

# COMMUNITY RADIO MEASUREMENT – MEANS, RATIONALE AND ENABLING ENVIRONMENT

By

Tamás Bódi

Submitted to

Central European University

Department of Public Policy

*In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the  
Master of Arts Degree in Public Policy*

Supervisor: Kristina Irion

*Budapest, Hungary*

2010

## ABSTRACT

Primary research question; the measurability of community radio audience is crucial in the advocacy, acknowledgement and further development of the sector. Case of Hungary helps to review the history of the sector and to understand both the primary role of the field in democratization and the challenges it may face later in a practicing democracy – that is the broader problem measurability has to be set in. Alternative media in Hungary played important role in forming of a legislation that was setting both standards in the region for third pillar media of media systems and ground for a relatively flourishing community media in the country.

The democratic role of third media is examined in the introduction through the evaluation of social gain derived from the activity of the sector. Conclusion of an initial literature review found that there is no universally accepted methodology to measure impact and the problem seems to lack proper attention. Significant part is devoted to look for role models of enabling policy environments through the European history and present practice of several nations. Also to review surveys initiated by governments, regulators, community radio associations or academic institutes to size up the field, tackle contemporary conditions, challenges and functioning of third media. After this results of the few cases of community media audience research from Netherlands Australia are summarized alongside some of the methodological guidance that is available for such attempts.

Methodology of own research includes interviews with community radio managers, researchers, advocates and legislators dealing with this field. The most active and diverse circle of small-scale community radio operators and content editors were surveyed to find examples of individual bottom-up initiatives for audience measurement.

The gains and prerequisites of sufficient community radio audience and impact measurement are not embedded in policy considerations. Major findings highlight the need for and the possible role of co-regulation or at least more institutionalized forms of interest representation and conciliation towards the regulator – as one of the most important prerequisite that makes it possible to conduct necessary audience measurement.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>ABSTRACT .....</b>	<b>II</b>
<b>TABLE OF CONTENTS .....</b>	<b>III</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1 – THE STATE OF COMMUNITY RADIOS .....</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1 THE CONCEPTUAL DEFINITION OF COMMUNITY RADIOS .....	3
1.2 DEVELOPMENT AND ROLE OF COMMUNITY RADIOS.....	5
1.3 THE ROLE OF CIVIC RADIOS IN DEMOCRACY .....	7
1.4 LEGISLATION, STATE OF COMMUNITY RADIOS, MEDIA REGULATION AND THE STATE .....	10
<b>CHAPTER 2 – MISSION AND MANAGEMENT OF COMMUNITY RADIOS.....</b>	<b>14</b>
2.1 WHO MAKES COMMUNITY RADIOS AND FOR WHOM?.....	14
2.2 CAN COMMUNITY RADIOS REACH THEIR AUDIENCE? TECHNICAL, PERSONAL AND REGULATORY CONDITIONS.....	15
2.3 CAN EFFICIENCY OF COMMUNITY RADIOS BE MEASURED? .....	16
2.4 WHAT ARE THE MEANS OF MEASUREMENT? .....	18
2.5 SOCIAL GAIN OF COMMUNITY RADIOS .....	20
2.6 DEVELOPMENT OF COMMUNITY RADIOS IN EUROPE .....	22
<b>CHAPTER 3 – COMMUNITY RADIOS IN HUNGARY .....</b>	<b>24</b>
3.1 CIVIC RADIOS IN THE HUNGARIAN DEMOCRACY .....	24
3.2 HUNGARY’S REGIONAL LEADING ROLE IN THE AREA OF COMMUNITY RADIOS.....	27
3.3 STATUS OF THE HUNGARIAN COMMUNITY RADIOS.....	29
3.4 POSSIBILITIES OF REGULATION: DESIRES AND REALITIES .....	32
<b>CHAPTER 4 – SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY .....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>APPENDICES .....</b>	<b>42</b>
1. INTERVIEWS .....	42
2. QUESTIONNAIRE.....	43
3. LIST OF SURVEYED HUNGARIAN COMMUNITY RADIOS .....	46

## INTRODUCTION

Community radio is the most diverse and complex form of the so-called three pillar media system. These stations are the ones which can address and form communities in the most direct way, channeling back their impact to the radio itself. „Low power – high impact” label (referring to low broadcasting power and important social effect) suggests well the social impact of these radios, describing them as the basic and essential tools of democratization. „To the extent that the functioning of democracy requires the exchange and debate of information and ideas, the media is a participant in the democratic process, as well as forming a space which facilitates that interchange.” (Hitchens, 2006)

The role of media in the democratic process is often emphasized as it provides a forum for public debate. It is also a marketplace of free speech; therefore it makes sense to extend the principle of the protection of free speech to the media. „Public sphere theory (including modifications of Habermas who recognizes alternative or counter-public spheres) is the area the most drawn upon by commentators.” (Lewis, 2008)

The role of the media strongly changed along with the social changes experienced during the 20th century and in the last one decade. „[Habermas] argues that the increasing complexity and rationalization of societies over the course of the 20th century, together with the growth of the mass media, have transformed the public sphere: »the public sphere becomes the court before which public prestige can be displayed – rather than in which critical debate is carried on« (Habermas, 1989). In other words, horizontal communication between citizens is increasingly replaced by vertical communication between mass media, greatly influenced by both the state and capital, and consumers.” (Downey *et al*, 2003) Some critics however note that it is less and less feasible to implement Habermas’ theoretical observations to the contemporary economic and media world.

What sorts of community expectations do such multifaceted media forms have to meet? How do we measure their community impact? Kate Coyer stresses about community media, community radio that „it provides a different kind of value, and so measuring their impact has to use different kinds of methodologies.” (Coyer, 2009) The best way could be to have

qualitative measures that demonstrate the community radios' impact. This can be measured, for instance, with an index called the value of participation. Some of these stations are not just about how many people are listening to them, it is not just about what kinds of content they are providing, but what matters is the fact that they provide opportunity for people to make media, to learn certain skills. Instead of counting how many listeners do they have, one can consider how many volunteers do they involve, how many producers do they have, or how many people are gaining skills. All the latter are part of the public service these radios are providing.

In Hungary the legislation gave free way to small community radios in 2002 by regulating third media in a pioneering way, therefore Hungarian regulation has a special importance in the region. This thesis also tries to answer the question how can or could community radios function in our country and under which regulations. It also examines the international environment, systems self-regulation and grassroots organizational development. The most important question is perhaps: what is the impact and efficiency of community radios? Can community media be measured and should it be measured at all? How can qualitative methods used at other media applied in the case of small-scale community stations?

The thesis is divided into three basic parts. First, it discusses the role of community radios, their emergence and early development. Second, it deals with current issues of media regulation, talks about the mission of such radios, their general structure and the question of measurement. The third section is a case study, introducing the situation of Hungarian community radios. It also attempts to give some suggestions based on opinions of community radio operators and some experts regarding community radio regulations. My work intends to summarize three different sources of literature. I made analysis of international literature focusing on the functioning special regulations of community radios. I also conducted interviews with Peter Molnar, a former MP in Hungary who played a crucial role in setting up the legislation for community radios about the practicalities of Hungarian and international regulation systems. I interviewed Gergely Gosztonyi too, a researcher of community radio legislation, with Pieter de Wit former director of the Dutch OLON, and with Steve Buckley representing AMARC. The third pillar of the thesis, which is the most practice oriented part of my work, is based on my research among Hungarian low-power FM community radios.

## CHAPTER 1 – THE STATE OF COMMUNITY RADIOS

### 1.1 *The conceptual definition of community radios*

The community radio is the most symbolic and the most concrete expression of the freedom of speech, democratic media, pluralism and localism. It is a third type of actor besides public service media and commercial radio stations. Community radios are as multifaceted as the types of community problems, listeners and their needs. Community radios are born out of various motivations, with different programs and structure. Historically, the philosophy of community radio is to use this medium as the voice of the voiceless, the mouthpiece of oppressed people (be it on racial, 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.” (Mtimde *et al*, 1998) In fact community radio can not be strictly defined even though there are certain characteristics, mainly within the domain of their difference from the mainstream radios (AMARC, 1995).

The main value of community radios is that compared to other media, it is able to address its audience more freely and intimately, it is not tied by advertisement contracts driven by the market as it would be the case with many commercial radios, and there are no strict state, political requirements as in case of public service radios. They are politically, economically independent, they stand apart from the traditional dual system of media- systems. The role of the community radio is nothing else but to “give voice to the voiceless”, in other words to provide space for the freedom of expression. (ORTT, 2007) The makers of these programs usually work as volunteers, so they are not bound by the need of “producing for the salary”; instead it is the love of the radio, community interests, sometimes patriotism at the local level, some kind of mission, or exhibitionism, or the spirit of adventure which brings them to the microphone. These radios are always some sort of channels, filling up gaps, serving community interests – of a workplace, of a community of residents, and are related to their cultural needs or worldview. The community radios are examples of grass-root initiatives, they are much more than radio stations, and about a community, they serve as a certain

cohesive power – “community radio is 90 percent community and 10 percent radio” (Coyer, 2007) Such radios always try to involve their audience into the program production, they try to address as many and different people as possible and provide opportunity for them (AMARC, 1995).

On one hand, the community radios are run by civil organizations corresponding to the actual state or regional law, on the other hand the organizational power of these organizations for self-regulation and self-organization is very strong. The legislation of many countries specifies that community radios have to be operated by NGO's, school, residence or workplace communities. It also specifies that the radios should be owned and led by the community, should organize and enforce the rules of their internal functioning using their potentials related to the freedom of speech, but in the same time making sure that they are intentionally not harming others' basic human rights and dignity. They should be multifaceted channels, which by all means aspire to be balanced.

There are different approaches to community radio worldwide. In Great Britain, where there were no alternative radios in the past, BBC has produced regional, local programs since the 1970's. In the same time, civic initiatives who could not even apply for a permit started pirate radios. Today's community radio stations are mostly run by civic organizations representing by immigrant, minority, ethnic, and marginal social groups in many aspects inheriting the legacy of earlier pirate stations.

In the US these types of radios were established with definite community goals and on voluntary basis, they are run by non-profit organizations where no ads or any other commercial activities are allowed. It is also characteristic that they transmit programs produced by various religious and ideological groups. On the contrary the European stations produce all their programs themselves, there is no scope for “canned programs” (Dunaway, 1998). At the European and North-American radio stations in general significant changes can be noticed which earlier characterized only the pirate and community stations – coverage of minority issues, questions of equality of women, homosexuality, etc. – such topics surface now in a more open way in the new types of media. One can say that this initial phase of pathbreaking changes is over, now the Latin-American and African community radios have a similar role in this respect (Weyer, 2009).

In Hungary the call for applications for small community radios announced by ORTT and NHH says the following: "...the goal of the small community radios is to enable the functioning of radios on small settlements and villages, where otherwise it is economically unviable to function a radio but the community has a need for a radio station..." (Gosztonyi, 2007). Small community radios can serve a community of fellow residents (a settlement, part of a city, residential community) as well as an educational institute or a specialized group of students. These small radios cannot be compared to the size of the local media services. At the same time, the radios in Hungary try to put an emphasis on professional development, knowledge dissemination and the education of the new generation. Radio is a community-builder which serves also as an important element of the democratic future. In Hungary too, due to the problems of the financial system, the fund-driven nature of the civic sphere and its uncertain prestige, community radios are greatly dependent on the actual political and economic situation.

