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ABSTRACT

New technologies, such as social media and web services, are becoming increasingly common and important tools for community radio stations. The convergence of community radio, social media and web services opens up new opportunities for participation from the audience and challenges previous conceptions of community, participation, empowerment and the public sphere. This study focuses on how this convergence affects notions of participation, empowerment, community and the public sphere as well as the resulting challenges and opportunities. The study was conducted at three community radio stations in the Western Cape, South Africa and used a mixed-methods approach of qualitative interviews, a survey and netnographic observations of social media and web presence.

The findings show that social media and web services increases and changes participation by extending possibilities to interact independently of spatiotemporal limitations of radio broadcasts. It has direct effects on the content of the radio shows and the audience is empowered as co-producers and contributors of content. Additionally, the interaction itself creates new content in other mediums, such as blogs. The study also shows how the converging public spheres of community radio and social media are contradictory as participation becomes economized and exclusionary and relies heavily on financial means, access and digital literacy of the community. The expanded, global reach of community radio also challenges the notion of community as it includes distant and diasporic communities. However, the presence in the global mediascape harmonizes with community radio values of self-representation and self-expression. The study concludes that community radio stations need to both strategize their social media use while balancing their mandate to be a voice of the voiceless that lack access and/or digital literacy to participate.
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1. INTRODUCTION

“The radio would be the finest possible communication apparatus in public life, a vast network of pipes. That is to say, it would be if it knew how to receive as well as to transmit, how to let the listener speak as well as hear, how to bring him into a relationship instead of isolating him.” - Berthold Brecht, 1932.

1.1 BRIEF HISTORY OF COMMUNITY RADIO

In 1932, Berthold Brecht realized the limitations of radio as a medium and rightfully pointed out what was missing – participation and interaction from the listeners. Without channels for feedback, he argued that radio is “...purely an apparatus for distribution, for mere sharing out” (Brecht, 1932). However, community radio has bypassed the technological limitations in the medium and found ways to create feedback channels through ownership, community surveying and in other ways pursuing involvement from the community. Despite a lack of ability to directly respond to broadcasts, community radio has involved its listeners through listening clubs, surveys and direct feedback to shape the content of broadcasts (Jallov, 2012). Consequently the radio has become an important medium for development and social change, giving communities a platform for communicating about local issues, news and challenges that directly affect their daily lives. It has also demonstrated many positive attributes that benefit in preserving local culture, giving the community a voice and capacity to express their identity, and empowering the community with direct positive affects on democracy (Mtimde, 2000; Myers, 2011; Odine, 2013). While community radios can come in different shapes, a few criteria is seen as essential for it to be ‘true community radio’. Community radio is two-way communication where the community can directly influence and be involved with content production and organization; it is not-for-profit; uses local languages; promotes local music, and; is owned by the community. Radio of this kind is in essence participatory and functions as a community communication mechanism and a platform for local development, which is defined by the community itself (Jallov 2012). The community radio provides a platform for the members of the community to hold governments accountable, to advocate for their rights and as a means to drive social change (da Costa, 2012). This demonstrates, in a way, a fulfillment of Brecht’s request to make communication two-way and not merely one-directional. Another advantage of radio in the context of development and social change is availability. Equipment for both broadcasters and listeners are widely available at low cost;
the broadcast caters to the illiterate; and they can serve the community in its local language (Odine, 2013). However, even though community radio has been around since the 1940s (Jallov, 2012), it has been constrained by state ownership of the airwaves in many parts of the world. With the liberalization of the airwaves and availability of cheaper technology in the last two decades, licensing to community radios has increased dramatically and Africa alone has experienced a growth of 1,386% between 2000 and 2006 (Myers, 2011). In South Africa, the freeing of the airwaves did not come into being without a fight from the grassroots. Anti-apartheid organizations along with unlicensed community radio stations were important actors in campaigning for open and democratic broadcasting (Mtimde, 2000). Parallel to a friendlier legislative climate for community in South Africa, the mobile revolution has made mobile phones widely available for even the poorest segments of societies (infoDev, 2012). The increased availability and affordability of mobile phones changes the way we view the digital divide as people are increasingly accessing the Internet via their mobile devices (Bosch 2014). The media environments that community radio is set within continue to converge and become more and more integrated into the work of radio stations (Bosch, 2014b; Chiumbu & Ligaga, 2013a; Jallov, 2012; Lorini & Chigona, 2014; Nassanga, Manyozo, & Lopes, 2013). Such convergence offers new possibilities and challenges in interaction and participation of the targeted community. The notion of community as defined by the radio stations changes as the audience becomes less organized around identity politics or communal relations, but rather on their networked sociality (Bosch 2014). Bosch concludes that even though the use of ICTs does not necessarily imply greater participatory engagement with audiences it makes it possible to “…engage audiences and extend the broadcast and conversations beyond the airwaves” (p. 40). Community radios are starting to use social media, but since they often cater to segments of the community who are poor and marginalized the probability of them not being able to afford the necessary devices and network charges increases (Bosch, 2014b; Chiumbu & Ligaga, 2013b).

