

SUBMITTED VERSION

John Budarick

Ethnic minority media and the public sphere: the case of African-Australian media producers

Journal of Sociology, 2016; OnlinePubl:1-15

© The Author(s) 2016

Published version available via DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1440783316657430>

PERMISSIONS

<https://au.sagepub.com/en-gb/oce/copyright-and-permissions#AuthorRights>

It is important to check the policy for the journal to which you are submitting or publishing to establish your rights as

Author. SAGE's standard policies allow the following re-use rights:

Version 1- original submission to the journal (before peer review)

- You may do whatever you wish with the version of the article you submitted to the journal (Version 1).

When posting or re-using the article please provide a link to the appropriate DOI for the published version of the article on SAGE Journals

7 November 2016

<http://hdl.handle.net/2440/102226>

Ethnic Minority Media and the Public Sphere: The Case of African-Australian Media Producers

Journal:	<i>Journal of Sociology</i>
Manuscript ID	JOS-2015-093
Manuscript Type:	Original Manuscript
Keyword:	Ethnic minority media, public sphere, African-Australian
Abstract:	This paper analyses the work of ethnic minority media producers through a series of 13 in depth interviews with African-Australian broadcasters, writers and producers. Focusing on the aims and motivations of participants, the paper demonstrates a more expansive role for African-Australian media, one that brings niche media products into dialogue with mainstream Australian public life and challenges common understandings of ethnic media as appealing to a small, linguistically and culturally defined audience. Such a role also raises questions around wider conceptual understandings of the public sphere, particularly as it is employed to interrogate minority-majority relations. The paper concludes by engaging with previous literature focused on the changing contours of the public sphere ideal in multi-ethnic and multicultural societies.

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Ethnic Minority Media and the Public Sphere: The Case of African-Australian Media

Producers

Introduction

Many ethnic minority media producers, writers, journalists and broadcasters work on a volunteer basis, finding time between employment, study and family, and enjoy little in the way of stable funding and resources. So why do they do it? Or, more specifically, what are the aims and motivations that drive the producers of ethnic media to continue their work, and what is the social role they envisage for their media? This paper engages with these questions by drawing on data from a series of 13 interviews with African-Australian media producers in Melbourne, Sydney and Adelaide, and interrogating the way in which producers discuss the importance of their work and what they hope to achieve. Through this analysis, the paper will engage with contemporary theoretical questions around minority-majority relations in complex multi-ethnic countries such as Australia.

Ethnic minority media around the world provide an important service often not catered for by the large, yet mainly homogenous, national and global broadcast, digital, commercial and public service media environments (Cover 2012; Browne 2005; Forde et al. 2009; Author 2013). Ethnic media exist at the intersection of local, national and the global cultures, and are often tasked with articulating a continuously changing and hybridised sense of culture, history and collective identity for their listeners, viewers and readers. On the one hand, transnational and diasporic communications and cultural networks have helped shape ethnic media, including the practices of media producers, the resources, stories and images available to them, and the set of products to which they can compare and contrast themselves and from which they can take inspiration

1
2
3 (Cover 2012). It is also true that the local social and media environment continues to
4
5 significantly effect ethnic media in Australia and elsewhere, presenting as it does a series of
6
7 unavoidable challenges and opportunities such as a lack of resources and employment,
8
9 relationships with authorities, and mainstream media representations (Cover 2012; Forde et al.
10
11 2009).
12
13

14
15 Ethnic minority media are produced, disseminated and consumed in multiple networks and fields
16
17 of power (Cover 2012). For example, literature suggests ethnic media producers are motivated
18
19 by a need to counter a powerful ‘mainstream’ media environment that is often both national and
20
21 transnational, is guided by a market rationale of appealing to the largest possible audience, and
22
23 draws on sets of familiar tropes that overtly and implicitly articulate symbolic borders of
24
25 inclusion and exclusion¹ (Browne 2005; Lay and Thomas 2012; Matsaganis et al. 2010; Gillespie
26
27 2006; Shields 2014). Additionally, the idea of a local community is often prevalent in the work
28
29 of ethnic media producers. As Lay and Thomas (2012: 376) suggest, “ethnic media ... facilitate a
30
31 sense of community cohesion”. They do this by providing a cohesive community voice and by
32
33 covering local issues important to minority ethnic communities, issues often ignored in the
34
35 mainstream media (Author 2015; Browne 2005). Indeed, this community cohesion has positive
36
37 psychological and democratic potential for migrants, as “ethnic community broadcasting is
38
39 contributing to the idea of active citizenry and enhancing the democratic process” (Forde et al.
40
41 2009: 18).
42
43
44
45
46
47