## **1.2 Development and role of community radios**

Throughout the world, the public sector has proved to be neither accountable nor accessible to the public. Grassroots organizations have established their own means of communication where the necessary means could be procured. In broadcasting these efforts – known as community, free or neighborhood radio – have developed throughout Western Europe, in the United States and Canada, in Latin America, and elsewhere. Despite substantial differences in origin and structure, each developed as a reaction to existing broadcasting systems (whether commercial or public) by excluded groups seeking to meet their own needs and develop their own programs. (Bekken, 2007)

Community radios developed worldwide differently; however they show some common elements. They try to offer a non-governmental, non-commercial model which serves a community and makes it grow. On the entire American continent this type of media exists since the mid-20th century, run by various organizations and institutes: universities, trade unions, churches, neighborhoods, etc. In some places citizens are reached through public loudspeakers, like in otherwise dynamically growing Latin America, where traditional and simple methods are still in use.



In Europe, community radio began as an unlicensed (pirate) service, sometimes going on to gain legal recognition – though often at the cost of government regulation, or of opening the door to commercial broadcasters as well. While pirate broadcasters are often closely integrated into social movements and are explicitly activist in tone, this illegal status leaves them vulnerable to suppression and creates barriers to wider community involvement. In North America community radio developed as a licensed service, although growing numbers of community broadcasters are turning to unlicensed operations in order to circumvent the Federal Communications Commission's inhospitable regulatory framework and the shortage of available frequencies. Meanwhile in Australia a dynamic development has started since the 1970's—small communities dispersed on large territories found a good medium in the locally operated and managed radios. Currently in Asia, Africa and sometimes Latin America, where 'free' media use still faces some limitations community radios are important tools of free information flow and of the democratization processes thus serving an essential social-community role.

Despite the fact that there are different models within the community radio sector, the following principles and characteristics can be observed worldwide:

1. free community access to tools of mass media communication;
2. freedom of speech and media pluralism;
3. free information access;
4. general media use without any gender discrimination;
5. local participation support;
6. acceptance of cultural diversity and of minorities;
7. open organization encouraging participation and self-definition;
8. editorial independence;
9. non-profit character and
10. development of media use skills.

Community radio, contrary to commercial and public service media, is an interactive media. It is the most important building-block of local identity, plays a significant role in education, in radio professionals' training, thus not only educating new generations of creators of radio programs but also facilitating more people to 'read' and understand media.

### **1.3 The role of civic radios in democracy**

“Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers.” (Article 19 UDHR, 1948) One of the most important pillars of Western democracies is freedom of speech, its protection and providing space for a free deliberation. Media serves as a tool for practicing democracy, for letting one’s voice to be heard, it is a certain “marketplace of ideas”, and it also serves as a mediator between citizens and the state, or the government. Communication is central to the success of development and democracy. And community radio is a crucial communication tool that is easy to run and maintain. Radio is the most accessible mass medium of communication in use. It is useful and effective in communities where most people can’t read or write. (Mtimde *et al*, 1998) There needs to be a type of media which does not work under a direct state influence (like the public service media) or is not driven by an immediate market interest (like the commercial radio stations), also which corresponds to the multiplicity of the society and serves those social groups which otherwise remain voiceless in the other types of media—for all these functions third type media, such as community radios, seem to be ideal tools. (Hitchens, 2006) Contrary to the media of the other two types, free radios are made with active participation of the audience, the feedback is much more immediate than in any other instances, all the communities can use their own, real voice and thus a certain democratic platform is being created in the course of the process. Democracy has to be equally accessible and available for practice for everyone, and community radios work as important tools towards this goal.

Other than providing tool for free flow of ideas, for open debates, community radios create forum for democracy education. As Gibbons emphasizes: “a practical recognition of the way that complex democracies work, with ideas and opinions being channeled into the constitutional process through the media, from discussions taking place in a whole range of overlapping constituencies and representative groups” (Gibbons, 1991). Beside freedom of speech, a concept more and more rooted in Western democracies, radio listeners could learn how to receive various types of information, equipping themselves with a repertoire of understanding and expressing various opinions. According to community media experts, among them the ones I have interviewed, in Western democracies those issues which pirate and community radios fought for became fully integrated into the mainstream, and

discussions on certain topics became open, thus their original role of democratization became so to say fulfilled.

Freedom of speech has not worked perfectly even in countries with the oldest tradition of democracy such as the UK, where for many decades voices and songs different from those of BBC could be aired only with the help of pirate radio stations. Pirate radios demanding freedom of speech play(ed) an important role in the general democratization process of the media and more specifically in the spread of community radios. In many countries, such as in Latin America or Africa, community radios are the only tools of freedom of speech, elsewhere, such as in Australia or South Africa, they are connected to the most fundamental institutions of the democratic development of the country along with community formation, basic media and communication. Sometimes they work as an extremely powerful tool of social mobilization, sometimes certain radio channels are in the background of some political events or changes, as it was the case in Belgrade with radio B92, which became a whole media world in the 1990's. This radio station backed the protesters who demanded democratic changes and change of the government. Elsewhere, the ruling political leadership, such as in Thailand or Croatia, can not tolerate their existence (Coyer, 2007). In the latter country, the democratic development of the country was not able to keep pace with its economic growth following its secession from Yugoslavia and its war with Serbia. This country, though willing to join the European Union, is not open towards the idea of free, independent, democratic radio stations. Distribution of radio frequencies in the non-profit sector is governed by an intricate set of laws – an NGO called Nemeza is trying to make steps to improve the situation, lobbying for a European level policy at the government (Coyer, 2007).

The most important attribute of community radios is their independence from state and commercial sources. It is the most sensitive point of these civic organizations to preserve their independence hence most of them strongly depend on outside sources – mainly from the support of civic radio funds, which are nothing else but free state resources. In the same time some media acts, like the British or the Hungarian, allow limited advertisement income. Thus the radios to some extent, sometimes to a significant extent (maximum half of their budget though) depend on the actual situation of the markets. Becoming independent from the government poses a real challenge for these organizations – as far as money distributing funds have state members as well, one can not speak about real independence unless it is a well-established and smoothly functioning democracy. For instance if there is a high level corruption on a state level, and local or higher level governance interests are represented only

by a strong political elite, independence of civic media financing becomes strongly questionable.

It is also true that many models, such as the Hungarian or the British, try to avoid making the financing of community media exclusive, these also introduce caps for incomes from various sources, encouraging the multiplicity of resources, thus helping the maintenance of independence (Coyer, 2007). Parallely, independent media control has an important role in media frequency distribution or in tender management and supervision. In Hungary unfortunately media supervision strongly depends on the composition of the Parliament and the strength of the government, president of the National Radio and Television Board (Országos Rádió és Televízió Testület – ORTT) supervising all three media sectors is elected by the Parliament based on the nomination of the President and the Prime Minister of the country. The leadership of British Ofcom is less obviously politically determined, and it is not within its role to supervise the commercial links of the public service media (BBC) and other channels. Its independence is however very fragile, for instance David Cameron, Conservative leader would shut down the institution that is regulating and financing civic media (Williams, 2009).

Perhaps Australia can be considered as the pioneer country of community radios. Community radio program transmission began in the 1970's, first in close cooperation and with support of the public sector media. The supervision of the former is done by the Community Broadcasting Association of Australia (CBAA), which itself became independent from the public service sector during the same period. The organization is supervising and representing the rights of community radio and television stations. It has more than 270 members, representatives of independent radios and televisions, lobbying for their values, organizing campaigns to popularize them, taking care of the professional and organizational development. Its most important role is to actively communicate with the government, to make various policies and to implement them (CBAA, 2010). In Australia one of the measurements of democracy is the participation level of small communities, various ethnic, religious, local groups in civic movements; local radios serve as the most important tool to reach this goal. Countrywide over 20.000 people, which are 0.1% of the total population, is involved in the work of community radios, and a huge rate of 45% of the adult population listens to their programs (CBAA-McNair, 2004).

In Europe one can find outstanding community radios in the Netherlands, where most of the broadcasting stations closely cooperating with local municipalities represent the real voice of the local community. Following the first attempts of the local and community radios in the 1970's, OLON, established in 1981, became the platform for independent radios, first representing and defending interests of 15 stations. By now it is the organization with practically all the community radios as its members, thus since 1988 it represents the whole sector, reaching out to 90% of the households in Holland. According to the legislation, all the 443 local municipalities of Holland are entitled to operate their own media. It is a possibility used by 406 organizations, running 286 community radios. OLON's power in representation of interests is reflected in creating financial stability for these radios. OLON membership is connected to a membership fee – what they get in exchange are well-coordinated lobbying activities, a strong bargaining power and professionalism useful in discussions with the government or other sectors of the political life.

Community radios in Holland serve as role model for the optimal implementation of this capacity of democracy. They serve as a platform for community and intercultural discourse, they help minorities to get their voices to be heard, help cultural and social identities and also enable community activities. During the more than 25 years of existence of community media in Holland, over 200.000 people had the opportunity to learn this media use, to hold a microphone or camera in their hands and to produce a program (de Wit, 2007).

#### ***1.4 Legislation, state of community radios, media regulation and the state***

The most common characteristic feature of community radios and the legislation attached to them is their diversity. Community radios emerge with varied needs and aims in different countries from their respective democratic traditions, structures and political orientations. The development of these radios is also very different and asymmetrical, in some places community radios reached a very high level of professionalism, in some other cases they function as pirate stations hiding from the vigilant eyes of the state (Napoli, 2005). Though according to the general policy small community electronic media (ethnic, religious, workplace, social cause, lifestyle, etc.) have to contribute to the community development, to the local education and social projects, it is difficult to talk about a general and uniform media

regulation. Small community radios usually serve an important democratic need for freedom of information, also as tools for creating awareness and inspiring the young generation.

Any community, ethnic group, or subculture has to have its right of self expression and should be given the possibility of it (DCMS, 2004). More and more international organizations are stating the importance of 'third type media', supporting and passing favorable policies for this sector. UNESCO and the World Bank Institute is also supporting community radios, understanding their role in community maintenance and preservation of cultural position (Coyer 2008). Many consider a well-designed legislation system respected by various communities and the society at large, and the appropriate social, technical, legal and financial regulations as essential preconditions for a successful functioning of freedom of speech in a society. It is especially important to stress the values of third type media in the legislation (Lewis, 2008).

The European Union helps the functioning of community media mainly through directives only. Recommendations emphasize the role of civic activities, the importance of media with community ownership, under community leadership and supervision. Third type media are based on the idea of locality and regionalism, their role is to strengthen cultural, linguistic, and ethnic diversities, and finally they have to function in a transparent way. Their educational role is important, and as program-making workshops they are real creative communities, where producers of programs or anyone else can share their experiences, and thus they become catalysts of the community. Radios should strengthen civic initiatives, participating as advisors, introducing critical voices into the work of local community leadership, making the voice of local community to be heard (Resetarits, 2008).