1.2 Relevance of research and research aim

Case studies that address the use of new technologies by community radio stations are lacking but is requested in recent literature (Bosch, 2014). Bosch (2014) especially requests research to look at new technologies, community radio and citizenship, something that is closely related to this study about notions of community, participation and empowerment. Due to rapidly changing and converging media environments in the global south, Poul & Nielsen (2014) argues that single-medium studies are becoming increasingly off-target. There is a
need to look at the convergence and interplay between mediums contextualized within their media landscapes. A recent study by Chiumbo & Ligaga (2013) finds that the use of ICTs changes radio cultures in all three broadcasting tiers in South Africa, but the study does not look specifically in-depth on the nature of community radio and social media. Thus, in order to add nuances to this field, the aim of this study is to gain an understanding of how the use of social media and web services as an extension of community radio broadcast affects notions of community, empowerment and participation. It will also explore the dualities of community radio and social media in terms of public spheres. The following two objectives are considered important in order to achieve this aim:

1. Identify how program hosts at community radio stations use social media and web services in their role as broadcasters and how it empowers the listeners’ as contributors and co-producers of media content.
2. Examine the convergent public sphere of community radio and social media and its effect on the notions of participation and community.

1.3 Research Questions

1. How do program hosts at community radio stations use social media and web services as an extension of their radio programs and how does it increase empowerment and participation in society?
2. What are the consequences of the converging public spheres of community radio and social media, and how does it affect notions of participation and community?

1.4 Research Design and Theoretical Framework

The research design uses a triangulation approach and consists of interviews with program hosts and station/program managers; mapping of social media interaction and web presence (survey); and netnographic observation of social media interaction. The 11 interviews were conducted during one month in August-September of 2014 at three community radio stations in the Western Cape, South Africa. The focus of analysis is largely the interviews while the survey and netnographic observations will serve to extend, confirm, reject and exemplify the results of the interviews. Using a mixed-methods approach will increase reliability (Stewart-Withers, Banks, McGregor, & Meo-Sewabu, 2014) and avoid a common limitation of similar studies that only rely on interview material with staff, whose claims of practices can be hard to test (Bosch, 2014). Notions of empowerment (Cornwall & Eade, 2010; Jallov, 2013; Leal,
2010; Luttrell, Quiroz, Scrutton, & Bird, 2009; Page & Czuba, 1999), participation and community (Cammaerts & Carpentier, 2007a; Jallov, 2013; Myers, 2011) are central to this study. Additionally, in relation to community, the Habermasian notion of public spheres and relevant critiques (Fraser, 2007; Fuchs, 2014; Goldberg, 2010) are incorporated and explored.
2. BACKGROUND & LITERATURE REVIEW

To serve as background and contextualization for this study this chapter will define community radio and social media and situate the mediums within their regulatory framework and media landscape in South Africa. It will also highlight recent research on community radio, social media and new technologies that are relevant to this study.