48
49 It is also important to acknowledge the multiple stances and gazes cast by migrants and ethnic
50
51 minorities and to resist the temptation to see their media use and production as any less complex
52
53 than that of non-migrants and non-ethnic minorities (Sreberny 2005; Deuze 2006). A focus on
54
55 community empowerment does not mean that the ‘gaze’ is always cast inwards (Sreberny 2005).
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Rather, diasporic networks coalesce with local ties in ethnic media, as they provide a space for
4 the articulation and management of difference based on age, migratory status, political and social
5 affiliation (Cunnigham and Nguyen 1999; Deuze 2006). Indeed, the community focus of ethnic
6 media can involve focusing on the specificities of particular communities embedded in a certain
7 time and space, as well as an expansive gaze, based on a desire to stay connected to the
8 homeland and diaspora (Cover 2012). Countering mainstream media portrayals can also involve
9 multiple relationships with co-ethnics, those from the majority ethnic group, and other
10 minorities.
11

12 Such multiple perspectives are reflected in the findings of this paper, which support the themes
13 discussed above. However, this paper will also focus on aims, motivations and roles less
14 commonly discussed in literature on ethnic media (Forde et al. 2009; Lay and Thomas 2012;
15 Husband 1998, 2005). These are based on the desire to reach out to the broader Australian
16 society and to communicate across communities (Husband 1998, 2005). They include actively
17 targeting a non-African audience and attempting, directly or indirectly, to affect and change the
18 representational practices of Australian media. These findings point to a need to broaden the
19 range of possibilities when it comes to understanding the work of ethnic minority media
20 producers, and to better relate the motivations of ethnic media workers to their surrounding
21 social and media environments. The findings also raise important questions about theoretical
22 understandings of the relationship between media, minority rights, public participation and social
23 cohesion (Fraser 2011; Husband 2005; Sreberny 2005). As such, I will relate the most significant
24 findings of this study to debates around the changing contours of the public sphere as a tool
25 through which to analyse and understand the role of media in democratic participation.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Why *Ethnic Minority Media*

The term ethnic minority media is used in this paper specifically as it allows for the analysis of media produced by and for (although not exclusively) a particular ethnic group and the role of these media “in the negotiation of minority-majority or minority-dominant group relations” (Matsaganis et al. 2010: 9). A focus on ethnic minority media, rather than a similar category such as immigrant media or minority language media, also allows for an analysis of media produced by and for second and third generation migrants, media produced in English and media produced in ways that facilitate both “cultural maintenance and adaptation” (Cunningham and Nguyen 1999: 125) as well as “belonging and distancing” (Deuze 2005: 273).

A focus on ethnic *minority* media also provides an opportunity to differentiate between diverse ethnic media systems around the world. For example, ethnic media in the United States include large-scale, commercially independent media organisations (Deuze 2005). These media cater to large audiences, and although they can still be considered as minority – not only numerically but also in terms of social and political power – their operational and economic structures differ significantly from the independent, small-scale community operations at the heart of this paper. Within the context of the former, there is evidence of distinct divisions in media use between ethnic minorities and the ethnic majority in the US (Morley 2000; Deuze 2005). According to Deuze (2005), mainstream newspapers struggle to reach ethnic audiences in both the US and Holland. Ethnic minorities also use media for different purposes, preferring ethnic media for information on their own countries and communities, and mainstream media for news on American politics.

1
2
3 Such differences raise questions about the role of ethnic media in social cohesion and
4 representation (Sreberny 2005; Deuze 2005; Husband 2005; Couldry and Dreher 2007).
5
6
7
8 Notwithstanding the important role that ethnic media play in cultural maintenance and
9
10 adaptation, public concerns revolve around fears of cultural and ethnic segregation and
11
12 ghettoization. Although in popular debates these concerns are often based on simplistic and
13
14 unfounded fears of ethnic isolationism, there are more complex issues at play that relate to
15
16 democratic representation and political participation for minority communities. Sreberny (2005)
17
18 portrays the conundrum as one of balancing the need for marginalised communities to have
19
20 spaces for self-controlled representation, whilst attempting to avoid ethnic reification in which
21
22 communities are frozen in isolated positions vis-à-vis each other and the majority ethnic group.
23
24
25 Similarly, drawing on the theory of the public sphere, Husband (1998, 2005) and Couldry and
26
27 Dreher (2007) question the dominant discourses surrounding ethnic media as, in and of itself, an
28
29 effective resource for minority empowerment. Rather, more attention should be paid to the
30
31 potential of communication across and between communities in ways that allow for recognition
32
33 of the fluidity of ethnic identities and the diversity of their voices. What is at stake is not so much
34
35 a re-idealisation of a singular public sphere, but recognition of the need for marginalised and
36
37 minority communities to not only speak, but be understood and acknowledged by the mainstream
38
39 and by each other.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46 Sreberny's (2005) study of ethnic and multicultural media in England found that ethnic media
47
48 producers and audiences sought a media system that better reflected the multiple identities,
49
50 relationships and 'gazes' of minority Britons. Many spoke out against being categorised as
51
52 'ethnic' producers, while others accepted the label as a form of positive differentiation. Audience
53
54 members complained of the lack of portrayals of mixed race characters on English television,
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 suggesting such portrayals often constructed a homogeneous ethnic group with few inter-ethnic
4 relationships (Sreberny 2005). What these findings, as well as those of Deuze (2005) and others,
5 suggest is that when ethnic minorities engage with media, either as users, producers or both, they
6 engage with a multiplicity of media, perform different identities and enact various gazes towards
7 geographical, political and social spaces (Sreberny 2005).
8
9

