

Local and Localism: The Broadcasting Dialectic

Harry Criticos, University of Newcastle, Australia, harry.criticos@uon.edu.au

Abstract

When the Australian broadcasting industry was deregulated in 1992, it was expected that it would lead to diversity and competition in the radio industry. While this may have occurred in the capital cities, for regional radio, the result was an increase in networking, concentrated ownership as well as a perceived loss of local radio and local voices. In the discourse of regional radio in Australia, local and localism are two terms used to describe the industry, its programme content and the place it holds in the media landscape. The Australian Communications and Media Authority (ACMA) and the radio industry body Commercial Radio Australia (CRA) use the terms interchangeably, which obfuscates the use of the terms when their individual attributes are taken into consideration. That is, local and localism can be thought of as place and space. As Giddens argues, there is an importance in understanding the distinction between both: "Place" is best conceptualised by means of the idea of local, which refers to the physical settings of social activity as situated geographically....what structures the local is not simply that which is present on the scene; the "visible form" of the locale conceals the distanced relations which determine its nature (Giddens 1990, p. 18). With a focus on regional radio, using the Super Radio Network as a case study, this paper will give a brief overview of the way local and localism have been used in reference to regional radio and how the idea of what is local has been defined by programme makers, regulators and the radio industry. Since it's demonstrable that the discourse on local and localism as used in the radio industry has not been adequately defined to encompass both meanings of these terms, I will be putting forward my own definition.

Introduction

This paper examines local and localism in regional radio, with a focus on the Super Radio Network (SRN). It proffers a working definition of local and localism to provide a context for their application in regional broadcasting. It takes account of the notions of local and localism as viewed by the radio industry, regulators and programme makers in the context of a regional radio network. Tuan (1977) makes a distinction between geographical space which becomes a familiar place the more we interact with it. More broadly this paper also places these ideas against Anthony Giddens' (1990) concerns with locales and the concept of 'disembedding' where certain places are also shaped by social actions of others operating at a distance from that locale. For example, it has been argued that the structural deregulation of the Australian broadcasting industry in 1992, and actioned in Canberra, resulted in an increase in the number of networked programmes on regional radio, a perceived lack of diversity and consequently, a loss of local voices and local content in regional areas across Australia. As a result the Local Voices Inquiry in 2001 and the Local Content Levels Investigation in 2007 questioned the increase in the networking of regional radio. Following the 2007 investigation, local content conditions were enacted in the Broadcasting Services Act 1992 (BSA), forcing regional radio licensees to provide a minimum amount of local content. Under these local content conditions, regional radio licensees had to provide a minimum of three hours of locally hosted programmes between 5am and 8pm Monday to Friday. This paper will

also examine through interviews with programme makers and management in the SRN the place regional radio holds in a network and whether centralisation has affected a station's ability to be local.

“Local” and “Localism” – Towards a Definition

In constructing a definition of local and localism I argue that local is the place with localism the space or culture of that place. Tuan (1977) explains this distinction as space becoming “place as we get to know it better and endow it with value....when space feels thoroughly familiar...it becomes place” (in Moores 2012, p. 28). This familiarity provides us with that sense of attachment, a connection or belonging to the locale. Massey adds that the concept of space is “produced of inter-relationships in life, and that therefore space is always under construction, in flows of influence, in process” (in Crouch 2012, p. 45). Giddens argues that there is importance in understanding the distinction between space and place:

“Place” is best conceptualised by means of the idea of locale, which refers to the physical settings of social activity as situated geographically....what structures the locale is not simply that which is present on the scene; the “visible form” of the locale conceals the distanced relations which determine its nature (Giddens 1990, p. 18).

An important facet of place and its relationship with identity, belonging and attachment is nostalgia. This is premised on the ‘born and bred’ heritage that binds us to place and which Savage (2008) terms ‘elective belonging’ (p.152). Savage (2008) asserts that any affiliations we claim to a place are based on our choices to remain, built on the identity that a place may lay claim to, a connectedness to that place. For people who have a strong sense of belonging and attachment:

The actual lived history of the place in which they lived was less important as the way in which they could define the place as belonging to them through their conscious choice to move and settle in it. We called this orientation to place as “elective belonging” (Savage 2008, p. 152).