The EU encourages all the member states to pass media acts which enable free access to media, and support local, grassroot initiatives. EU objective is to make civic or community media become regional, self-regulatory entities which are supervised by independent media supervisory boards of each member state. EU prefers centralized and local support of civic media instead of direct media regulation (Macedo, 2007). In the same time, the international organization implementing interests of community radios, AMARC, demands a more coherent approach and points out a lack of proper legislation from the side of EU. According to them, the latter is the cause of diverse policies within the Union (Coyer 2008).

Since 1968 only the state radio BBC had the right for broadcasting in the UK. Later within EU they became pioneers in introducing new regulations to the „third media” sector. Various civic initiatives tried to break the monopoly of BBC – many of these attempts happened through the operation of pirate radios from the open waters near the British shores. In this early period of civic radios programs like popular music, political and social criticism gained popularity mainly among younger generations of listeners interested in ethnic and minority issues and the social problems of marginalized sections. It is to note that the average audience of pirate radios, between the age of 15 and 24 years, listened to these stations primarily because of the broadcasted music which meant a real alternative to the „official” music programs available elsewhere. Pirate radios thus became important places of alternative identity-construction, became also involved in various protest activities. Programs of BBC produced in a monopolistic situation, often accused of political impartiality, provided one-sided, centralized information to its audiences till the 1970’s, when partly due to the pressure of pirate radios regional programs of BBC radio had started (Lewis, 2008).

Since the start of commercial radios in 1973, British legislation could no more ignore the growing numbers and audience of pirate radios in the 1980’s. In mid-80’s they legalized the broadcast of one or two smaller program-blocks in London and Sheffield (Lewis, 2008). In this fuzzy period of legalization, a few stations functioned more or less legally, while in the 1990’s hundreds of applications have been submitted by community radios requesting for a broadcasting permit. The conservative government of that time however seemed to be scared of such expressions of freedom, delaying further the birth of a full-fledged policy for many years. The breakthrough came with the establishment of Ofcom in 2010, an organization meant to regulate third type media, enabling 15 radios stations to start their pilot programs in the same year. Incorporating experiences from the latter practice, the 2004 legislation gave finally free way to community media in the UK. Community Radio Order has been introduced in the same year, defining legal frameworks of community radio functioning and giving orders about the same (The Community Radio Order, 2004).

According to the legislation, these radios have to primarily keep in mind interests of a community – that is of a geographically or socially bounded group. Radios have to provide space for voices which cannot be heard elsewhere, also to various discourses, opinions. They should educate and help individual’s economic, social growth, success in the job market, introduce good examples, deepen cultural and linguistic plurality within the society (Lewis, 2008).

Budgets of those 131 community radios (by 2011 around 200) which broadcast with less broadcasting power (usually with 50 kWatts) than BBC's regional programs and the commercial radios are regulated by two main principles. Firstly, the maximum half of their income can originate from Ofcom community fund in form of various supports, and secondly maximum 50% of the budget can be of the broadcasted advertisements. Many radios are community funded, or are financed by a public institute: it is an open question if the interests of funders are protected in return for their patronage (Ofcom, 2009). Most of the radios however find it difficult to raise enough financial support for their daily existence – these are usually expenses related to the technical operation. Therefore many small communities who applied and were selected for a frequency use could not finally avail this opportunity and begin broadcasting. Radios supported by Ofcom have to draw up annual accounts, report back about their efficiency and impact on target community. They also have to give a feedback about their program production and the ways they meet social expectations which created them (Everitt, 2003).

Directives of the Australian government by and large correspond to the needs of the community radios. Here the three most important pillars of community radio functioning are:

1. free access to the media;
2. diverse program selection, serving needs of all communities and social groups
3. self-governance, self-control, independent functioning

(CBAA, 2010).



## CHAPTER 2 – MISSION AND MANAGEMENT OF COMMUNITY RADIOS

### 2.1 *Who makes community radios and for whom?*

The most important mission of community radio is to deal with questions or play music which is not part of the mainstream media. Listeners and program producers form a small community where their primary aim is finding quality solutions for the arising problems, and not necessarily to increase numbers of listeners. Audience of such radios is more likely to carefully select between different programs and listen only to the ones closely related to their interest, unlike listeners of other types of radios. Program producers, usually working as volunteers, are part of the community itself or are concerned about a certain cause, issue. They are in a constant discussion with the rest of the community and produce quality programs according to their best knowledge (Dunaway, 1998). Community radio is „run for and by the ordinary people” (Day, 2004). Community radios are typically run by enthusiastic individuals as grassroot initiatives. Editors of these radios are amateurs whose main profession is not producing radio programs, though it is true that one can see examples where experienced radio professionals do social volunteering and help the work of such radios. In Hungary, maximum one or two people per radio have a permanent post or receive some sort of financial compensation or salary for their work at community radios. Typically these are radios working within educational institutions, e.g. a teacher employed by the school (state) supervises the work of students running a school radio (ORTT, 2007). It is a general problem how to divide functions effectively, how to maintain a continuous interest of volunteers, and to reduce dropout of people working for the radio. At those radios where program production is more free and with fewer limitations everyone works on his/her topic, is held responsible for and maintains the continuity of a certain program.

In cases where program production is more free and people research their own topic, it is more difficult to maintain the continuity of the radio. Elsewhere, slightly similarly to other types of media, roles and tasks are strictly defined. There are editors and sub-editors, technicians, coordinators – everyone is responsible for his/her share of the tasks. Research of ORTT says about Hungarian examples that it is usually a core team of 20-30 people who are responsible for coordination. They are surrounded by a group of enthusiastic volunteers who

change more frequently than the core team: occasional program anchors, reporters, people responsible for a certain profile of programs (ORTT, 2007).

One can see that community radios are by and large run by enthusiastic amateurs with an exception of a few professional advisors or helpers. For instance, in Sweden, basic requirement for community radios is that the production of radio programs cannot be their main profile. As a result, volunteers could get engaged with production of programs in different forms and on different levels but they could not learn the real professionalism of it.

## ***2.2 Can community radios reach their audience? Technical, personal and regulatory conditions***

In Hungary, according to the research done by Foundation for Civic Radios (FCR) most of the small community radios would prefer to break out from broadcast area prescribed to them by the current legal framework. They would like to try out local frequency with 30 kms of radius. In case of a larger broadcast area they would still maintain the character of a small community radio (Gosztonyi, 2007). The currently defined one km radius broadcast area proved to be unrealistically narrow; programs are not accessible to more than 4-6000 people. The legislation does not count with the topographical differences of various areas, thus there exist small performance broadcast stations, which are unable to transmit even within the reach of a few hundred meters with the permitted broadcasting power. Thus many community radios can not meet their real goal and remain a marginal broadcasting station (Benedek *et al*, 2007). Due to technical and legal regulations some radios can not even start broadcasting, or because they were not able to reach their target audience, they cease to exist (as it happened in case of Aroma Rádió – A Roma Rádió from Kiskőrös, due to its weak broadcasting power it could not reach its listeners on the margins of the city, their programs could only have been listened to with expensive very good quality, radio receivers).

According to the FCR a research program producers complain that the National Broadcasting Authorities do not take them seriously enough, i.e. they do not examine cases when a radio with winning tender could not finally start its program. Two-third of the interviewed people working for various community radios think that the current legislation is not appropriate and it does not serve their interests (ORTT, 2007).

It is also difficult to synchronize the time of program producers with their listeners. Many listen to radio during the morning hours while preparing for work, or on the move sitting in their car (or on other public transport using a mobile device). After working hours families usually sit and watch television. Thus during the late afternoon hours, early evening little information reaches them through radio. Program producers however reach radio studios before or after their main working hours, thus it is questionable if their programs meet the right group of listeners. Because of the technical limitations of mobile radio receivers and due to the small broadcast areas chances of a continuous radio reception are very small. Therefore someone can listen to these small frequency community programs either sitting at home or on his/her workplace. Luckier ones are those radios which were established with a very definite aim and within a well-defined community (e.g. a hospital, a jail, a military base) or the school radios where audiences and makers of these programs work roughly in the same rhythm and within the same time slots. In such instances programs can effectively reach their target audience located on a geographically well-bounded territory (a campus, a building block).

In the UK, those 131 functional community radios registered by Ofcom reach 15% of the population, which means 6.5 million of adult listeners (Ofcom, 2009). Stricter limitations are applied only in those big city areas (e.g. most parts of London) where and it is not possible to give out more frequencies of the spektrum. In Holland, it is the local municipalities who decide about setting up community radios. The municipalities also govern the functioning of radios and an independent media authority supervises them. Later on, there will be more discussion about the functioning of the various independent media supervisory boards.

### **2.3 *Can efficiency of community radios be measured?***

It is extremely difficult to apply a general definition when talking about the mission of community radios as they emerged out of different social needs in various contexts. While commercial radios work according to the simplified principle of „more listeners bring more money”, community media can be measured on the basis of the quality of its programs, according to the extent to which it make an impact on the society or on a certain group. To evaluate the latter is definitely different from merely applying the measurement methods of commercial radios. To understand the efficiency of community media we need more

comprehensive, analytical studies which take into consideration various social impacts and functions.

„The need to quantify the social and cultural benefits of community radio is an area fraught with difficulties for the sector’s representative bodies. Given the above expose of community radio’s specialist audiences, audience measurements are unlikely to impress governments. And of course, social and cultural benefits are notoriously difficult to quantify in monetary or economic terms.” (ORTT, 2007) Many of the small stations in the US have not been able to receive grants from the limited government budget available for such purposes. The simple reason is that the selection criteria for funding are based on the number of listeners and not the financial support rose from other resources. It means that the system rewards bigger stations and discriminates against the smaller ones, even if the latter could provide a different kind of value and quality of programs.

Many experts, among them Peter Molnar find numeric measurement of audience neither an adequate nor important indicator. The emphasis should rather be on the quality, on goals of the radio and on their community impact. One of the important factors of the success of community radios is the number of people who get in touch with the radio, the number of volunteers who work for the radio, their fluctuation; composition – stresses a research done by the Australian Griffith University. Their large scale research examined primarily the functioning and community-building role of community radios. The research report gave an overview about the operation of the sector for policymakers, sector bodies and the stations. At the same time it lacks data on audience and research data about the community of listeners, point out some of the expert critics (Meadows *et al*, 2005).

Usually regulators decide in a given country about the needs for a survey, elsewhere it emerges as a need of the radios themselves (Napoli, 2005). The British legislation expects an impact study about every community radio. On a yearly basis they have to report about their aims, mission, and achievements. Third media is not dependent on the markets, or at least to a much smaller extent than the commercial radios. Thus instead of the quantitative data emphasis is on a more qualitative measurement. Due to the variety of the programs and the complexity of the program-structure, it is almost impossible to be objective during such a research. The objective research methods often turn out to be false and misleading for the producers of community radio programs (Napoli, 2005).

## **2.4 What are the means of measurement?**

Democratic aims of community media can only be measured through a longitudinal, continuous program-watch which can be complimented by further analysis. Certainly the number of listeners or the radio's impact on a given community can appear only indirectly in these studies. Following the previously mentioned criteria, the Australian government prepared an extensive study about its community radios in 2008. They studied the program composition in it, examining the presence of community values, ethnic, marginal and minority communities, gay and lesbian values in it. They tried to see if these radios can represent such values, if they cover the local cultural events, festivals to the desired extent. The study also gives a special attention to the question of individual media access and the realization of "democratic media". According to the Australian government, community radios have to support all civic and individual initiatives which are not being covered in the mainstream media. The study also talks about the popularity of community radios and their programs. In a survey they asked members of various communities about the radio programs, their impact – and got responses about the popularity of programs and radio, about the quality of programs and their role in the everyday life of the community (DBCDE, 2008).