15 **Sample and Methods**

16
17 The author conducted in depth, qualitative, semi-structured interviews with 13 African-
18 Australian media producers, presenters, broadcasters and journalists in Melbourne, Sydney and
19 Adelaide. The interview questions were prepared according to criteria established in previous
20 literature on qualitative methodologies (Berg 2007; Silverman 2003). Although the sample is not
21 intended to be generalizable, it nonetheless provides a significant range of respondents from a
22 variety of media. Participants represent a variety of countries from the African continent,
23 including the Congo, Ethiopia, Botswana, South Sudan and Sierra Leone. Respondents produce
24 media through different technologies, including a website, community radio, community
25 television, and magazines. All but three of the interviewees produce at least some of their content
26 in English. The three exceptions are all Ethiopian community radio broadcasters, with two
27 broadcasting in Amharic and one in Harari. The participants are all first generation migrants.
28
29 All interviews were conducted in English, audio recorded and transcribed by the author. The use
30 of in depth interviews is the best way to examine “the *how* and *why*”, of participants’ work,
31 including their aims, motivations and the social role they see their media playing (Gustafson and
32 Hickerson 2014: 6). Interview transcripts were analysed first in their totality, in line with aspects
33 of grounded theory (Ryan and Bernard 2003). The next stage of the analysis consisted of
34 identifying key themes as they relate to the central aims of the paper. Each transcript was read
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 through carefully several times, with themes identified and highlighted (Ryan and Bernard,
4
5
6 2003). The themes themselves were made more prevalent by the overall structure of the
7
8 interview itself.
9

10 In discussing the data I begin with findings that replicate those most common in previous
11
12 literature on ethnic media – their role in providing an alternative to mainstream media. At the
13
14 same time, I will contextualise the situation amongst African-Australians within the broader
15
16 media landscape of Australia, particularly the mainstream media discourses that have emerged
17
18 around African migration and settlement. I will then move on to some of the more unique
19
20 findings of this project and articulate the way in which they shed further light on the relationship
21
22 between minority ethnic media and majority social institutions and media practices. Finally, I
23
24 will relate these findings to debates involving the public sphere.
25
26
27
28

29 **A Voice of our Own: Countering Negativity and Promoting Positivity**

30
31 Participants are far from homogenous in their approaches to media work and production. Coming
32
33 from different political, linguistic, cultural and religious backgrounds, they display a diverse set
34
35 of aims and motivations. Indeed, Cunningham (2001: 138) suggests diasporic media provide a
36
37 “space for the staging of difference”. The acknowledgement of such difference in terms of media
38
39 production and reception is an important antidote to the all too easy essentialisation of migrants
40
41 and ethnic minorities as consisting of homogeneous communities guided by uniform experiences
42
43 of displacement and nostalgia. Several participants are motivated in their work by a personal
44
45 desire to create media and, in some cases, to work their way into the mainstream media sector in
46
47 Australia. At least one participant was motivated to produce a magazine by, in part, a love of
48
49 creativity, writing and art. Still another participant cited as part of his motivation for community
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 radio broadcast a desire to give back to the community after he had been exposed to kindness
4 upon arriving in Australia.
5
6

7
8 There are several instances in the interviews, however, in which the personal and public
9 intertwine and participants' discussions of their personal reasons for producing media are clearly
10 part of a wider narrative concerning representation, power and access to wider social structures.
11
12

13 This is particularly the case in discussions of Australian media, and their general failure to
14 sufficiently acknowledge African-Australians as anything other than 'problems' to be dealt with.
15
16

17 In Australia, both African migrants in general, as well as Sudanese and Somali youth more
18 specifically, have been featured in mediated public debates over multiculturalism and migrant
19 and refugee settlement (Due 2008; Marjoribanks et al. 2010; Windle 2008). Analysing media
20 representations, Due (2008) and Marjoribanks et al. (2010) argue that the mainstream media in
21 Australia construct a binary opposition between a white Australian 'we' and a black 'other'.
22
23

24 Sudanese in Australia, for example, are constructed largely as a problem to be dealt with, even
25 when they are reported as being victims of violence (Marjoribanks et al. 2010; Windle 2008).
26
27

28 Such media coverage provides a platform for debates about their perceived inability to integrate
29 (Marjoribanks et al. 2010). Arguably, these issues came to a head in Melbourne around 2007,
30 when teenager Liep Gony was beaten to death by two white youths. After the attack, then
31 immigration minister Kevin Andrews questioned the ability of African migrants to integrate into
32 Australian society.
33
34