We can add to this by contending that the boundaries of place are no longer limited to our immediate locale, rather, the boundaries of our existence have been extended and enhanced by technology, of which radio can be an attribute. Computers, smartphones or other portable devices, provide access to local radio to those that have connections with a licence area, but live outside of that area. As Giddens states ‘locales are thoroughly penetrated by and shaped in terms of social influences quite distant from them’ (1990, p. 19). Giddens expresses this as ‘disembedding’ (1990, p. 21).

But.....What is Local?

The discourses on local and localism, explained in part through the operation of disembedding, present a variety of descriptions and meanings. Saffran (2008) describes local as:

A term encapsulating radio's unique and inherent qualities fostering its ability to serve the public interest in local communities, such as local announcers in local studios talking to local audiences (p. 4).

DiCola (2006) considers local in the context of community and identity that is:

Serving the interests of a local community as separate and distinct from that community's identity as part of the nation or the world. It pertains to where programming is produced, who produces it, and whether that programming meets local communities' and local residents' needs (p. 75).

Starkey asserts that:

Localness in local radio provided a rare opportunity for listeners in distinctive communities to access local content that was otherwise missing from the limited media landscape of the time (2011, p. 187).

However, these definitions do not lucidly define local or localism. They also consider communities and residents as separate entities when it can be argued that a resident is part of a community or communities. The notions of local and localism are further obfuscated in the way these terms are viewed, and used, by the regulator and the industry.

As FARB argued in their final submission to the Local Voices inquiry in 2001, it was not the responsibility of the licensee, nor a requirement of the BSA to provide regional audiences any level of local content (FARB 2001, p. 2). FARB argued strongly that localism:

Doesn't have to be someone in the studio in the town to which the programme is being broadcast. It is about what comes out of the speakers from the consumer's perspective – it is material of relevance and appeal to the local audience (2001, p. 3).

The ACMA has not provided a specific meaning of 'local' or 'material of local significance' through either the BSA or other instruments. Rather, the ACMA has provided a broad meaning of local in the BSA. That being:

News bulletins, weather bulletins, community service announcements, and designated local content programmes are local if they relate to a licensee's licence area (ACMA 2007b, p. 2).

This meaning of local was derived from the 2007 Local Content Investigations Report. The ACMA took into consideration the minimum number of hours for local programming and a minimum number of minutes for local news that would provide a level of local content to form part of 'material of local significance' and the LCC.

To maintain a balance between a profitable regional radio industry to service regional Australia, the ACMA had to be mindful of how it defined 'material of local significance':

A broader definition will make it easier for licensees to comply with the local content requirement but may conflict with the policy objects behind the introduction of the requirement. On the other hand, a narrow definition will result in a requirement that many licences - for example, those that have a predominantly music format - cannot currently meet and would impose significant financial cost to meet in the future (ACMA 2007c, p. 17).

The ACMA settled on an amendment to the BSA that states material broadcast by a licensee is material of local significance if it is "Hosted in; or Is produced in; or Relates to the licence area of the regional commercial broadcasting licence" (ACMA 2007a, p. 2). A broad definition for material of local significance such as "relates to" has broad interpretations.

Local radio is a hybrid of location, content, the source(s) of the programme material and the location from where the programme material is broadcast (via a hub or local). As the industry argues, providing a local service is expensive with the highest incidence of local programming occurring in licence areas that can financially support the station.

As Randell (1993) asserts, local programming was more likely to occur in larger regional markets than smaller ones. This was directly related to advertising revenue where stations located in larger markets with more revenue offer more local programming (Randall 1993, pp. 2-3).

These ideas can be exemplified in the case of the Super Radio Network.

The Super Radio Network – A Brief Overview

Broadcast Operations (BO), the owner of the Super Radio Network, can be seen as an example of an Australian company that has taken advantage of a deregulated radio industry, operating as a monopoly in most of their licence areas. Broadcast Operations which brands itself as the Super Radio Network (SRN) owns 40 radio licences made up of four digital (DAB+) stations (Sydney only), twenty-one AM stations (Sydney, regional NSW, regional Queensland) and Fifteen FM stations (regional NSW, regional Queensland). This makes the SRN the third largest radio network in Australia, and the largest in NSW. The SRN FM stations have a music format (mostly contemporary hit radio) and the AM stations a talk / music (adult contemporary) format. The majority of SRN stations take programme from SRN hubs that are responsible for the supply of content to SRN stations between 9am and 530am/6am the following day. They operate in a largely deregulated environment.