In Holland, the organization of community media, OLON, prepared extensive surveys about the coverage of community radios and televisions in 2005. The results show that the local media is very popular, about 12% of the population, that is, 2 million people, listens to them. In case of the televisions these numbers are even higher, 34% of the population is interested in the local news accessed through these channels. These data from Holland clearly indicate the weight of this type of media. It needs to be mentioned that community radios also introduce local music to their audiences, differing this way too from the commercial stations. Community radios have definite aims and ideas, it can be clearly stated that they fill up an existing gap in the media market (de Wit, 2009).

In the US, Nielsen Institute developed a special research method called Local People Meter (LPM) which enables a more democratic, more detailed data collection, taking into consideration not only the variety of programs but also differences between various listeners and viewers, their social, ethnic backgrounds. The research method used in 1999 in Boston partially served commercial purposes, namely to give a more precise definition of the target audiences for the advertisers, to increase efficiency of the ads. The method also enables the study of minority, or community radio uses. The research method however, though useful for

the radios, created a lot of resentment and anxiety among the listeners. Organization called Don't Count Us out Coalition, a group of lawyers hired by the protestors criticized the research method used by LPM, questioning its ethical basis. They considered the commercial use of research data to be a violation of human rights. As a result of the strong protest action, use of LMP data was not allowed. Other methods used to substitute LMP like Media Rating Research, otherwise sensitive towards handling data on minorities, proved to be misleading. Despite all the controversies, LMP showed good results in qualitative measurement of minority, community radio use. Therefore, many countries permitted this method for non-commercial purposes within a strict framework of regulations (Napoli, 2005).

In Hungary, community radios are not asked to submit regular impact studies about their activities, sometimes the radios themselves try to investigate this question, subject to their needs. Measurement of the numbers of community radio listeners does not work with the traditional media research techniques, only a few bigger ones (like Civil, Tilos, Radio C) reach a minimum number of audience recognizable by the measurement scale (Benedek *et al*, 2007).

The national media board, ORTT, soon after the beginning of the community radios conducted a research based on questionnaires and in-depth interviews, focusing mostly on the experiences of the producers of the radio programs (ORTT, 2007). The first and so far the most comprehensive study has been made by the Foundation for Civic Radios sponsored by the National Civic. The 2007 survey was based on data provided by the radios on voluntary basis: out of the 50 radios which were addressed by the research 34 reacted, which translates into a 76% success. The aim was to get a picture about community radios from their own point of view. The research covered issues like what was the need to start the radio, how is it operated, its financial situation, relationships with media authorities etc. They did not or perhaps could not measure the impact of these radios. Also it turned out that the radios themselves have no real knowledge about their audiences or about their level of satisfaction with the radio programs, usually they had some ad hoc information about the latter. Radios active in different communities could rely on different types of feedbacks, e.g. a school radio, or a university radio received a more direct feedback through informal channels, while a radio station of a small region or locality had more “voluntary” opinions through incoming phone calls, internet forums, and correspondences with the listeners. This information was very subjective – even if they suggest something about the audience's satisfaction levels one can not draw any general conclusions from such data (Gosztonyi, 2007).

The European Union is working on a research method which would measure small community radios, as they are important components of European plurality (Coyer 2008). In Hungary the main difficulty is to find the right form of measurement. At the moment of writing this thesis (a change is expected in the first months of 2010) only a large-scale, national, regional/local measurement exists to research audiences for commercial purposes. The local research was done on samples of 500 people per town/per occasion and it was repeated thrice a year. In all, 31.000 filled-in radio diaries tracking the listenership of community radios have been incorporated into the research. This research method is not refined enough to be sensitive for smaller audiences, or to detect smaller changes in various program blocks. Therefore it can not provide relevant information about small community radios, about their efficiency or success. These goals can be achieved by a broader sampling method, and by its specification. Small community radios have to be taken out and treated separately from the general pool of research which currently includes the commercial and public service radios too.

„New research has considered the use of ethnographic research methods [including in-depth interviews, participant observation, diaries and surveys – (Slater & Tacchi 2004)] and the community radio impact assessment methodology presented here has taken its inspiration from these and other social science research methods, all the time keeping in mind on the one hand the questions to which we needed answers, and on the other hand the need for the methodology and its techniques to be practical and sustainable in real-life settings: They should not just be participatory. It should be possible for the volunteer community radio producers to carry out this work and its analysis themselves without the (expensive) involvement of external researchers.” (Jallow, 2005)

## **2.5 Social gain of community radios**

As we cited opinions of some specialists earlier, value additions of community radios become more and more integrated to the public discussions in the commercial and public service mainstream media in most Western societies. Thus community radios gradually lose their original importance; they do not have to fight for freedom of information and speech anymore. Their new role is to broadcast local news, report about local events. For example, in Holland, the media law gives relatively large freedom to community radios, but it prescribes that in

half of their broadcasting time local news and information has to be covered. After the first attempts of the 1970's when 6 city and village community radios had begun broadcasting, during the next decade the legal framework of small community radio broadcasting became clearer and more than 290 radios received a permit. The law prescribes that these radios have to primarily focus on social issues, on culture, education, religion, various ideologies, local values and interests. Due to their specialization on local interests these stations became important information sources for many of their listeners. According to an OLON research, local media reach out to 90% of the households in Holland (de Wit, 2009).

In many cases it is precisely due to third type media that certain issues or problems get publicity, which otherwise can not be covered in state controlled and censored public service media or in the commercial channels. Sometimes even the most elementary information necessary for social survival or well-being can not reach the people. In such cases it is often the community media which fulfills this role and thus plays an essential part in providing information. This is typical in some African, Latin American cases or in case of the Nepali community radios. In Africa, community radios despite the technical limitations (reaching only a small number of people) broadcast information programs, give advice on family planning, in the prevention of HIV/AIDS, promote women's rights and so on. According to some researches in Ethiopia and Tanzania those who listen to these community radios show greater willingness to make an HIV test, pay attention to the prevention of the disease, and follow certain steps of personal hygiene than those who do not listen to the community radios. William Simmering, president of the Developing Radio Partners compares the work of community radios to the impact of some preventive vaccines: "a simple, effective solution" (Sullivan, 2007) to reach people in the third world, to make sure that information often silenced at state level reaches them. These radios are effective components of the aid packages. They provide trustworthy forums; people follow advice aired in the civic media more likely than those channeled through state routes in forms of directives.

In some conflict-zones of the world, similarly to the previous examples, local activities such as community radios receive a special outside support. Locals are provided with more information which leads to stronger democratization processes and peace. In these areas access to free information is denied to the civic media and they can operate only either illegally or with foreign help. While the latter indicated political reasons behind restrictions on community/ civic radios, geographical or topographic obstacles often stood in their way: community radio can not reach the poor areas which have no economic potential to sustain a



radio of their own. In such geographical locations community radios have a special role to reach out to scarcely inhabited areas, to districts which are neglected by the state and to speak on their own language, on some marginalized languages or dialects (Sullivan, 2007).

## **2.6 Development of community radios in Europe**

In the Scandinavian countries, and more specifically in Sweden, a unique model of community radios exists. A central organization (narration) runs a frequency with medium performance where various radios receive a shared program-time. Communities jointly demanded establishment of community radios and the legislation reacted promptly and flexibly to their request. In Sweden, community radios exist within well-defined legal frameworks as the legislation kept in mind the civic interests. In a country with a geographically vast area and dispersed population, local communities have a special strength – in this case small community democracy works as a textbook example. In such a context the early spread and popularity of community radios is not surprising. A group or a community can relatively easily apply for a grant for producing a radio program. Community frequencies, divided by the state and shared between different civic organizations provide space for such ambitions. The most important criteria are that organizations or communities who are willing to produce programs can not do this as their main occupational activity. Radio stations, technical equipments of the studios are run by central organization as a “top down” initiative, thus civic/ community producers of the programs do not have to deal with the technicalities, they can merely focus on the content of the programs. The latter represent the voice of the community, which supervises the content of the programs and can be held responsible for it. In this system established in 1978, 150 organizations, usually NGO’s take part as producers of programs. Since 1993 they include advertisements in their programs, but their main financial sources are from various broadcast funds and from city and regional grants. There is also a pending plan of establishing a comprehensive national financial system in 2010 (Benedek *et al*, 2007).

Partially “top-down” initiatives can be observed in the UK as well where a special media law, the Community Radio Order, regulates third type media. Office of Communication (Ofcom) established in 2003 is responsible for collecting all the frequency applications, for evaluating them, and finally releasing permits. Those who apply for broadcasting permit have to specify

in details how their programs are going, fulfill certain social needs or fill up the existing gaps. According to the law they have to fulfill the following criteria: “(a) the provision of sound broadcasting services to individuals who are otherwise underserved by such services, (b) the facilitation of discussion and the expression of opinion, (c) the provision (whether by means of programmes included in the service or otherwise) of education or training to individuals not employed by the person providing the service, and (d) the better understanding of the particular community and the strengthening of links within it.” (DCMS, 2004)

They have to emphasize why a radio is needed in a certain area or community and which spectrum of the community will directly benefit from the programs. According to the Ofcom report, till 2008, 191 permits have been released, out of which 131 radios became active. Most of community radios target local population of a township or a rural area, representing certain local issues. 23 radios attempt to represent some minority issues, most of them targeting primarily the youth, or they are of religious character, or they focus on elderly people, but there are also radios with art, healthcare profile, or specialized on informing people with changed abilities (Ofcom, 2009). Steve Buckley says: “In the UK the legal framework is set out in the Community Radio Order 2004. It sets a more complex and extensive regulatory framework than some countries because of the inclusion of protection for small commercial stations. In practice the UK regulator, Ofcom, is fairly light touch but has extensive powers to intervene where license conditions are transgressed.” (Buckley, 2009)

In France, community radios called as “free radios” exist among minorities, immigrants as well, providing a forum for them to express themselves. Mainly in big immigrant cities such as Paris, Marseilles or Lyon these radios operate not in French, but in various immigrant languages, providing essential information for those who do not speak the official language of the country. Community radios and in general freedom of communication was declared in the 1986 law in France, enabling free media use for everyone. Today among five different types of private radio, category “A” characterizes community radios. An independent, but state defined monetary fund (FSER) is responsible for dividing financial grants between the community radios, which can apply for up to 60% of their budget (but maximum 15250 Euros) from this fund. Another part of the budget can originate from local municipalities, from regional cultural, educational or social funds (FSER, 2004). The French community radios have to serve the usual interest: community building, green interests, pluralism; also they have to represent strong political independence and neutrality in matters of religion.