35 Whilst interviewing participants in 2013 - 2015 it became clear that, while some saw a slight
36 improvement in media coverage, there were still major concerns with the mainstream media's
37 treatment of African migrants and related issues. All 13 participants discussed Australian media
38 in negative terms, while 6 also saw some positive attributes to the mainstream media sector. The
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 major themes in these discussions revolved around a lack of balanced representation, little focus
4
5 on the positive achievements of African-Australians, and a preoccupation with crime and gang
6
7 activity amongst young Africans (Marjoribanks et al. 2010; Due 2008). It is within this context
8
9 that participants discussed the importance of self-representation and the way in which they could
10
11 counter the negative images of the mainstream media sector (Browne, 2005). Several participants
12
13 directly relate the need for self-representation to mainstream media. One participant, a young,
14
15 female community radio host and musician, discussed the importance of having control over
16
17 media in the following way:
18
19
20
21

22 I studied at NAIDA and my teacher told me that the only job I'll ever get is either SBS or
23
24 community media...if you're trying to get in channel 7, channel 9, channel 10, the
25
26 criteria within there is that if they don't look like us (white) don't bring them in the
27
28 door...it's good that we focus on kind of creating our own outlets.
29
30
31

32 Other participants lamented the lack of African voices in debates about African communities and
33
34 issues in Australia. As one male community radio host said:
35
36

37 There isn't a platform at the moment for the African Australian community to speak.
38
39 Every time there's an issue there's 'Bob Smith', who's a Professor at so and so talking
40
41 about, you know why this issue is important...No matter how well meaning that person is
42
43 they won't necessarily be going with the agenda or the interests of the African Australian
44
45 community at heart.
46
47

48 When discussing the need to promote a positive image of African communities, participants
49
50 pointed out that they do not want positivity at all costs, rather a more balanced portrayal that
51
52 includes coverage of problems facing African-Australian communities, as well as the
53
54 contributions these communities have made to Australian society. One young female participant
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 who contributes to an English language website was careful to emphasise the journalistic ideal of
4
5
6 objectivity in her work. When discussing the benefit of being able to provide a voice for African-
7
8
9 Australians, she described her motivation as being “able to send out the right messages out there,
10
11 even if it’s negative even if it’s positive, but we just need to be heard, that’s it”.

12
13 Indeed, at times it is simply a more realistic portrayal that is aimed for. A female host of a
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Indeed, at times it is simply a more realistic portrayal that is aimed for. A female host of a
Sudanese community radio program spoke of the importance of her program as showing “we
don’t only exist when there’s a mistake; we also exist when everything is just normal”. A young
male participant who produced and hosted a community television program in 2012 spoke about
the lack of normalcy when it comes to media portrayals of Africans and Africa. In particular, he
lamented the construction of Africa as an exotic safari holiday destination, and Africans as
successful entertainers or sports people:

There is nothing normal, you know, it’s either we’re super holiday, or super dancing, or
sports, you know, yeah we’re the best in sports, super body built African, and so people
tend to think we’re just not normal, so I wanted to show Africans as being normal.

For some participants, their aims to promote a positive image of their community involve an
inward gaze that is directed less at mainstream media and more toward language and cultural
maintenance, social education and the embracing of future community leaders. The 3 Ethiopian
participants who broadcast in Amharic or Harari focus extensively on community and youth
issues, including involving young people in Ethiopian and Australian social life. As the section
below explains, community maintenance and support was a central factor for several
participants.

Local Issues, Community and Youth

1
2
3 Supporting community culture, Language and traditions is a common goal amongst ethnic media
4 producers around the world according to Browne (2005). Several participants in this study
5
6 emphasised their aim of promoting and articulating a particular community, whether that be pan-
7
8 African or a specific linguistic or cultural group. The importance of community maintenance was
9
10 most evident from participants who's media was based on a particular linguistic group (the
11
12 Ethiopian respondents who broadcast in Amharic or Harari, or the Sudanese participants who
13
14 broadcast in Dinka and Arabic as well as English) and those who focused on a particular aspect
15
16 of the African communities, such as social justice and African history.
17
18
19

20
21 Two participants from a community radio program in Sydney articulated an African history and
22
23 identity when discussing the aims and motivations of their programs. Their approach is
24
25 educational and one in which they aim to rediscover and pass on a particular African narrative to
26
27 future generations. As one of the participants explained:
28
29
30

31 We're [African communities in general] not talking about the real issue ... you know
32
33 who we are, cause we come here and automatically want to be Europeans, we want to
34
35 forget about being Africans ... and my passion now is to ... we need to start steering
36
37 ourselves in the right direction cause I find the youth following this gang mentality that
38
39 comes from America
40
41
42

43 A focus on local news and issues was motivated by a need empower members of African
44
45 communities and to provide information lacking in the mainstream media, such as news about
46
47 employment, policing, housing, culture and language. Several participants spoke with pride
48
49 about the information, sense of community and general well-being afforded to their listeners and
50
51 readers. Another less common reason behind a focus on local issues is a lack of resources with
52
53 which to source news from Africa and the African diaspora. Major news events from Africa were
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 still covered; however, priority was often given to local issues due to the desires of audiences
4
5 and the comparative ease of finding such news.
6
7

8 **Reaching out to the Mainstream: Impacting on media practices and public debates**