Regulation of Local Content – A Brief Overview

Deregulation of the broadcasting industry in 1992, and the removal of licence ownership limits resulted in an increase in networking with a perceived loss of local radio (content) and local voices (announcers

and journalists). It became increasingly apparent that regional areas were being subject to more networking than those in metropolitan areas. Concerned with the amount of networking in regional Australia, a parliamentary committee held the Local Voices an Inquiry into Regional Radio. It was held in 2000/01. This committee appraised whether networking led to a loss of localism.

Paul Neville MP, the chair of the committee, stated in his introduction to the Local Voices report that the advantages of networking, such as more hours of broadcast and higher quality programming, were countered by fewer of what Mr Neville considered “the very essence of regional radio”: local voices (Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia 2001, p.vi). However, the recommendations of this inquiry fell short of calling upon parliament to enact prescriptive legislation for local content. Of the twenty recommendations made by the committee, not one suggested locally produced material be a requirement in the BSA.

In 2007, the ACMA held the Local Content Levels Investigation to determine the amount of local content on regional commercial radio and define the term local. According to the ACMA, Local Content Conditions (LCC) were introduced to “ensure that the liberalisation of the media regulatory framework does not lead to further reductions in local content...on commercial radio” (ACMA 2007c, p. 1). This situation can be contrasted to regional television that has “greater value and impact in terms of publicity and marketing, rather than for any contribution to local knowledge and debate” (Dwyer, Wilding, Wilson & Curtis 2006, p. 13).

Historically, the local aspect of regional radio was inferred but not explicit in broadcasting Acts in that the provision of a radio broadcast licence was “intended to provide a local or regional service...” (Australian Broadcasting Control Board Second Annual Report in Oswin 1984, p. 25). It could be argued that the reticence of the State to enshrine local in the BSA was not only to avoid conflict with the radio industry, but also the difficulty in defining local and localism. This reticence is evident in the 2007 investigation when the ACMA stated that they had two options in defining local: narrow or broad. A narrow definition would have meant that “no FM licences and only a few AM licences would meet the local content requirement” (ACMA 2007c, p. 3) while a broad definition would result in “a good majority” of licences meeting the requirements (ibid). This reticence on the part of the State to choose between these two options has presented problems for the industry.

Local: An Industry, Regulator and Government Perspective

The notion of what makes local radio ‘local’ is an underlying problematic in the discourse on regional broadcasting. If a programme is relevant and meets community needs, if a community has the opportunity to contribute to a programme, then whether the programme is locally hosted or not appears redundant. However, there are a number of issues that need to be taken into consideration when determining what constitutes local radio. Firstly, it is the local knowledge of the programme makers that creates the social and cultural cohesion between the station, contributors and the listener, an opportunity not afforded by a networked programme. Secondly, networked programmes do not afford regional audiences the same level of access as a locally hosted program. Put simply, a local politician or

community group has better access to a local station broadcasting live in their local radio area. We can compare this situation to a networked programme that broadcasts to a number of licence areas in which the programme maker will consider the value and relevance of the material to the aims of the broadcast itself rather than the benefit to the localities being broadcast to.

In the 2001 Local Voices inquiry, both the Australian Broadcasting Authority (ABA) (regulator) and Federation of Australian Radio Broadcasters (FARB) (industry body) argued that regional commercial radio should not be considered in isolation from other media but as part of a broader group of regional media providing services to the community, and as such, the licence area (Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia 2001, p. 67). This was not a view shared by the committee that authored the Local Voices report who maintained that localism was essential and relevant to the audience or community of particular localities. Furthermore, the committee pointed to the failure of the BSA and the ABA to address, and be more responsive 'to the community's need for adequate and comprehensive coverage' (Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia 2001, p. 71).

Local: A Perspective of Managers and Programme Makers

Management and the Local

There is an expectation that stations that operate in a network lose their localness as they become reliant on networked programme from a hub. Yet, there are examples in the SRN, as well as other regional networks, that demonstrate that some networks exceed the local content requirements required by the Broadcasting Services Act 1992. SRN managers interviewed for this research discussed not only the importance of being local, but also how it could be difficult to achieve in practice. In the SRN, localness is subject to a range of parameters. Manager 2 explained why some SRN regional stations could maintain a high local presence while they were not compelled to take network programme:

I think it's important. [Licence Area 1] for instance they do a local Saturday morning programme. And I think that's good, because Saturday morning's a good retail time and with sport and whatever. Stations have the options. We provide a lot of networking, that doesn't mean to say that the stations are taking everything that we put out. They're not. [Licence Area 5] doesn't take much networking at all (Manager 2 2009).

