internet radio station,
MultiCult2.0, five minutes after its analogue demise.4

Questions of radio form too remain open. The polylingualism which characterises much
of migrant-produced programming on NEAR FM and Dublin City FM, which was a
feature of Sunrise FM’s programming and which has characterised migrant radio
elsewhere in Europe, is a key component of migrant media. A central function of first
language radio programmes is information provision for new migrants, which will
continue to be a necessary service in multiethnic cities characterised by inward migration.
As previously observed, this study stops short of what Spivak (2003) calls ‘language-
based’ investigation. Further exploration and analysis of ethnic and migrant-produced
programming predicated on study of first-language programmes would considerably
increase scholarly understanding of the strategies of articulation employed by migrant
and ethnic communities.

The changes at economic and political levels in Ireland discussed above are occurring at
the same time as changes in broadcasting policy at a conceptual level in wider national
and European broadcasting and cultural policy environments. As discussed in Chapter
Two, both PSB and community media are being reframed within EU cultural policy, both
to some degree in response to perceived audience demand for greater choice. Whether that choice results in greater demand for migrant focused programming or for other forms of ‘niche’ programming, now that the concept of greater choice for media consumers is further facilitated through technological advances and changes in the regulation of broadcasting, the increased options provided will continue to shape the ways media is produced and consumed.

In a wider context, the legitimation of community media as third sector media by the EU parliament in 2008 could lead to the allocation of increased resources, following Lewis’ (2008) observation that: ‘the evidence points to the sector being an important factor in social cohesion and citizenship, particularly for minority ethnic communities and refugee and migrant communities’ (Lewis 2008: 5). Such legitimation brings us closer to the realisation and application of Robins’ (2006) ‘transnational cultural policy’, which incorporates the facilitation of ethnic and migrant media. In his report Lewis recognises the importance of the history and developments in Australian community radio. Lawe Davis’ (2009) comprehensive report on Australia’s established but bipartite multicultural broadcasting sector highlights the increasingly independent and important role of community broadcasting in Australia in facilitating ethnic representation, and self-representation, on Australian radio. Lawe Davis additionally highlights a prevalence of ‘Language other than English’ (LOTE) programming across Australian multicultural broadcasting, which reflects the intersections between linguistic, ethnic and cultural communities, suggesting that in some instances ‘common language does not equate with common culture’ (Lawe Davis 2009: 16). This recognition, as well the broadcast of radio
programming in 67 languages in Australia, indicates an established commitment to polylingual broadcasting which could provide a useful model for facilitating European radio programming for and by ethnic and migrant communities.

This research has shown how the ways in which migrants are represented across the Irish public sphere differ substantially between public service broadcasting and the community radio sector. Where migrants are represented in public service broadcasting primarily as subjects, for the consumption and arguably the education of the settled white Irish listenership, the established facilitation of migrant-produced programming and transcultural production in community radio has provided the opportunity for migrant self-representation and articulation of migrant perspectives and experience. The question at this time remains: how will migrants be represented, or facilitated in self-representation and participation in Irish radio into the future? The changes noted above in the context of broadcast policy and the legitimation of community radio as third sector media indicate some potential for expanding opportunities for migrant media practitioners. The BCI invitation for expressions of interest in new broadcasting contracts, published in September 2008, is a significant development in this regard in the Irish context; who the BCI decide to award these new broadcasting contracts to will be worth watching. The BCI’s assertion of support for ‘bottom-up’ broadcasting has suggested they will assess applications at least partly on the ways in which they propose to represent diversity in the community.
As of autumn 2008 *African Scene* was still broadcasting on Dublin City FM, formerly Anna Livia FM. Lizelle Joseph has left the show but Olatunyi (T.J.) Idowu continues as presenter and producer on the programme, broadcast between 8.30 - 9pm on Thursdays. Dublin City FM continues to broadcast other migrant-produced programmes including two Russian programmes: *The Russian Show* and *The Russian Language Show*, as well as the long-running *Korean Show*, *Bollywood Masala*, *Polish120h* and *Bridging the Gaps*.