9

10 Despite a focus on community, cultural maintenance and local issues, ethnic minority media are
11 far from “homeostatic devices” (Bauman 2011: 32). Indeed, according to Amin Malouf (as cited
12 in Bauman 2011) if migrants feel their original cultural practices are respected, safe and strong,
13 they are more likely to engage positively with the cultural practices of the country of settlement.
14 African-Australian media are involved in the constant change of cultural adaptation and political
15 and social relationships of power and inequality. This change comes through generational change
16 as first, second and third generation migrants engage with media for different reasons (Hickerson
17 and Gustafson 2014). Even amongst the sample for this study, in which all participants are first
18 generation migrants, gazes are focused towards the wider cultural institutions and social
19 structures of Australian society. This is not a teleological march toward a point of integration or
20 assimilation at which ethnic media are no longer needed (Hickerson and Gustafson 2014; Park
21 1922), but rather part of complex relationships between minority and majority cultures.
22 According to Browne (2005), reaching out to a non-ethnic audience is not a common goal
23 amongst ethnic media producers. In many ways, however, the findings of this study are not
24 surprising, and can be seen as a logical extension of aims and motivations discussed earlier, in
25 particular the need to counter negative media coverage and provide a more positive image of
26 minorities. African-Australian media producers take this a step further and directly and indirectly
27 reach out to a non-African audience and attempt to, or desire to, impact the Australian media. All
28 participants mention a desire to either reach out to or change powerful social or media discourses
29 in Australia.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 For some this is a direct goal. The producer of a pan-African website actively monitors and tries
4
5 to change the mainstream media reporting of African issues. As he says:
6
7

8 [E]very time there is media publication that I see as negative for the African, I want to
9
10 organise an interview with the journalist that published that, as a way to kind of say hey
11
12 you know, it's okay, you can publish your media, but we would like you to be able to
13
14 give us a little bit of the understanding why you're reporting in this way rather than the
15
16 other way...I mean it's some sort of soft monitoring.
17
18

19
20 Other participants take a more indirect approach, or aim to challenge mainstream media more in
21
22 the future. Participant six, the young male host of a community radio program explained, "We
23
24 try to do it indirectly...by...showcasing different successful Africans, their contributions to the
25
26 community...but we don't actually directly contact those media agents and say...listen to us,
27
28 which is what we should be doing, I think that's the next step." Additionally, some participants
29
30 featured senior members of Victoria Police on their radio programs in order to question policing
31
32 practices and policies in areas highly populated with African migrants.
33
34

35
36 This engagement with non-Africans is further demonstrated in the targeting of a white, or non-
37
38 African audience. Participants implicitly and explicitly target a white audience through their
39
40 media, and all are open to non-African readers and listeners. A content producer for the English
41
42 language website, described her audience in the following way, "I think the main aim would be
43
44 Australians, we're trying to sell our stories to them and to show them what we can do....".
45
46
47

48 Another participant who hosts an Amharic language Ethiopian community radio program
49
50 pointed to the reality of language restrictions while also acknowledging a desire to engage a
51
52 white audience in the future: "I have to say Ethiopians, because our program ... is in Amharic.
53
54 But ... I want to put it in English ... for Ethiopian born in Australia and ... for Australians".
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Indeed, even amongst those producers whose aim is to maintain cultures, communities and
4 languages, the engagement with young second generation African-Australians, and a desire to
5 promote their successful inclusion in Australian society, is evident. There is also anecdotal
6 evidence of this approach to audiences having some sort of impact, with one participant
7 suggesting that:
8
9

10
11
12
13
14
15 ...for Australians, even though they were not Africans, they appreciated it [his program],
16 a lot of people did respond and just say ‘thank you, you’ve really shown us like another
17 side of Africa that we never imagined and certainly you’ve shown us African-Australians
18 in a way that we’ve never really seen them’.
19

20
21
22
23
24
25 The above approaches to audiences, content and mainstream media problematize definitions of
26 ethnic media as simply alternatives to the mainstream, with defined ethnic audiences. Analyses
27 of their relationship to mainstream media have been restricted to the counter-narratives they
28 offer, with little in the way of attempting to change mass media practices. The desire to impact
29 on the mainstream media is evidence of a more active role for African-Australian media, one in
30 which mainstream debates and discourses are engaged with in an attempt to change them. It is
31 perhaps not surprising that one participant described his work as “advocacy journalism”. Implicit
32 in this process is recognition that the common aims and motivations – countering negativity,
33 positive representations – will do little to directly change the discourse and attitudes of the
34 dominant ethnic group.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **Discussion: Which Public Sphere?**