However, in the course of this research, while being local was important, it wasn't reflected in the content being broadcast. Manager 1, who is also a programme maker, provided an explanation as to why there was a minimal amount of local material:

It just depends. Some days a local story can take up all the time of the programme. But it depends on whether something actually happens that we consider to be entertaining or really informative. For us, I guess, we look at what is the big story. We don't just look at whether it's local or not we look at what's the big story (Manager 1 2009).

How management view local may have an influence on programme makers and their practice. That is, how programme makers compile material for their programme or news.

When asked what is local, a variety of responses were elicited from regional programme makers. The view of some programme makers not only contrasted those of management, but also those of other programme makers within the SRN.

The Journalist and the Local

Journalists in the SRN hubs who compiled local and network news were asked what local meant in news terms. Journalist 1 explained local as:

Things as I say, that are affecting us here. Things that are going to be council stories, the older audience are more going to be concerned about major developments coming along in their area that might impact on their quality of life. Things that hit their hip pocket, Who's looking after the kids? Those sort of emotional triggers. You look for stories that are like that because you're looking to hook the audience and keep them (Journalist 1 2009).

For Journalist 2, local was:

For me, anything that's got to do with the [city] or [region] or specific local people as well (Journalist 2 2009).

When questioned further, it was clear that in practice, Journalist 2 did not focus on the local when compiling the news. For Journalist 1 and Journalist 2, local was the immediate area they were broadcasting to rather than the broader licence area.

It is evident that while SRN managers at hubs value local, it is not a priority. When compiling news for the SRN network, Journalist 1 asserted that local stories were dropped unless they were of significance or relevance to a broader, national audience:

We are a local station after all. And so sometimes you feel when you're in that network mode you think "gee that's a good story" but I've just got to be mindful that we're wider today and we've got to walk away from it (Journalist 1 2009).

Journalists at SRN nodes and stand-alone stations had another perspective of local. For a journalist at a node, local encompassed the licence area:

You've got your droughts and bushfires and all that, so anything that's in the listening area is considered local (Journalist 3 2010).

Yet for a journalist located at an SRN stand-alone station, local encompassed a defined distance from the radio station:

I see local as definitely [town where station is located]. Probably an hour each side. That's local for me. Only because I live at [town] so like an hour and a half away from [station location] but I don't consider myself local but we like to hear the same news. Local is like an hour I would say (Journalist 4 2011).

We can argue that from Journalist 3's perspective, local extends to a wider area to include a number of towns. Each town within the licence area has its own local qualities such as its own communities (business, arts, farming), culture and knowledge that are unique to their location.

The Announcer and the Local

Announcers as programme makers on FM stations in the SRN were conflicted between making their programme appealing to listeners and including local content. Based at a SRN hub, Announcer 5 stated that their programme was not as local as it could be:

I think that's somewhere where we could do better. Most days we try and have maybe one or two local stories but no, we don't have an overly local emphasis on the show. And I think that is an area we could improve in, definitely. And it's something that I'm very interested in. I always try and look at the local papers. But look, to be honest with you, sometimes the national stories are just bigger stories or they're funnier, or they've got more sort of "relateability" for people just listening generally. So, I suppose it's always what's best for the show first and then if it's local great and if not, well, so be it (Announcer 5 2009).

It is interesting to note that Announcer 5 rated national stories higher than local stories, which could explain in part why they removed local references from locally sourced stories. An example of this is Announcer 5 using a story out of the local newspaper to generate callers to their programme. During the course of the programme the local aspect of the story was removed. The story was reworked to be more generic so as to appeal to a wider audience. As Manager 1 stated earlier, stories are not selected because they are local but how they can be made to fit the programme to attract an audience. In other words, story selection is based on whether they will generate listener interaction. Manager 1 defended this position stating that:

We have a think about that and how it relates to the local area and you know, a lot of the times we find we can put a twist on that and make it work for the [Licence Area 2] market (Manager 1 2009).

That 'twist' referred to by Manager 1 was to omit local references. There were other occasions where local references, such as the location of callers were also omitted.