## CHAPTER 3 – COMMUNITY RADIOS IN HUNGARY

### 3.1 *Civic radios in the Hungarian democracy*

Before the political changes various attempts were made to challenge the actual cultural-political borders of the Aczel era towards more free ways of expression in the Hungary of the 1980's. This was possible in the form of samizdat, journals, and exhibitions shortly banned after their opening, performances, Polymer cassette 'programs' copied at home. University clubs, underground concerts, university collegiums as intellectual workshops became spaces of the alternative public life. Many of the regime changing organizations, parties emerged from such circles. In the same time for many years it was Radio Free Europe (RFE) started in 1949 and the Voice of America (VoA) radio station that meant free speech and uncensored news believed to be really true, and the voice of Western music. Both the stations were functioning, however, on the basis of a very strong political will and with strong governmental support – the former one became the voice of the National Committee for a Free Europe which came into life with a definite anti-communist goal, RFE became voice of CIA legalized by the Senate itself, while VoA was run by the Ministry of External Affairs of the US. Later, Black Box (Fekete Doboz), supported by the Soros Foundation, in 1988 documented those first events predicting the change of regime with a VHS camera – its home copied video journal became an important footprint of the era (Sükösd, 1993).

Change of regime happened in Hungary relatively fast, the print media got privatized at a very early stage, and in 1990 already 80% of the media ownership was foreign (Hirner, 1996). At the same time, the electronic media found itself in a constitutional vacuum: the actual government ordered a media moratorium instead of regulating the issue, thus violating the freedom of speech. (Many think that this step, half a year after the constitution of the new government, was provoked by the media support of the taxi drivers protesting against the increased fuel charges.) It happened only 5 years after the change of the regime, within the term of the second government that real discussions of the new media law have restarted. It was also a period when the commercial radio and television stations in the neighboring countries created a real environment of economic competition.

The first independent civic radio station, Tilos, was established in 1991, as a reaction to the unregulated media frequency use and to the basically unconstitutional and incomprehensive

media moratorium, based on European examples and with the intention to establish a 'third type' free community radio station. Tilos radio, being a proper pirate radio, was exposed to constant police harassment – in the same time it gained more and more public popularity. Soon afterwards more initiatives from the countryside followed the example set by Tilos, for instance ZÖM in Kaposvár, Szubjektív in Pécs, and Szárköz Rádió. Despite their differences all of them operated as pirate radios. As they put it very suggestively, it was not them who violated the law but the legislator did not fulfill their democratic role. Their common goal was to annulate the highly disputable frequency moratorium, which they considered to be against the law. They tried to achieve with the help of the Hungarian Federation of Free Radios (established in 1992) by putting political pressure to the Hungarian legislation that other than legalizing the entire media market sufficient space has to be created for establishing a network of frequencies for community radios (Gosztonyi, 2010).

Paralelly, Péter Molnár and János Tímár, MP's of the political party Fidesz at that time, wanted to shape the media law in a way that it includes community radios by all means. Their intentions were based partly on the American model (how to integrate community radios into a kind of public media system), partly on the study of other civic sectors. The 1991 conference in Budapest, which was initiated by Tilos and co-organized by AMARC, tried to harmonize the interests of the time which were shaping-up civic sphere and the ambitions of the political sphere. First it seemed that the conference could even reach its goal. However, a year later the political struggle around the media law focused exclusively on the public sector media and on the issue of frequency division, the civic interests completely drifted out of the centre of attention. According to the plans, every third player of the media market would have come from this sector (meaning that if there were already two commercial stations functioning in a settlement the third had to be non-profit oriented). However, this idea could not be finally implemented in the practice.

At the same time, there were ongoing discussions about the financial support system of the third sector. The final aim was to establish a program producers' fund, which would have supported not particular programs but the existence of community radios. This method of funding was well complementing the personal taxation system established in 1997, which gave opportunity for individuals to give 1% of their personal tax to any cultural or religious organization or to any other part of the civic sphere, for instance, to the community radios. The latter could use this opportunity well enough, mobilizing their active audiences through their programs.

Tilos actively took part in the preparation of the new media law which after a long delay was born in 1995, as almost the last one among the Central Eastern European countries. As part of the changes in the same year Tilos received shared frequency with Civic Radio, and in 2000 got its own frequency with a 24-hour broadcast permit. Afterwards those free media who once participated in the change of regime stepped on the road leading towards the world of business and “big media”. The only exceptions were Magyar Narancs, who meanwhile got rid of all its Fidesz-ties, and Tilos radio, which could maintain its original goals – a critical and independent social, political approach, a channel of free civic media. All the other journals and the Fekete Doboz (Black Box) became increasingly politically connected, also the process of establishing media worlds, production companies, media research institutes had begun.

A pioneer of the free Hungarian civic radio-making, Tilos stands as an example for all community radios which could keep their original aims: progressive music, democratic content, alternative voice which helps in developing a tolerant, and civic democracy. As a self-regulating institution it established its own rules of operation which corresponds to the paragraphs in the new media law regulating community radios.

In the program structure established by Tilos, anchors have full autonomy over the program content – within the framework of the operational rules. “All those who participated in Tilos came with different motivations: minorities, alternative values, those without support, marginalized but relevant opinions and approaches, cultural ambitions, ways of expression, all to be made public” – says Tilos about its credo (Tilos, 2007).

Sharing the same frequency with Tilos in 1995 and transmitting in the same day, later inheriting the full use of the same frequency, Civil Radio became Hungary’s largest community radio. They target the largest community of listeners and intend to deal with the wildest circle of questions related to the civic sphere. Their programs are mostly constituted of live studio discussions where questions related to self-governance and local municipalities, cooperation and conflicts, green culture and consumer protection are being discussed. Civil Radio with a large team of volunteers continuously recruits young professionals with expertise in community building and program-making.

In 2001, Radio C started as a minority and community radio station in Budapest with 24-hour programs in a day- it is the first and so far only electronic media prepared by the Roma. It is first, in a sense, that an ethnic minority in Hungary organized itself and established a radio

station. Other than this only the Magyar Radio (Hungarian Radio) prepares minority and Roma programs fulfilling its role as a public service media under the name MR4 within some broadcasting area in the length of 12-hours per day. On the contrary, Radio C is a grassroots radio station, is ‘the radio of the Roma’. Its programs are prepared by Roma for Roma and non-Roma on the basis of public service rules. Radio C as a community radio places interactivity and personal tone on the top of its list of priorities (Rádió C, 2001). In the same time, Radio C works as a commercial organization too, thus it differs from traditional types of community radios.

Since 1992 Tilos, Fiksz, Szubjektív radios, and Hungarian Federation of Free Radios called to life by Organization of Community (SzaRáMaSzer) Developers to fight for establishing space for independent, free community radios. SzaRáMaSzer is a professional “organization which actively participated in starting and popularizing non-profit radios between 1992 and 1995. It worked in committees dividing temporary frequency uses and dealing with tender competitions and also actively participated in setting up the legal regulations for non-profit radios.” (SzaRáMaSzer, 2009) Civic radios however had to fight for the desired frequencies in the shadow of commercial radios. In this situation, ORTT’s decision of 2002, originally planned since 1996, meant a real breakthrough – it gave free way to start small community radios in a pioneering fashion even in the European context. ‘Non-profit oriented’ or ‘public program providers’ with an area of circa 1 km radius of broadcasting circle, with programs totaling a minimum of 14 hours per week, could participate in a simplified tender competition. Forty-three small community radios could start functioning between 2004 and 2007. Currently SzaRáMaSzer represents around 40 small community radios from Hungary in the international organization Association Mondiale des Radiodiffuseurs Communautaires (AMARC) (Benedek *et al*, 2007).

### **3.2 Hungary’s regional leading role in the area of community radios**

In Hungary one had to wait for a relatively long time, till 1995, for the regulation of electronic media. Since then a significant number of community radios has developed in the country. In 2002, a law was created regulating access of non-profit radios to frequencies, and in the same year the first tenders were invited for community radios. As the processing of these tenders was very slow in the beginning, first stations could begin broadcasting only in 2004. In the

meantime, many of the former applicants gave up and many groups of volunteers lost their enthusiasm. This phenomenon is of course not unique, OLON reported about similar difficulties from their initial period. Due to the successful activities of SzaRáMaSzer, an organization active in implementing interests of community radios, the tender system became simpler and the timeframe between the submission of applications and the announcement of successful applicants reduced from nine to six months.

After the media law came into power (Act I of 1996) 10 to 15 non-profit community radios (according to the common parlance: free radios) operated in Hungary, most of them in Budapest itself. The emergence of minorities, ethnic groups in the public sphere was a novelty at that time. The newly formed community radios became real voices of freedom, democracy in the second half of the 1990's. Also, some of the already existing radios tried to use the tag of community radios thus gaining more popularity. Many of them lost their right to frequency use in the course of time (Gosztonyi, 2010). The 2002 law, formed after a long series of negotiations, is indeed of a European standard and has a pioneering character in many ways. Some critics note that the lenient regulation of community radios helped in their fast growth, though unfortunately many of them lost their real community standards and values.

According to the research done by Gosztonyi, among the community radios who received frequency; when asked about their reasons to start a radio, 28% remarked that they lack funding to begin broadcasting as a commercial station. It means that they used the funding for community radio as an initial stage in their growth to become full-fledged commercial radios. Most of the radios were however formed with clear cultural aims, others intended to cover topics of public interest, while to provide local information figured only as a tertiary aim. Currently it is striking that minority, religious or social programs are being produced only in very small numbers. All types of programs usually called as radio formats can be found among the programs of community radios. It can be stressed that these radios broadcast mainly local news (Gosztonyi, 2007).

Presently approx. 240 various radios operate in Hungary, among these 68 are community radios. With these numbers, Hungary has a leading place among former socialist countries with this type of media activities. 28% of radios consider themselves as community radios but strictly speaking 12 of them fulfill all the community radio criteria (5% of all the radios) (Gosztonyi, 2010). The latter play a significant role in community building, providing platform for discussions of various cultural, social and political questions. Unfortunately, after

a promising beginning it is difficult to discover a unified political will for the future of community radios. Gergely Gosztanyi stresses that the ORTT committee that prepared new legislation did not mention community radios, only deals with public service and commercial radios. The currently valid program broadcasting contracts guarantee a much shorter period of frequency use for community radios (3+5 years) while for commercials (7+5 years).

The financial background of radios is also uncertain, in the financial plans the amounts for community radios have decreased (Gosztanyi, 2010). The imperfections of financial support systems also do not help community radios to find a firm ground. Also in Hungary, the listeners' financial support is not part of the system, therefore chances of self-sustaining are minimal. The professional credibility of ORTT has drastically decreased – many found worrying the situation around the frequency re-allotment for two commercial channels in 2009.

### **3.3 Status of the Hungarian community radios**

In Hungary, the currently operational law, harmonized with the recommendations of SzaRáMaSzer says that small community radios can function independently from political and state institutes, from financially profit-oriented enterprises. They serve (minority, ethnic, religious, life-style) communities, represent interests of minorities, and they are organized on voluntary basis in a democratic fashion. Radio stations broadcasting in small frequency areas, representing local interests can have maximum half of their income from advertisements and their advertisement time can not cross the limit of 3 minutes per hour. The profit coming from advertisements has to be used for the operation of the radio station in a non-profit way (Hargitai, 2005).