49

50
51 This last point is worth expanding upon. As this study has demonstrated, there are certainly
52 attempts to reach beyond a specific audience and social field amongst African media producers.
53
54
55 There is also evidence of some success in doing this, whether it is small changes to mainstream
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 media reporting or finding a receptive white audience in a way that might change attitudes
4
5 toward migration. The question that needs to be asked is to what extent can such effects become
6
7 sustained parts of a genuine process in which African, and other ethnic media producers, are able
8
9 to influence the political, social, and cultural discourses that are formed and disseminated by
10
11 powerful mainstream groups (mainstream media, police and legal institutions, government). In
12
13 other words, what is the transformative potential of ethnic media outside of their fluid, ideal
14
15 community of listeners and readers? This is a question that has been engaged with, although not
16
17 in any particularly sustained fashion, through a critical engagement with the public sphere.
18
19 In light of the Bourgeoisie public sphere's very constitution through certain forms of exclusion
20
21 and communicative bracketing, the original ideal of a single inclusive space for public
22
23 deliberation has understandably relinquished ground to a model of multiple publics. Such publics
24
25 are important in terms of both the content of public debate and the mode of that debate. What is
26
27 worthy of public discussion (important public issues) is rarely agreed upon throughout civil
28
29 society, and minority groups are in danger of having their concerns personalised or trivialised
30
31 (Fraser 1990). The nature of communication within the public sphere has also been demonstrated
32
33 as specific, rather than universal, resting on masculine assumptions of rationality and particular
34
35 cultural behaviours. This is an important issue for ethnic minorities, for even if they speak
36
37 English – as all of the participants in this study do – there are more subtle cultural differences in
38
39 terms of cultural mores and status relations between interlocutors (Fraser, 1990). A historical
40
41 exclusion of minority groups from the bourgeoisie public sphere had authors such as Fraser
42
43 (1990) calling for a model of multiple counter-publics; subaltern public spheres which employ a
44
45 strategy of 'engaged withdrawal' (Kurasawa 2014) through which they construct counter-
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 discourses and communicative structures that directly challenge dominant public understandings
4
5 of social issues.
6
7

8 However, the question that remains is one of political efficacy and inter-public engagement. It is
9
10 useful to jump ahead to Fraser's (2014) discussion of the possibility of a transnational public
11
12 sphere, for it raises questions pertinent to any consideration of the public sphere in an era of sub-
13
14 and transnational identities and social and political formations. Here, Fraser reminds us that the
15
16 public sphere's structural transformation in the post-westphalian global system raises questions
17
18 of normative legitimacy (who belongs to the public) and political efficacy (the ability of public
19
20 opinion to 'speak' to a sovereign political body). The prevailing question in regards to multiple,
21
22 independent public spheres is not so much their existence, nor the utility of such a model to
23
24 understand contemporary social relations (particularly in the field of media), but rather their
25
26 correlation– or lack thereof – with a representative political body, and their (in)ability to resonate
27
28 with a wider public, or publics. In other words, to what extent are separate public spheres able to
29
30 articulate their desires into real political action through political means, and have their narratives
31
32 heard and understood beyond their fluid boundaries? Within this model of multiple, contesting
33
34 and interrelating publics, how can those in marginal positions be guaranteed access to the still
35
36 largely centralised mechanisms of public policy, cultural formation and political decision
37
38 making? How might a group of visible migrants, such as Black Africans, have their concerns
39
40 heard and valued consistently within public discourses – concerns over housing, employment,
41
42 institutionalised racismⁱⁱ. These are questions beyond the scope of this paper, but we can take
43
44 some clues from available literature.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 There is ample evidence to suggest that at the discursive and symbolic level ethnic media reach
54
55 beyond their assumed sphere of activity and facilitate inter-public dialogue, either between
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 minority and majority publics, or between minority publics only (Forde et al. 2009; Deuze 2006;
4
5
6 Couldry and Dreher 2007; Lay and Thomas 2012; Sreberny 2005; Husband 1998, 2005). In
7
8 findings that correspond to this study, research suggests that minority ethnic media bring
9
10 minorities into contact with mainstream organisations and structures by: providing information
11
12 about the wider society; exposing migrants to social debates and issues that affect them and
13
14 others; encouraging ethnic minorities to become involved in mainstream political process such as
15
16 voting; and by bringing ethnic minorities and migrants into direct contact with people from both
17
18 minority and majority ethnic groups through work in radio stations and organised community
19
20 events (Forde et al. 2009).
21
22
23

24 For Fraser (1990: 67), the “concept of a counter public militates in the long run against
25
26 separatism because it assumes an orientation that is publicist”. The public nature of even a
27
28 marginalised public ensures the exchange of views, dialogue, discourse and the potential
29
30 expansion of debates to “ever widening arenas” (Fraser 1990: 67). Importantly, such an approach
31
32 prioritises autonomy as a guard against subsumption into a wider, less representative public
33
34 space tainted by structural power inequalities. For ethnic media, such autonomy is important and
35
36 self-control. Take, for example, the way participants in this study spoke about the need to
37
38 counter negative media portrayals. Not through a simplistic celebration but through a nuanced
39
40 acknowledgement of both their positive contribution to Australian society as well as the issues
41
42 facing their communities.
43
44
45
46
47

48 However, at what point does such autonomy leave itself open to marginalisation, particularly in
49
50 the case of poorly resourced and under-funded ethnic minority media? Husband (1998, 2005) is
51
52 less enthusiastic about the potential of counter-discourses and publicity alone to foster a more
53
54 democratic and inclusive social system. He provides an evaluation of the underlying structural
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 conditions necessary in order to achieve balance between self-representative publics and
4
5 minority groups that are politically efficacious, and argues for a multi-ethnic public sphere with a
6
7 strong ethnic media sector at its heart. He suggests that the “adequacy of a multi-ethnic public
8
9 sphere will be measured by both the diversity of interests given a voice and the extent to which
10
11 there are open channels of exchange between these voices” (Husband 1998: 143). Such exchange
12
13 is not guaranteed by the public nature of dialogue or by “ethnically segmented media” (Husband
14
15 1998: 143). Rather, it rests upon a media environment that reflects two key political and rights
16
17 based values.
18
19