Announcer 7 (2010) who broadcasts from a node, stated that the amount of local material on their programme was based on their ability to “find as much local news” as possible, adding that “apart from community service announcements, lost and found” the local aspect of their programme is minimal.

Amongst the AM station programme makers in the SRN, the meaning of the term local varied between hub and node stations. For SRN AM Announcer 2 broadcasting from a hub, local was:

Anything that has an impact on the lifestyle or the economy and everything in-between.....
Anything relevant to this region. So, a local actor in LA is local for me. A fire down the street is obviously very local for me.....As long as there's some impact on a local community (Announcer 2 2009).

In this case, we can see that for Announcer 2, local was about relevance rather than the specifics of the licence area. Announcer 2's view of what constitutes local was a reflection of how programme makers at the hubs whose programmes were either networked, locally hosted or both, based story selection on relevance so as to gain wider audience appeal.

Not all announcers followed the pattern of generalising stories by omitting local references. There were announcers that attempted to have more of a focus on the local. Announcer 4, for example, often referred to local people and businesses during their programme. By Announcer 4 establishing ties with community members, it reinforced connections between the announcer, the station and the communities within the licence area.

The views of programme makers are important if we are to construct a notion of local and its application to the radio industry or broadcasting in general. Constructing a notion of local raises a number of questions. How is local determined? Is it the immediate locale, the licence area or the region? Or is local determined by content?

By programme makers omitting local references to stories in the belief that by doing so they would generate a listener's interest in their programme, they are removing identity. As Fry (1998) and Starkey (2004) assert, towns and cities in regional areas have their own identities and access to this identity can only be garnered from living within the community. As many SRN programme makers reside in the licence area, they have the ability to connect with their communities. As such, they should take advantage of this regional identity for stories. Access to, and use of, this local knowledge can have a positive affect on a broadcast, programme content and the audience. The actions of some programme makers question the value of having someone in the town from which the station is broadcasting, and the ability of a networked station to interact with the community in the licence area.

Several announcers expressed that community involvement was important for themselves and the radio station:

I like to get involved if I can.....I think our link is vital (Announcer 6 2011).

Another announcer added:

I'm on the [charity] committee, you know, you have to be involved. They expect you to be involved in the community. And that's where it differs in a major market (Announcer 4 2010).

As Announcer 2 asserted that where there is a loss of connectedness between the station and its community, it could be due to networking:

...smaller radio stations should, in a perfect world, it should all be local. It should be wonderfully espousing the virtues of the local community groups and being as local as you can but commercial reality doesn't allow that to happen anymore (Announcer 2 2009).

Super Radio Network programme makers and managers concurred that networking and low staff numbers made it difficult to be actively involved with the community and community events.

While the above discussion helps us understand how regulators, programme makers and management view local, it remains that local and localism, in the context of radio, are broadly defined and applied.

'Local' and 'Localism' – The Place and Space

Through Tuan's (1977) concerns about the distinction between geographical space and how this becomes a familiar place, and Giddens' (1990) concerns with locales and the action of disembedding, that is influence from distance, it can be argued that how we situate ourselves within the space and place defines us, our relationships with those both within our locales and at a distance, and our interpretation of what is local.

While the word 'local' can be traced initially to the 1400's, according to the Oxford English Dictionary (2014a), there are now a number of definitions attributed to this word:

Relating to or concerned with "place" or position in space. Now chiefly in local situation"; "Having the attribute of place or spatial position"; relating to or existing in a particular region or district"; "Belonging to a town or some comparatively small district, as distinct from the state or country as a whole.

Localism is a word that has been in use since the early 1800's, defined by the Oxford English Dictionary (Oxford English Dictionary 2014b) as an:

Attachment to a locality, esp. to the place in which one lives; limitation of ideas, sympathies, and interests growing out of such attachment; disposition to favour what is local; Also, an instance of this state of mind.

Localism can also be defined as “something characteristic of a particular locality; a localizing feature; a local idiom, custom, or the like” (2014b). However, there is a correlation between localism and nationalism with the latter defined by the English Oxford Dictionary as (2014c):

Advocacy of or support for the interests of one’s own nation, esp. to the exclusion or detriment of the interests of other nations. Also: advocacy of or support for national independence or self-determination.

The use of localism and nationalism dates to the same period of the 1800’s. The definitions of localism and nationalism engage the notions of identity, belonging and attachment as subjective and ideological, which can be explained through Garibaldi and the unification of Italy in the 19th century.