The NEAR Media Co-Op of which NEAR FM is a part also incorporates NEAR TV Productions and a community IT centre, NEAR Online. In incorporating both radio and television production the NEAR Media Co-Op continues to function as a communally owned media production facility, embodying community media principles of access and training opportunities. NEAR FM, now calling itself NEAR90 FM, continues to stream Radio France daily during the week and to broadcast *Global Solidarity*, a long-running programme about issues faced by migrants, as well as a programme called *Network Europe* and the long running *Quartier Francophone*. NEAR90 FM also continues to broadcast the migrant-produced programmes *Islam in Focus* and *Polska Tygodniowka*.

As community media, with its inherent principles of inclusion and community building, continues to gain strength and recognition in European cultural policy creating further opportunities for transcultural media production, opportunities may increase for migrant participation in Irish community radio as well as in community radio elsewhere in Europe. As community media gains opportunities to flourish, will it continue to be perceived as 'alternative' in relation to the mainstream Irish sphere? Will the legitimisation of community media and recognition of its informing ethos of
community participation mean that opportunities for migrant media practitioners remain in community media rather than at the national broadcaster? Or will the mainstream Irish media begin to incorporate migrant stories which are also migrant-produced?
Notes


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audio Track</th>
<th>Title/Description</th>
<th>Duration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUDIO 1</td>
<td><em>Different Voices, 2003</em>: Media Experts 1</td>
<td>1:27sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUDIO 2</td>
<td><em>Different Voices, 2003</em>: Media Experts 2</td>
<td>2:37sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUDIO 3</td>
<td><em>Different Voices, 2003</em>: Moore Street 1</td>
<td>1:58sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUDIO 4</td>
<td><em>Different Voices, 2003</em>: Moore Street 2</td>
<td>4:57sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUDIO 5</td>
<td><em>Different Voices, 2004</em>: Nimpa Programme Intro</td>
<td>37sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUDIO 6</td>
<td><em>Different Voices, 2004</em>: ‘When I say Africans’</td>
<td>1:25sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUDIO 7</td>
<td><em>Different Voices, 2004</em>: Christmas Farewell</td>
<td>1:18sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUDIO 8</td>
<td><em>Spectrum, 2005</em>: Verwoerd Commentary</td>
<td>2:27sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUDIO 9</td>
<td><em>Spectrum, 2005</em>: Waterford Programme 1</td>
<td>1:57sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUDIO 10</td>
<td><em>Spectrum, 2005</em>: Waterford Programme 2</td>
<td>2:54sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUDIO 11</td>
<td><em>Spectrum, 2005</em>: Waterford Programme 3</td>
<td>4:01sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUDIO 12</td>
<td><em>African Scene, 2006</em>: Racism Discussion</td>
<td>2:30sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUDIO 13</td>
<td><em>African Scene, 2006</em>: ‘That’s the Way I Live it’</td>
<td>4:03sec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AUDIO 14</td>
<td><em>African Scene, 2006</em>: Interview with Cathal Goan</td>
<td>2:39sec</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AUDIO 15</th>
<th>Sunrise FM, 2006: Riyaz Programme Intro</th>
<th>1:29sec</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AUDIO 16</td>
<td>Sunrise FM, 2006: Longer Station ‘Promo’</td>
<td>3:56sec</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Radio Programmes

Different Voices
   2003
   2004

Spectrum
   2005

African Scene
   2006

Sunrise FM: Schedule
Different Voices Programmes, 2003 series

Dun Laoghaire Festival of World Cultures
10 October 2003

Second Frontline Human Rights Conference
17 October 2003

Intercultural Sports: SARI and Dublin Bus
24 October 2003

Different Ethnicities in Ennis
31 October 2003

Humous or Horta: Moore Street, a changing streetscape
7 November 2003

The Chinese Community in Ireland
14 November 2003

Photographic Exhibition by photographer Simon Norfolk
21 November 2003

Rio to Roscommon:
The growing Brazilian population in the Roscommon area
28 November 2003

New Cultural Representations: Diversity in the Media
5 December 2003

Migrants from Eastern Europe and the Far East
12 December 2003

Fashion and Festive Food and Drink
19 December 2003

Different Voices Music Special
25 December 2003

Ireland’s Entry to the EEC and 10 Acceding Countries
2 January 2004
Different Voices Programmes, 2004 series