The financial basis of the community radios comes from state resources, from ORTT and other civic fund tenders. According to the media law 0.5-1.0% of the annual Broadcasting Fund has to be used to sponsor civic radios. Radios who promote community or local interests, cultural plurality and values can apply for support for their operational expenses, innovations (technical investments, studio technique, broadcasting devices, etc.) and for magazine program production (Lewis, 2008). In Hungary the biggest program is to maintain financial stability for these radios. Very few of them use their maximum advertisement time. According to the survey of ORTT there are a few radios whose main income comes from commercial



advertisements (Pusztai Rádió, Vértess Rádió) (ORTT, 2007). (According to the ORTT survey, which is often imprecise, or just difficult to interpret, Pusztai Radio gets hundred per cent of its financial support from advertisements. This is in clear contradiction with the current media law. It is unknown if the mistake was made on the level of information or its interpretation.) In case of school radios, it is the usually mother institute which takes over the financial costs, elsewhere the local municipality provides support. The most common sources of income are however the tenders of ORTT and of other funds targeting the civic sphere. Though it is known to some, the American system of membership or audience support works only very rarely (ORTT, 2007).

In Hungary the media is supervised by the National Television and Radio Board (Országos Rádió és Televízió Testület – ORTT) which comes directly under the Parliament. ORTT defines the operational area of electronic media, prescribes its possibilities and legal limitations. According to the current law, ORTT defines the broadcasting power of radios between 0.5-10 watts and the broadcast area in maximum 1 kms (ORTT, 2007). ORTT announces a simplified tender competition for the free frequencies twice a year. The frequencies are allotted by the National Communications Authority (NCAH). There is no broadcasting fee charged as such, and the price of the broadcasting device can be reclaimed in the next tender application.

According to the survey about the community radios, a bit more than half of the interviewed thought that ORTT considers the needs of community radios in its policies; 20% of the answers say that they are unsatisfied with the work of this media authority. In the same time the radios are unhappy with NHH and the Artijus Legal Right Protection Office, with their networking and communication. They think that these offices make the work of radios more difficult, in some cases, completely hindering their activities (Gosztonyi, 2007). Gosztonyi also adds in his interview that community radios find it difficult to implement their plans because of the highly regulated nature of media by the state. It is difficult to harmonize various interests of SzaRáMaSzer community radio members, also the ORTT does not consider them as equal partners during the negotiations. They are only marginally involved, or involved late in the preparations of media enactments or regulations, usually not allowed enough time to form a valid professional opinion.

Research of SzaRáMaSzer sponsored by the Norwegian Civic Fund intends to summarize the experiences of Hungarian community radios in the last half a decade. The questionnaire sent

to radios at the end of 2009 tries to find out information about the popularity of these radios, about their public relations, and their mission. (The previous survey, conducted in 2007 by Gosztonyi asked about the financial and technical situation of the radios, about their cooperation with media authorities, and not the role of these radios in a given community). The 2009 questionnaire gives a special importance to the popularity of the radio, to the public appearance of a radio, and to listeners' feedback (See the full questionnaire in the Appendix). I have sent out a shortened questionnaire to the community radios with approval of SzaRáMaSzer because the mentioned research was still going on during the writing of this thesis work. My questionnaire focused mostly on self-definition and on publicity of the radio, asked for a short evaluation of the activities of the radio till the present, and asked about the Hungarian environment of civic radios. Due to the approaching deadline and the timing of this research questionnaires were sent out at the end of December 2009. Out of 55 questionnaires 15 were sent back answered. This is definitely not a representative sample, but one can read interesting tendencies from the received answers.

Mostly, it is the real small community, village radios who feel this media type as their own. According to their opinion the aim of these radios is to report about local events, mediate the local interest, also to educate, disseminate information, cultural activities, local patriotism, serving the community, developing a kind of „meeting point”. They think that in Hungary the community radios are over-regulated, therefore there are not many such radios. They are encouraging other communities to start their own broadcasting wherever there is an emerging need for it and the circumstances are given.

A member of a dynamic team of Berzsenyi Radio run by the university in Szombathely thinks that programs about the youth and about immigrants are missing from the pluralistic media. According to his opinion, the regulation should filter out more commercial channels, those which apply for community frequencies only because of lack of other types of tenders more appropriate for their profile, misusing this way the opportunities given to community radios. These radios, according to their own definition, were established to fill up gaps on the musical palette or with goals similar to commercial radios.

To measure popularity is a difficult task for radios. For most of the radios who were asked during the interviews it would be important to know the number and composition of their listeners. However, they do not learnt about it due to financial constraints. Some of the radios

tried to conduct a self-made survey, but because of certain limitations of the research their data are quite unreliable, they serve only as vague information.

Radio X from Hódmezővásárhely though has precise data about their popularity due to the fact that they received precise information about this from GFK Hungarian and Ipsos, two professional media – and public opinion research institutes. An interesting public research method is used by Gorba radio from Tardos village. They developed partnership with a larger project focusing on settlement development which uses a representative questionnaire. From the results of this research they know that 10% of the villagers listen to their programs. We asked specific questions about the radio itself as a community, enquiring if they would make a program just for the sake of program production, reaching out for even one person.

From the answers it seems that those who find the popularity of their radio important would not produce a radio program for its own sake. Five people wrote in their questionnaire that popularity is not very important and that they would produce a program even for one listener.

*”On one hand, a good quality survey involves so much financial investment and work which is not necessarily compensated by the gained data. On the other hand, a radio which gives lots of freedom to its producers besides following certain basic values, can not fall into the trap of restricting or influencing the producers of the programs on the basis of some numbers.” (Medvegy, 2010)*

Usually community radios fall out of scope of the various media research initiatives ordered by the state or some private companies. It is also visible that community radios try to learn about their listeners within their limited means – usually through the participants on internet forums, listeners calling-in to the programs, or asking people almost randomly on various community events. Naturally, these results are very imprecise and they can not be considered representative by any means. So far two nationwide surveys are known; Gergely Gosztonyi, and ORTT have conducted surveys in the recent past, and there is an ongoing research by SzaRáMaSzer, the results of which will be out after the submission of this thesis.

### **3.4 Possibilities of Regulation: desires and realities**

Regulation of community radios is usually a very complex question and therefore it is difficult to come up with general solutions for it. First it is the question of freedom of speech

which comes into the focus; it is difficult to balance between the latter and a reasonable regulation. Mass media use involves lots of responsibilities even if it is the most effective means to exercise freedom of speech, to spread democratic ideas. The same is valid for community radios even if on a smaller scale than for national or commercial channels. Publicly uttered words carry more weight than those shared in a smaller circle. Jürgen Habermas however reminds us that public sphere is made of private opinions (Hitchens, 2006). Media generates the public sphere and provides adequate forums of it. Community radios serve such purposes in a very direct way. While a more or less well defined system of regulation was successfully implemented for the commercial and public service media, it is difficult to establish the same for community radios exactly because of the openness and complexity of the latter (Hitchens, 2006). The multiplicity of community radios makes their real value, but as a media which is part of public sphere it needs certain regulation.

The interviewed experts usually agree that successful operation of community radios needs a board but well-defined framework which is based on self-regulation, where the participants, the radios themselves define their goals. It would be desirable to have a media supervisory board independent of the public and commercial media, which would specialize in community radio regulation and supervision. Others, like Péter Molnár, argue that though self-regulation is a real alternative, it can not solve everything. For instance it is not at all sure that it can effectively screen out extreme radical voices. In case of the radios –internet is an entirely different case which needs more active participation – a professional, objective, independent, well-communicating media supervisory body is required which would take up the role of regulation and supervision.

In Hungary, the state plays a far too important role in media regulation. In the same time the professional organizations, unions are not unified enough to be able to successfully negotiate with the state apparatus and implement the interests of community radios (Gosztonyi, 2009). It is important to synchronize the work of various professional bodies active at different levels, with different goals and orientations, and to form a larger platform where professionalism is represented in a properly defined framework and on a high level. Gergely Gosztonyi, a lawyer specialized in community radios stresses that a common platform on its own is not enough; state has to be forced to make some definite steps. The state is not necessarily the best guardian of community radios, say most believers of the liberal media regulation. Balázs Weyer adds that what makes the legitimacy of Hungarian community radios difficult is the fact that they heavily depend on state funds; there is no system of private/ individual financial

supporters in our country which would create a basis for the existence of community radios. It also means that they have to adjust to the state prescribed system of criteria. There are/ were various suggestions for how to make community radios less dependent from the state. The suggestions mostly say that the field of regulation and supervision needs to be removed from under state control that is from ORTT which reflects the actual political situation with its party delegates sitting in its board. Instead, a professional, independent, self-regulatory organization, in Hungary's case it is SzaRáMaSzer, has to take this role.

In most countries the extent and quality of self regulation is closely linked to the capacity and effectiveness of the country level sector associations, as it can be observed in case of community radio associations of different countries like SNRL in France, CRAOL in Ireland, BFRO in Austria, but similar organizations of self-regulation and self-help can be found in Australia (CBAA), South Africa (NCRF), and the US (NFCB) too.

Knowing the rigidity of the Hungarian state, it would not give up easily the role of frequency division and regulation and the right of deciding about funds – therefore this important step has to be well prepared and requires a lot of professional and unified work. At the moment the same board of ORTT handles all the three types of media; most of the experts believe that these are entirely different areas requiring different expertise. As an example Holland and the UK are often quoted for their good practice of community radio regulation. Experts also complain that the state regulation is not good enough, i.e. the system of criteria is too flexible, most applicants can easily fulfill them, and there is no proper way of sanctions and control. Also the boundaries of freedom of speech and public speech addressing a certain community are not clear; some cases of the recent past also prove this fact. There is no continuous dialogue between legislators and community radios. Gosztonyi would consider a regular, maybe half yearly meeting between these two parties useful in a form of a committee hearing. The Dutch type of regulation can be quoted as a good example, where an Independent Media Authority (CVDM – Commissariaat voor de Media) holds the right to divide the community radio frequencies. This organization has to negotiate with the local municipalities, mostly about the technical conditions to avoid any clash of frequencies. Every local municipality elects a media provider which is held responsible for running the local media. 271 such community radios operate in Holland.

The producers of radios themselves are not very happy with the system of regulation in Hungary. Most of them feel that the legal status of community radios is overregulated,

unnecessarily complicated and too much directed from top. They find the tender system too robust and lacking enough funds. On one hand, they feel their representative system is not strong enough on the other hand there are not enough partners for negotiations. Others would place more stress on the popularization of community radios; this could be founded from a central budget. According to their opinion, there is not enough information reaching the audiences about community radios.

The formation of broadcast areas is also heavily criticized as the system often does not follow the geographical or demographic diversities. It is also not clear, points out both the professionals and the producers of community radios, in what status do community radios operate. Certain elements like the definitions of royalties are not in accordance with the non-profit profile of the community radios.