Nationalism and the Risorgimento, which is explained as “a common idealised past as well as a less than perfect present” (Riall 1994, p. 1), provided a form of cultural identity (Riall 1994, p. 63). As Hall argues, identities need to be understood in “specific historical and institutional sites within specific discursive formations and practices by specific enunciative strategies” (2000, p. 17). Hall adds that identities emerge:

...within the play of specific modalities of power, and thus are more the product of the marking of difference and exclusion, than they are the sign of an identical, naturally constituted unity – an “identity” in its traditional meaning (that is, an all-inclusive sameness, seamless, without internal differentiation (2000. p. 17).

Rather than being interchangeable, as is often the case in the broadcasting discourse, the attributes of local and localism each have a specific relationship in their application to regional broadcasting.

A Defining Moment

Kirkpatrick (2006) argues that the idea of localism, in particular, may have been an unfortunate error borne of parochialism on the part of early regulators. For Kirkpatrick (2006, p. 88) the poor implementation of localism for regional radio was due to either regulators being weak or that localism was unworkable as a concept and a mere folly. To clarify, the Oswin report (1984) explained that an underlying belief of localism is that ownership and programming should be controlled at, and cater for, the area in which it broadcasts. As to why this should be the case, the Oswin report argued that:

The concept of localism has never been explicitly prescribed, nor fully explained, in any broadcasting legislation or single government policy statement. Notwithstanding its existence over a long period, the ambiguity and the complex nature of the concept means it cannot be easily or precisely defined (Oswin 1984, p. 5).

A uniform definition of ‘local’ and ‘localism’ at an academic, industry or regulatory level is lacking. Rather, we are provided with an ensemble of ambiguity; a circumspect list of those attributes that

constitute the terms local and localism. I argue here that the reference points for local and localism should be considered in terms of a region, its communities, where the programme is hosted, and where it is produced. But this also reveals problematic layers.

Firstly, there is the reference to community. As Willson (2006, p. 1) posits, community is an amorphous term making it difficult to describe and define. We can take this further by adding Starkey's (2011) notion of 'distinctive communities'. In a regional radio licence area that takes in a number of towns, each with its own local community and issues, it can be difficult for a radio station to address the needs of each community in their licence area. Programme makers respond to this by limiting discussions to the town where the radio station is located, often addressing the needs of communities in that town. In this sense, each town should be considered as part of a larger regional community. Secondly, in hosting a programme from where the station is located, we can apply a caveat. That is, unless the programme maker is well informed, programme content will focus on the area immediately surrounding the announcer's location ignoring what is happening at other locations within the licence area. Thirdly, where the programme is produced affects the level of local content. A programme maker who lives in the licence area will have a greater connection, or empathy, with the material and the audience.

With this in mind, and to provide a sense of what local can be, it is proffered that the local is constituted by a set of identifiable communities whose unique but shared cultures and knowledge are synthesised to give a distinct identity to a specific geographic region. Localism is a connection or attachment to and identification with these regional cultures.