20
21 The first includes a fundamental re-evaluation of communicative rights to include the right to be
22
23 understood, and the obligation to seek comprehension of others. Even in Australia, where rights
24
25 to freedom of expression are not enshrined in a human rights declaration or a constitution, the
26
27 right to be understood is important for its implications of dialogue. In recent debates about free
28
29 speech and freedom of expression, the political tone, and that within the mainstream media, has
30
31 been one in support of individual rights to expression, and less embracing of concerns around
32
33 racial vilificationⁱⁱⁱ. What such a focus on individual rights of expression ignore, however, is the
34
35 inevitable relative silence of minorities in a system in which some people’s avenues of
36
37 expression include powerful media, legal and political systems, while others’ involve
38
39 marginalised processes largely ignored by all but a minority of people. Effective cross-cultural
40
41 and inter-public dialogue is thus dependent on an acceptance of both rights and obligations in the
42
43 communicative process (Husband 1998).
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 This change in communicative expectations is to be matched with “an institutional pluralism
51
52 consistent with polyethnic rights rather than a cultural pluralism consistent with multicultural
53
54 tolerance” (Husband 1998: 143). Such a process would involve a level of institutionalized
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 recognition and support for ethnic minorities that is more than simply token acknowledgement of
4
5 difference, or of the kind of multiculturalism that Bauman (2011) critiques for masking
6
7 inequality as cultural diversity. Rather it involves institutionalized changes in the structures of
8
9 publicity, including media, and a greater investment in non-market funding and support. Within
10
11 media organisations, such change may begin with what Sreberny (2005) refers to as 'mixedness';
12
13 the ability for minorities to exist outside of their designated 'communities' or archetypal 'roles'
14
15 and to have a constitutive role in the production and dissemination of all sorts of media content.
16
17
18 The question here becomes one of autonomy, and the possibility of genuinely alternative
19
20 discourses emerging in a system of transformed, yet pre-existing, avenues of political
21
22 representation. For participants it may mean engaging with questions over how much control of
23
24 their media they are willing to sacrifice for a more sustainable and resonant voice in public
25
26 debates. These questions are perhaps too reliant on a dichotomy between counter-publics and a
27
28 mainstream public sphere. As even Habermas' more recent work attests to, the situation is often
29
30 more complex. Couldry and Dreher (2007: 80) for example, challenge "the assumption that the
31
32 public sphere model requires either a unified public sphere or a set of independent 'counter-
33
34 public' spherecules". Their analysis of the Forum for Australia's Islamic Relations (FAIR) is of
35
36 note here. They describe FAIR not as a counter-public sphere, but rather "a space of information,
37
38 deliberation and activism that seeks to reform the mainstream public sphere, but from a position
39
40 at present outside it" (Couldry and Dreher 2007: 82).

41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48 Emphasising the importance of dialogue and affect between publics, Couldry and Dreher (2007)
49
50 raise the possibility of a space between mainstream and counter-publics. Aspects of this certainly
51
52 resonate with the attempts by African media producers to directly and indirectly communicate
53
54 with and change mainstream media, public and political discourses in Australia. Such an
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 approach recognises that both a single public sphere, or multiple publics, while conceptually
4 helpful, are necessarily based on an implicit fastening of what are in reality porous and fluid
5
6
7
8 ‘boundaries’ in between overlapping publics containing social actors who engage with a variety
9
10 of communities in their everyday lives. Nonetheless, in trying to understand the role of ethnic
11
12 minority media in Australia and other countries, a useful starting point is debates over the nature
13
14 of public deliberation and political representation, and the questions they raise regarding the
15
16 balancing of social and political affect with minority representational autonomy.
17
18

19 20 **Conclusion**

21
22 Browne (2005) argues that the most likely way that ethnic media will encourage participation in
23
24 the public sphere will be indirect; curiosity and small group discussions. At present, it seems that
25
26 African-Australian media producers are in the early stages of direct participation in the public
27
28 sphere, certainly in terms of influencing the practices of major public institutions (police, mass
29
30 media) and engaging in public debates and discourses. The question remains as to how best to
31
32 understand the changing social and media landscape in complex, multi-ethnic societies. This
33
34 paper has finished by raising more questions than it answers. However, these are questions
35
36 pertinent to present and future discussions of ethnic media and political and social participation.
37
38
39

40 41 **References**

42
43 Author (2013)

44
45 Author (2015)

46
47 Bauman, Z. (2011) *Culture in a Liquid Modern World*. Cambridge: Polity.

48
49 Browne (2005) *Ethnic Minorities: Electronic media and the public sphere*. Cresskill, NJ:

50
51 Hampton.