*„There is a great need to form a separate category for community radios in the media regulation instead of the current public media/ non profit media divide. The appearance of commercial radios in this sector is highly disputable. Radios delegated by civic organizations, operated on the basis of democratic principles can really represent community interests. An opportunity has to be provided for radios smaller than local radios for broadcasting programs which could cover larger areas than the current small community frequencies. Most of the communities can not be defined on the basis of their residence in a circle of 1 km of radius.”*  
(Medvegy, 2010)

## CHAPTER 4 – SUMMARY

The more than half a century history of community radios in the world created the model of plural media use in its most extensive sense. Radios of various types and patterns, radios with different aims and goals create a colorful selection of electronic media. Naturally, the huge variety shows differentiated results. While in Asia or Africa community radio is an essential tool of communication, mediating basic information between masses of illiterate population, a symbolic and real tool of democratization processes, in the Western part of the world audiences learned how to use this type of media, they can distinguish between various impulses, and these radios became forums of local communities and community building tools. These radios also work as tools of underground or sub-cultures, running parallel to the mainstream radio culture.

In Hungary, community radios began functioning slightly late, however they picked up very fast and set the basis of community radios in an almost exemplary way. Since 2004 many new stations began broadcasting here. According to many critics, Hungary is not utilizing well its leading role in the region and does not consciously show a sort of good practice to the other neighboring countries, for instance in setting up bilingual programs in the border regions (Gosztonyi, 2009). As the short survey conducted specifically for this thesis indicates, radio producers and experts believe that after an extremely promising beginning a not too flexible legislation is in operation in Hungary. Moreover, they foresee an uncertain legal and political regulation for the future. They believe that there would be scope for community radio development, for setting up new broadcasting stations. As Periszkóp Rádió of Pécs suggested in the survey, a national network of community radios could be established connecting all the already existing radios.

It is also true that other experts can not subscribe to the community building role of these forms of radios anymore. Steve Buckley visualizes a more definite future for community radios. He says, „though community radios themselves range from fairly mainstream even quasi-commercial services to others that are very much the 'voice of the voiceless' or engaged in various forms of challenging, radical, innovative, avantgarde, progressive, critical etc approaches to the use of the medium. In future community radios, to survive, will, I suggest, need to adopt a cross media strategy, building a content-oriented Internet presence with blogs,

forums, audience generated content, including text, photo, video as well as audio material.” (Buckley, 2009)

According to another opinion, community radios need to be measured similarly to the public service and community radios, thus giving them a new meaning, measurable popularity, and proving their importance. Others like Buckley thinks that it is not sure whether one can make a qualitative distinction between 'small scale' and other community radios in terms of their social impact. Some very large and some very small community radios have significant social impact. Impact is not, we can say, size related, except in purely quantitative terms of the numbers of people that are reached.

The new technical innovations open up new dimensions for the future of community radios. With the spread of digital radios new, better quality broadcasting areas can become functional with wider circles of transmission. Also geographical limitations are almost non-existent with internet-based radio transmission, which represents a much cheaper technology too. Financially developed countries also experiment with mobile phone based transmission technologies (Sullivan, 2007). This way the original romanticized world of radios may be gone forever, the era when we were tuning our radios in the darkness, almost in a secret, looking for better reception and for a voice which is truly addressing us.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Act I of 1996 on Radio and Television Broadcasting. January 15, 1996.

<http://net.jogtar.hu/jr/gen/getdoc.cgi?docid=99600001.tv&dbnum=62>

AMARC *Radio Production Training Pack*. Sheffield: AMARC Europe, 1995

Article 19 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. United Nations, 1948.

<http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/>

DBCDE – About (Department of Broadband, Communications and the Digital Economy)

[http://www.dbcde.gov.au/radio/community\\_radio](http://www.dbcde.gov.au/radio/community_radio)

Bekken, Jon. “Community Radio at the Crossroads: Federal Policy and The Professionalization of a Grassroots Medium.” In *Seizing the Airwaves: A Free Radio Handbook*, edited by Sakolsky, Ron and Stephen Dunifer, 29-46. San Francisco: AK Press, 1994.

Benedek, Gergő, Gergely Gosztanyi and Henrik Hargitai. “Kisközösségi rádiózás Magyarországon – Az első 3 év.” *Civil Szemle*, no. 3-4 (2007): 123-144

CBAA – About – Aims (Community Broadcasting Association of Australia)

<http://www.cbaa.org.au/content.php/671.html>

CBAA-McNair Ingenuity Research. “Community Radio National Listener Survey – Summary Report of Findings.” (Sydney, September 9, 2004)

[http://www.cbonline.org.au/media/listener\\_survey/McNair\\_Report.pdf](http://www.cbonline.org.au/media/listener_survey/McNair_Report.pdf)

The Community Radio Order 2004 (Statutory Instrument 2004 No. 1944), July 19, 2004

<http://www.opsi.gov.uk/si/si2004/20041944.htm> (accessed: Jan 23, 2010)

Coyer, Kate. “Access to broadcasting: Radio.” In *The Alternative Media Handbook*, edited by Coyer, Kate, Tony Dowmunt and Alan Fountain, 112-123. New York: Routledge, 2007.

Coyer, Kate. *Community Media: Scholarship, Policy Advocacy, and Power Tools*. Social Science Research Council (SSRC) Media Research Hub, MCRM Essays, December 3, 2008. <http://essays.ssrc.org/mcrm/?p=28> (accessed: Jan 23, 2010)

Day, Julia. "Britain tunes in to community radio." *The Guardian*, 16 June 2004. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/media/2004/jun/16/radio> (accessed: Jan 23, 2010)

DCMS (Department for Culture, Media and Sport, UK). Explanatory Memorandum of The Community Radio Order. *UK Government* (June 2004) [www.opsi.gov.uk/si/em2004/uksiem\\_20041944\\_en.pdf](http://www.opsi.gov.uk/si/em2004/uksiem_20041944_en.pdf) (accessed: Jan 23, 2010)

Downey, John and Natalie Fenton. "New Media, Counter Publicity and the Public Sphere." *New Media & Society*, vol. 5, no. 2 (2003): 185-202

Dunaway, David. "Community Radio at the Beginning of the 21st Century: Commercialism vs. Community Power." *The Public*, vol. 5, no. 2 (1998): 87-103

Everitt, Anthony. *New Voices – An Evaluation of 15 access radio projects*. Radio Authority, London, 2003. <http://www.ofcom.org.uk/static/archive/rau/radio-stations/access/NewVoices/New%20Voices.pdf> (accessed: Jan 23, 2010)

Foxwell, Kerrie. "Quantifying Community Radio... Some Qualifications." *Australian Community Broadcasting Series*, vol. 1, no. 5. (2001): 1-14

FSER (Fonds de Soutien à l'Expression Radiophonique), April 16, 2004. [http://www.ddm.gouv.fr/article.php3?id\\_article=242](http://www.ddm.gouv.fr/article.php3?id_article=242) (accessed: Jan 23, 2010)

Gibbons, Thomas. *Regulating the media*. London: Sweet & Maxwell, 1991.

Gosztonyi, Gergely. "Kisközösségi rádiók Magyarországon." *Médiakutató*, vol. 8, no. 3 (2007): 43-56

Gosztonyi, Gergely. "Past, Present, and Future of the Hungarian Community Radio movement." In *Understanding Community Media*, edited by Kevin Rowley, 297-307. Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, 2010.

Hargitai, Henrik (ed.). *Kisközösségi rádiók kézikönyve*. Szabad Rádiók Magyarországi Szervezete, Budapest, 2005.

Hirner, Wolfgang. *Independent Radio in Central and Eastern Europe: Country by Country Report*. AMARC Europe, 1996. <http://www.amarc.org/documents/article/Country-Europe.doc> (accessed: Jan 23, 2010)

Hitchens, Lesley. *Broadcasting Pluralism and Diversity: A Comparative Study of Policy and Regulation*. Oxford: Hart Publishing, 2006.

Jallov, Birgitte. "Assessing Community Change: Development of a 'Bare Foot' Impact Assessment Methodology." *Radio Journal: International Studies in Broadcast & Audio Media*, vol. 3, no. 1 (2005): 21-34

Lewis, Peter Maynard. *Promoting Social Cohesion: The role of community media*. Council of Europe, Strasbourg, 2008. [http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/standardsetting/media/Doc/H-Inf\(2008\)013\\_en.pdf](http://www.coe.int/t/dghl/standardsetting/media/Doc/H-Inf(2008)013_en.pdf)

Macedo, M. Gonalo. *The state of community media in the EU*. Report by Kern European Affairs (KEA) for the Department Structural and Cohesion Policies, European Parliament, Brussels (September 2007) [www.europarl.europa.eu/activities/committees/studies/download.do?file=22408](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/activities/committees/studies/download.do?file=22408) (accessed: Jan 23, 2010)

Meadows, Michael, Susan Forde, Christine Morris, Jacqui Ewart and Kerrie Foxwell. "Perfect match? Qualitative audience research and the community media sector." *3CMedia Journal of Community, Citizen's and Third Sector Media and Communication*, no. 1 (2005): 13-24.

Mtimde, Lumko, Marie-H  l  ne Bonin, Nkopane Maphiri, and Kodjo Nyamaku. *What is Community Radio? A Resource Guide*. AMARC Africa 1998. [http://www.amarc.org/documents/manuals/What\\_is\\_CR\\_english.pdf](http://www.amarc.org/documents/manuals/What_is_CR_english.pdf)

Napoli, Philip. "Audience Measurement and Media Policy: Audience Economics, the Diversity Principle, and the Local People Meter." *Communication Law and Policy*, vol. 10, no. 4 (2005): 349-382

Ofcom. *Community Radio: Annual Report on the Sector*. Office of Communications, UK (March, 2009) [www.ofcom.org.uk/radio/ifi/rbl/commun\\_radio/cr\\_annualrpt/cr\\_annualrpt.pdf](http://www.ofcom.org.uk/radio/ifi/rbl/commun_radio/cr_annualrpt/cr_annualrpt.pdf) (accessed: Jan 23, 2010)

ORTT (National Radio and Television Board). *A kisközösségi rádiózás Magyarországon*. Budapest, 2007.