With networking embedded in the broadcasting culture, the idea of the local still holds an important place not only for rural communities but also for stakeholders who need to inform communities in the licence area and the region. Without some level of obligation placed upon licensees by the regulator, it is clear that there would be no local radio in the accepted sense of the term. Under self-regulation, licensees will understandably resort to high levels of networking, especially in those areas that do not have a strong local economy that would support a local station. However, licensees can maintain economies of scale by adopting strategies that provide an acceptable level of local radio. One strategy that licensees can consider is regional networking. That is, the licensee breaks their network up into regions, with hubs located in the larger regional centres. This action may result in a slight increase in costs, but it will offer a better service to meet the requirements of all stakeholders. However, this strategy relies on the cooperation of major stakeholders such as the regulator and the industry body to foster an agreement on the course that this will take. It will also involve a relaxation of the local content conditions in the Broadcasting Services Act. These imperatives will also involve a number of programming changes that will require licence owners, managers, programme makers, and programme directors to be more aware and inclusive of their licence area. If these structural changes to the radio industry are not considered, Australia will have three tiers of radio, with four levels of service. Community radio will become local radio, commercial radio will be regional and state, and the ABC will be state and national.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ACMA 2007a, *Broadcasting Services (Additional Regional Commercial Radio Licence Condition - Material of Local Significance) Notice 19 December 2007*, Australian Communications and Media Authority.
- ACMA 2007b, *Broadcasting Services (Meaning of Local) Instrument 2007*, Australian Communications and Media Authority.
- ACMA 2007c, *Local Content Levels Investigation Report*. Canberra: Australian Communication and Media Authority.
- Announcer 2 2009, Interview: Face-to-Face, September 2009.
- Announcer 4 2010, Interview: Face-to-Face, January 2010.
- Announcer 5 2009, Interview: Face-to-Face, September 2009.
- Announcer 6 2011, Interview: Face-to-Face, June 2011.
- Announcer 7 2010, Interview: Face-to-Face, January 2010.
- Crouch, D. 2012. Landscape, Land and Identity: A Performative Consideration. In: Berberich, C., Campbell, N. & Hudson, R. (eds.) *Land & Identity*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- DiCola, P 2006, *False Premises, False Promises: A Quantitative History of Ownership Consolidation in the Radio Industry*. Future of Music Coalition.
- Dwyer, T, Wilding, D, Wilson, H & Curtis, S 2006, *Content, Consolidation and Clout: How Will Regional Australia be Affected by Media Ownership Changes?* Melbourne: Communications Law Centre.
- FARB 2001, *Final Submission by Federation of Australian Radio Broadcasters Limited to House of Representatives Standing Committee on Communication*, Transport and the Arts Inquiry into the Adequacy of Regional Radio.
- Fry, G 1998, *A Cultural Geography of Lake Wobegon*. Howard Journal of Communications, 9, 303-321.
- Giddens, A 1990, *The Consequences of Modernity*, Cambridge, UK, Polity Press.
- Hall, S 2000, Who Needs 'Identity'? In: Du Gay, P., Evans, J. & Redman, P. (eds.) *Identity : a reader*. London: SAGE.
- Journalist 1 2009, Interview: Face-to-Face. NSW, September 2009.
- Journalist 2 2009, Interview: Face-to-Face. NSW, September 2009.
- Journalist 3 2010, Interview: Face-to-Face. NSW, January 2010.
- Journalist 4 2011, Interview: Face-to-Face. NSW, June 2011.
- Kirkpatrick, B 2006, Localism in American Media Policy, 1920-34: Reconsidering a 'Bedrock Concept'. *The Radio Journal - International Studies in Broadcast and Audio Media*, 4, 87-110.
- Manager 1 2009, Interview: Face-to-Face. NSW, September 2009.
- Manager 2 2009, Interview: Face-to-Face. NSW, October 2009.
- Moore, S 2012, *Media, Place & Mobility*, Hampshire, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Oswin, J 1984, *Localism in Australian Broadcasting: A Review of the Policy*, August 1984. Canberra: Parliament of Australia.
- Oxford English Dictionary 2014a, *Local*, Viewed 03 August 2014:
<http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.newcastle.edu.au/view/Entry/109549?rskey=SMCCj1&result=1> - eid.
- Oxford English Dictionary 2014b, *Localism*, Viewed 03 August 2014:
<http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.newcastle.edu.au/view/Entry/109552?redirectedFrom=localism> - eid.

Oxford English Dictionary 2014c, *Nationalism*, Viewed 03 August 2014:
[http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.newcastle.edu.au/view/Entry/125289?redirectedFrom=nationalism - eid](http://www.oed.com.ezproxy.newcastle.edu.au/view/Entry/125289?redirectedFrom=nationalism-eid).

Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia 2001, *Local Voices: An Inquiry into Regional Radio*.
Canberra: The Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia,.

Randall, L 1993, Towards 2000, *Towards 2000: Radio in a Mutli-Channel Environment*, February 1993.
Communications Law Centre.

Riall, L 1994, *The Italian Risorgimento State, Society, and National Unification*, London, Routledge.

Saffran, M 2008, *Effects of Local-Market Radio Ownership Concentration on Radio Localism, the Public Interest, and Listener Opinions and Use of Local Radio*. The Rochester Institute of Technology.

Savage, M 2008, Histories, Belongings, Communities. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 11, 151-162.

Starkey, G 2004, Estimating Audiences: Sampling in Television and Radio Audience Research. *Cultural Trends*, 13, 3-25.

Starkey, G 2011, *Local Radio, Going Global*, Hampshire, Palgrave McMillan.

Willson, M 2006, *Technically Together: Rethinking Community within Techno-Society*, New York, Peter Lang.