52
53
54
55 Berg, B. (2007) *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*. Boston: Pearson
56
57 Education.

- 1
2
3 Couldry, N. and T. Dreher (2007) 'Globalization and the Public Sphere: Exploring the space of
4 community media in Sydney', *Global Media and Communication* 3(1): 79-100.
5
6
7
8 Cover, R. (2012) 'Digital Transitions: Minority ethnic community media, local/home hybridity,
9 and digitisation of the means of communication', *Australian Journal of Communication* 39(2):
10 19-33.
11
12
13
14
15 Cunningham, S. and T. Nguyen (1999) 'The Popular Media of the Vietnamese Diaspora', *Media*
16 *International Australia* 91: 125-147.
17
18
19
20 Deuze, M. (2006) 'Ethnic Media, Community Media and Participatory Culture', *Journalism* 7(8):
21 262-280.
22
23
24
25 Due, C. (2008) 'Who are Strangers?: "Absorbing" Sudanese refugees into a white Australia',
26 *Australian Critical Race and Whiteness Studies Association Journal* 4(1): 1-13.
27
28
29
30 Forde, S., K. Foxwell and M. Meadows (2009) *Developing Dialogues: Indigenous and ethnic*
31 *community broadcasting in Australia*. Britsol, UK: Intellect.
32
33
34
35 Fraser, N. (1990) *Rethinking the Public Sphere: A contribution to the critique of actually existing*
36 *democracy*', *Social Text* 25/26: 56-80.
37
38
39
40 Fraser, N. (2014) *Transnationalizing the Public Sphere: On the legitimacy and efficacy of public*
41 *opinion in a post-Westphalian world*, pp. 8-42 in K. Nash (ed.) *Transnationalizing the Public*
42 *Sphere*, Cambridge: Polity.
43
44
45
46
47 Hickerson, A. and K. Gustafson (2014) 'Revisiting the Immigrant Press', *Journalism* 15: 1-18.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Kurasawa, F. (2014) An Alternative Transnational Public Sphere? On anarchist cosmopolitanism
4 in post-Westphalian times', pp. 79-97 in K. Nash (ed.) Transnationalizing the Public Sphere,
5
6 Cambridge: Polity.
7
8

9
10 Lay, S. and L. Thomas (2012) 'Ethnic Minority Media in London: Transition and
11 transformation', *Media, Culture and Society* 34(3): 369-380.
12

13 Marjoribanks, T., D. Nolan and K. Farquharson (2010) 'Media Representations of Sudanese
14 People in Australia: An initial analysis', Proceedings of 'Media, Democracy and Change',
15 Australian and New Zealand Communication Association.
16
17

18 Matsaganis, M, V. Katz and S. Ball-Rokeach (2010) Understanding Ethnic media: Producers,
19 consumers and societies. CA: Sage.
20
21

22 Ryan, G. and R. Bernard (2003) 'Data Management and Analysis Methods', pp. 259-309 in
23 Denzin, N. and Y. Lincoln (eds.), *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials*. California:
24 Sage.
25
26

27 Silverman, D. (2003) 'Analysing Talk and Text', pp. 340-362 in Denzin, N. and Y. Lincoln (eds.)
28 *Collecting and Interpreting Qualitative Materials*. California: Sage, pp.
29
30

31 Sreberny, A. (2005) 'Not Only, But Also: Mixedness and media', *Journal of Ethnic and*
32 *Migration Studies* 31(1): 443-459.
33
34

35 Windle, J. (2008) 'The Racialization of African Youth in Australia', *Social Identities* 14(5): 553-
36 566.
37
38

39 Gillespie, M. (2006) 'Transnational Television Audiences after September 11', *Journal of Ethnic*
40 *and Migration Studies* 32(6): 903-921.
41
42

43 Shields, P. (2014) 'Borders and Information Flows and Transnational Networks', *Global Media*
44 *and Communication* 10(1): 3-33.
45
46
47
48
49

1
2
3 Cunningham, S. (2001) 'Popular Media as Public "Spherecules" for Diasporic Communities',
4
5 International Journal of Cultural Studies 4(2): 131-147.
6

7
8 Morley, D. (2000) Home Territories: Media, mobility and identity. London, UK: Routledge.
9

10
11
12 _____
13 ⁱ Although Australia does still have a public broadcasting sector, it is one that has recently suffered from funding
14 cuts, political interference and the encroachment of commercialisation.
15

16
17 ⁱⁱ At the time of this study, members of the Victoria Police in Sunshine were found to have circulated stubby
18 holders with images of mudfish on them, a derogatory term for Africans.
19

20
21 ⁱⁱⁱ In 2014 then Attorney General George Brandis proposed a weakening of section 18c of the Racial Discrimination
22 Act in Australia. After protests from ethnic, migrant and community groups, the proposed changes were
23 abandoned. However, both Brandis and Human Rights Commissioner Tim Wilson have publicly expressed their
24 support for freedom of speech, with little consideration given to inequality and the vilification of minority groups.
25
26
27
28
29

30
31 Word count: 6,582
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60