[http://www.ortt.hu/elemzesek/21/1173689316a\\_kiskozossegi\\_radiozas\\_magyarorszagon\\_20070312.pdf](http://www.ortt.hu/elemzesek/21/1173689316a_kiskozossegi_radiozas_magyarorszagon_20070312.pdf)

Rádío C – About (Gipsy Radio) <http://www.radioc.hu/magunkrol/magindex.html> (accessed: Jan 23, 2010)

Resetarits, Karin. *Report on Community Media in Europe*. European Parliament, Committee on Culture and Education, Brussels (24 June 2008).  
<http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//NONSGML+REPORT+A6-2008-0263+0+DOC+PDF+V0//EN> (accessed: Jan 23, 2010)

Sullivan, Marguerite H. *Community Radio: Its Impact and Challenges to its Development*. Working Group Report, Center for International Media Assistance (October 9, 2007)  
[www.ned.org/cima/CIMA-Community\\_Radio-Working\\_Group\\_Report.pdf](http://www.ned.org/cima/CIMA-Community_Radio-Working_Group_Report.pdf)

Sükösd Miklós. “Helyzeti alternatívok – Az alternatív nyilvánosság.” *Mozgó Világ*, vol. 19, no. 11 (1993): 79-96

SzaRáMaSzer – About (Hungarian Federation of Free Radios)  
<http://www.szabadradio.hu/hu/magunkrol> (accessed: Jan 23, 2010)

Tilos Rádió – About – Mission statement  
[http://tilos.hu/index.php?page\\_id=info\\_tilos\\_szellemiseg](http://tilos.hu/index.php?page_id=info_tilos_szellemiseg) (accessed: Jan 23, 2010)

Williams, Chris. “Ofcom top of Tory deathlist.” *The Register* (July 6, 2009)  
[http://www.theregister.co.uk/2009/07/06/cameron\\_ofcom/](http://www.theregister.co.uk/2009/07/06/cameron_ofcom/) (accessed: Jan 23, 2010)

de Wit, Pieter. “The Dutch Community Media Scene: building further” transcript of the speech held at the international colloquium on community media “Finding and Funding Voices: the inner City Experience.” London Metropolitan University, 17 September 2007.  
[http://www.communitymedia.eu/events/finding-and-funding-voices/presentations/Pieter\\_De\\_Wit-OLON.pdf](http://www.communitymedia.eu/events/finding-and-funding-voices/presentations/Pieter_De_Wit-OLON.pdf) (accessed: Jan 23, 2010)

## APPENDICES

### 1. Interviews

**Steve Buckley** (January 6, 2010)

president, World Association of Community Radio Broadcasters (AMARC)  
director of Sheffield Live! 93.2 FM

**Kate Coyer** (April 7, 2009)

director, CEU CMCS, postdoctoral fellow, UPENN  
community media researcher

**Gergely Gosztonyi** (December 1, 2009)

assistant professor, ELTE  
community media researcher/producer, Civil Rádió (Budapest)

**Orsolya Kovács** (December 1, 2009)

office manager, SzaRáMaSzer  
community radio producer, Fúzió Rádió (Budapest)

**Péter Molnár** (January 19, 2010)

senior research fellow, CEU CMCS  
media policy advisor, former MP (1990-1998)

**Balázs Weyer** (November 26, 2009)

editor in chief, [origo], radio producer Tilos (Budapest)  
former vice-president, of AMARC, former chairman of Tilos Radio Cultural Foundation

**Pieter de Wit** (December 17, 2009)

president, Community Media Forum Europe  
former director of OLON (Dutch Federation of Local Public Broadcasting Media)

## **2. Questionnaire**

### ***Functioning and Goals***

1. When did you start broadcasting (your programs)? (Year, month) <sup>(GG9)</sup>
2. How many people participate in the program production now?
3. How do you define the community role of your radio?
4. Are you satisfied with the realization of your self-designed community goals? Please explain your answer.  
☐ yes  
☐ no  
☐ partly

Explanation:

### ***Environment***

5. How would you change the current Hungarian regulation of community radios?
6. According to your opinion, are there less, enough or many community radios in operation? Please explain your answer.  
☐ many  
☐ few  
☐ just enough

Explanation:

7. What kind of community voices are you personally missing from the radio programs?

### ***Listenership***

8. Do you have data on the audience of your station? <sup>(GG45)</sup>  
☐ yes  
☐ no
9. If yes, how reliable are these data? <sup>(GG46)</sup>  
☐ very reliable  
☐ reliable

☐ random

10. Has your radio made a survey about its audience? <sup>(GG47)</sup>

☐ no → Why not?

☐ yes → In which year?

→ In what form? ☐ telephonic interview  
☐ personal interview  
☐ internal estimates  
☐ Others, namely:

11. Number of potential listeners according to the program broadcasting contract? <sup>(GG48)</sup>:  
people

12. What do you think how many listeners do you have through traditional radio transmission?  
<sup>(GG49)</sup> people

13. And how many do listen to your programs through other forms (cable, internet, etc.)? <sup>(GG50)</sup>  
people

14. Do you find data on your audience important?

☐ yes  
☐ no

15. Would you make a program for even one listener?

☐ yes  
☐ no

### **Feedback**

16. On a broadcasting day how often do you get feedbacks from your listeners which get directly connected back to the live program? (telephone, email, forum, chat, etc.) <sup>(GG56)</sup>

☐ often  
☐ rarely  
☐ never

17. After the end of the program how often do your listeners reflect and give you feedbacks?  
<sup>(GG57)</sup>

☐ often  
☐ rarely  
☐ never

18. On what other forums do your listeners react to your programs? How else do the local community and your listeners meet?

### ***Basic Data***

19. Name of the radio:

20. Broadcast area:

21. Name of the answerer:

22. Broadcasting frequency:

23. Webpage address:

24. Central email address:

25. Central telephone number:

**Thank you for your cooperation!**



### 3. List of surveyed Hungarian community radios

#### **Zöld Rádió**

launch: December 2004  
location: Erdőkertes  
frequency: FM 92,4  
contact: Péter Balázs  
org: Zöld Rádió Közhasznú Egyesület  
tel: +36-30-486-2225  
e-mail: [zoldradio@zoldradio.hu](mailto:zoldradio@zoldradio.hu)  
addr: 2113 Erdőkertes, Báthori utca. 1.  
URL: <http://www.zoldradio.hu/>

#### **Első Pesti Egyetemi Rádió**

launch: October 2004  
location: Budapest, Belváros  
frequency: FM 97,0  
contact: Henrik Hargitai  
org: Média Universalis Alapítvány  
tel: +36-1-485-5200/ext.2191  
e-mail: [hhargitai@gmail.com](mailto:hhargitai@gmail.com)  
addr: 1088 Budapest, Múzeum krt. 6-8.  
URL: <http://eper.elte.hu/>

#### **Alfa Rádió**

launch: October 2008  
location: Balkány  
frequency: FM 88.0  
contact: András Balla  
org: AndrySoft Bt.  
tel: +36-21-382-9904  
e-mail: [info@alfaradio.hu](mailto:info@alfaradio.hu)  
addr: 4233 Balkány, Ságvári Endre út 17.  
URL: <http://alfaradio.hu>

#### **Vértes Rádió**

launch: January 2005  
location: Zámoly  
frequency: FM 88.7  
contact: István Menyhárt  
org: Háló Zámoly Fejlődéséért Egyesület  
tel: +36-20-922-7599  
e-mail: [zamoly@telehaz.hu](mailto:zamoly@telehaz.hu)  
addr: 8081. Zámoly, Rákóczi u.7.  
URL: <http://www.zamolyportal.hu/>

#### **Mustár FM**

launch: November 2007  
location: Nyíregyháza  
frequency: FM 89,6  
contact: Gábor Dombóvári  
org: Mustárház Ifjúsági Iroda  
tel: +36-42-400-344  
e-mail: [info@mustarhaz.hu](mailto:info@mustarhaz.hu)  
addr: 4400 Nyíregyháza, Sz. István u. 20.  
URL: <http://www.mustarhaz.hu/>

#### **Rádió X**

launch: October 2005  
location: Hódmezővásárhely  
frequency: FM 105,4  
contact: Lajos Ágoston  
org: n.a.  
tel: +36-62-222-770  
e-mail: [radio-x@invitel.hu](mailto:radio-x@invitel.hu)  
addr: 6800 Hódmezővásárh., Koszta u. 9.  
URL: <http://www.mgstudio.extra.hu/>

**Rádió MI**

launch: March 2005  
 location: Szeged  
 frequency: FM 89.9  
 contact: Gábor Medvegy  
 org: Itt Szeged Egyesület  
 tel: +36-30-468-1719  
 e-mail: [radiomi899@gmail.com](mailto:radiomi899@gmail.com)  
 addr: 6722 Szeged, Egyetem u. 2.  
 URL: <http://radiomi.hu/>

**Kontakt Rádió**

launch: August 2008  
 location: Budapest, Terézváros  
 frequency: FM 87,6  
 contact: András Janovits  
 org: Közösségi Rádiózásért Egyesület  
 tel: +36-1-707-7123  
 e-mail: [kontaktradio@gmail.com](mailto:kontaktradio@gmail.com)  
 addr: 1066 Budapest, Desseffy u. 35  
 URL: <http://www.kontaktradio.hu/>

**Rádió Eper**

launch: September 2008  
 location: Miskolci  
 frequency: FM 92,4  
 contact: László Csonka  
 org: Sound Stúdió 69 Kft.  
 tel: +36-46-784-793  
 e-mail: [cslaszlo@radioeper.hu](mailto:cslaszlo@radioeper.hu)  
 addr: 3534 Miskolc, Bánát u. 3.  
 URL: <http://www.radioeper.hu/>

**Rádió Csobán**

launch: October 2007  
 location: Csobánka  
 frequency: FM 93,5  
 contact: Lajos Gordon  
 org: n.a.  
 tel: +36- 26-320-146  
 e-mail: [gordons@t-online.hu](mailto:gordons@t-online.hu)  
 addr: 2014 Csobánka, Holdfény u. 6.  
 URL: <http://radiocsoban.hu/>

**Gorba Rádió**

launch: November 2008  
 location: Tardos  
 frequency: FM 107,4  
 contact: Réka Elekes  
 org: Vörösmárvány Művelődési Ház  
 tel: +36-30-268-3773  
 e-mail: [elekesreka@gmail.com](mailto:elekesreka@gmail.com)  
 addr: 2834 Tardos, Rákóczi Ferenc u. 14.  
 URL: <http://www.tardos.hu/>

**Berzsenyi Rádió**

launch: April 2005  
 location: Szombathely  
 frequency: FM 98.8  
 contact: Gabriella Velics  
 org: NYME Savaria Egyetemi Központja  
 tel: +36-94-504-380  
 e-mail: [gabriellavelics@hotmail.com](mailto:gabriellavelics@hotmail.com)  
 addr: 9700 Szombathely, Károlyi G. tér 4.  
 URL: <http://www.berzsenyiradio.hu/>

**Radio Smile**

launch: November 2008  
 location: Kiskunfélegyháza  
 frequency: FM 89,9  
 contact: Viktor Csősz  
 org: n.a.  
 tel: +36-70-326-2726  
 e-mail: [viktor@radiosmile.hu](mailto:viktor@radiosmile.hu)  
 addr: 6100 Kiskunfélegyháza, Liget u. 10.  
 URL: <http://www.radiosmile.hu/>

**Rádió Füzes**

launch: December 2005  
 location: Füzesabony  
 frequency: FM 92,4  
 contact: Sándor Szabó  
 org: n.a.  
 tel: +36-30-281-6139  
 e-mail: [peter.szabolcs.radio@gmail.com](mailto:peter.szabolcs.radio@gmail.com)  
 addr: 3390 Füzesabony, Rákóczi út 50.  
 URL: <http://www.radiofuzes.hu/>

**Studio FM**

launch: October 2008  
location: Zalaegerszeg  
frequency: FM 96,3  
contact: Márta Fraenhoffer  
org: Radio Studio Kft.  
tel: +36-92-963-963  
e-mail: [fraumarta@studiofm.hu](mailto:fraumarta@studiofm.hu)  
addr: 8900 Zalaegerszeg, Csutor I. u. 1.  
URL: <http://www.studiofm.hu/>

**Periszkóp Rádió**

launch: June 2006  
location: Pécs  
frequency: FM 97.1  
contact: Balázs Kovács  
org: Moiré Kulturális Egyesület  
tel: +36-20-233-1867  
e-mail: [xrc@periszkopradio.hu](mailto:xrc@periszkopradio.hu)  
addr: 7621 Pécs, Mátyás Király utca 2.  
URL: <http://www.periszkopradio.hu>