‘Different Churches, Different Beliefs’ 6 November 2004

Integrating Ireland:
National Network of Refugee, Asylum Seeker
and Immigrant support groups

13 November 2003

Diversity in Irish Schools

20 November 2004

‘A Day in the Life of A Refugee’

27 November 2004

Ireland and the EU Presidency

4 December 2004

‘Understanding Islam’ Conference and *Metro Eireann*

11 December 2004

_Different Voices_ Music Special:
Interviews with Papa Wemba and Youssou N’Dour

18 December 2004
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview with Archbishop Desmond Tutu</td>
<td>4 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Medical Nurses in Ireland</td>
<td>18 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant Medical Doctors in Ireland</td>
<td>25 September</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Permits Bill</td>
<td>2 October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Infant Circumcision in Waterford</td>
<td>9 October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intolerance in Muslim Schools</td>
<td>16 October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update on New Zealand government election; Deportation in Ireland</td>
<td>23 October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Chinese Magazine in Ireland</td>
<td>30 October</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Citizenship Test; Implications for Ireland</td>
<td>6 November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocation of Waterford Crystal</td>
<td>13 November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report on Race Riots in Paris; The Northern Ireland Equality Commission</td>
<td>20 November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of Emigration in Ireland</td>
<td>27 November</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish Ferries Dispute</td>
<td>4 December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish and Pakistani Responses to Pakistan Earthquake</td>
<td>11 December</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
20 Years of Pavee Point:
The Traveller Community in Ireland

Christmas *Spectrum* Special
African Scene Programmes, March 2006 – May 2006

The Importance of Taking Holidays;  
Contributor from Irish travel agency  
16 March

Residents Against Racism spokesperson; Anti-Racism Week;  
Debate on Multiculturalism, Critique of Media coverage  
23 March

Community Work with Migrants;  
Spokesperson from Clondalkin partnership; African news  
30 March

Discussion of Racism; Newspaper Review  
6 April

Easter; Focus on Different faiths; Overview of the Easter Rising  
13 April

Discussion of hip-hop culture in Ireland;  
Two African DJs/musician contributors  
20 April

Corruption in Nigeria; Analysis of Nigerian constitution  
27 April

Migrant-owned Model Agency  
4 May

(No programme 11 May 2006)

Coverage of the MAMA awards  
18 May

Dyslexia in Ireland  
25 May

Discussion of the World Cup  
1 June
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Midnight – 2am</td>
<td>Welcome to Sunrise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2am – 4am</td>
<td>China This Week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4am – 6am</td>
<td>The Chinese Music programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6am – 8am</td>
<td>African Eye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8am – 9am</td>
<td>African Roots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9am – 10am</td>
<td>Sunrise Immigrant Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10am – 12noon</td>
<td>Eastern European Eye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12noon – 2pm</td>
<td>Poles Apart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2pm – 3pm</td>
<td>Radio Plus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3pm – 4pm</td>
<td>Eastern European Musicfest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4pm – 5pm</td>
<td>Swap Shop with Asian Choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5pm – 6pm</td>
<td>Asian Newsweek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6pm – 7pm</td>
<td>Talking Persia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7pm – 9pm</td>
<td>Planet Bollywood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9pm – 10pm</td>
<td>Asian Choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10pm – 12midnight</td>
<td>Asian Remix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Sunday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midnight – 3am</td>
<td>The Chinese Music programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3am – 6am</td>
<td>China Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6am – 8am</td>
<td>The African Music Box</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8am – 10am</td>
<td>The African Perspective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10am – 12noon</td>
<td>Poles Apart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12noon – 2pm</td>
<td>Radio Plus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2pm – 4pm</td>
<td>Eastern European Musicfest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4pm – 5pm</td>
<td>Swap Shop with Asian Choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5pm – 6pm</td>
<td>Meeting Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6pm – 7pm</td>
<td>Talking Persia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7pm – 8pm</td>
<td>Arabian Days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8pm – 9pm</td>
<td>East Meets West</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9pm – 11pm</td>
<td>Bollypopping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11pm – 12midnight</td>
<td>Sunrise Week Ahead</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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