2.1 CONVERGING NEW AND OLD TECHNOLOGIES

While the terms ‘old’\(^1\) and ‘new’\(^2\) media can be used to define the technology used behind a medium, an appropriate term that is frequently used in studies on the subject of community media is ‘alternative’, ‘radical’ or ‘citizen’ media (Rennie, 2006). Radio in itself can be both new and old depending on whether it is broadcasted in a traditional way via analog electromagnetic airwaves, or in the form of an online streaming or podcast, or a combination of the two. Even though the convergence of technologies and platforms transforms the way community radio is executed, the underlying philosophy, attributes, values and definitions are still very much the same. This study deals with both the practice of community radio as well as its values and therefore a broad approach towards community radio in the literature review will be employed. The literature review will focus on community radio and its participatory aspects in general, and on recent research addressing the changing modes of interaction and participation via ICTs in particular.

2.2 DEFINING COMMUNITY RADIO

Understanding community radio requires an understanding and conceptualization of community media in general. Community media commonly includes radio; television; print; and computer networks, but the nature and purpose, regardless of the medium, carries shared characteristics. Howley (2005) defines community media as follows:

By community media, I refer to grassroots or locally oriented media access initiatives predicated on a profound sense of dissatisfaction with mainstream media forms and content, dedicated to the principles of free expression and participatory democracy, and committed to enhancing community relations and promoting community solidarity (p. 2).

---

\(^1\) Wikipedia defines old media as “…traditional means of communication and expression that have existed since before the advent of the new medium of the Internet “ (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Old_media, accessed December 22\(^{nd}\) 2014).

\(^2\) Wikipedia defines new media as “…refers to on-demand access to content anytime, anywhere, on any digital device, as well as interactive user feedback, and creative participation” (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/New_media, accessed December 22\(^{nd}\) 2014).
Thus, community media springs from dissatisfaction with mainstream media and serves to offer an alternative media channel for the community. Unlike solely commercially driven stations, the listeners and producers of (ideal) community radio are part of the community and allow for them to take active part in the production and content of programming. Jallov defines key aspects of community broadcasting as “…for, by and of the community” and that it is “…the voice of the voiceless and the space for alternative political and socio-cultural thinking and action” (Jallov 2012, pp. 16-18). Berrigan (1979, as cited in Carpentier 2011) emphasizes the role of the community as participants, planners, producers and performers in community media and its role to serve as an expression of the community (p. 97).

Furthermore, the power of community radio lies in its ability to be a voice for everyone, including the marginalized and impoverished, offering a channel to speak for those who don’t have anywhere else where they will be heard (Jallov 2012, p. 20). Unlike mainstream media that primarily aims to serve a broad and general audience with a commercial purpose, community media aims to serve those who do not have any other channels that can amplify their voices, without looking for profit in those efforts.

The notion of participation is a central core value to community radio, and Bosch (2003) defines it as “…meaningful action on the part of local citizens in a medium otherwise dominated by commercial and corporate interests” (p. 27). Jallov (2012) views participation as threefold: through ownership (direct involvement in the organization around the community radio); programming (as producers of content); and feedback (ability to give feedback and respond to broadcasts). Thus, the community (synonymous with the audience) can/should be part of all aspects of the community radio, from organization, presenting and feedback. An important part of participation in community radio and to achieve the sense of ownership that Jallov speaks of is the ability to give feedback to the station on the content broadcasted and to raise concerns that should be addressed. Depending on the context of the station, so-called listening clubs where listeners get together to listen and discuss radio broadcasts can serve as an important tool to create effective feedback (Jallov 2012; Myers, 2011), especially for those who have no access to ICTs. Similarly, ICTs can serve as another channel for listeners to offer their feedback and ultimately participate in their community radio station.

2.3 The Media Landscape in South Africa

Community radio is set apart from commercial and public service radio in that it is non-profit, ensures democratic participation in structure and governance, and helps local communities to
have ownership of their development (UNESCO, 2013). In order for healthy community radios to thrive, regulation is necessary, and an outline of the regulatory frameworks and institutions in South Africa is helpful to understand the context and post-apartheid state of community radio. The freeing of the airwaves came with a struggle from the grassroots with anti-apartheid organizations and unlicensed community radio stations being important actors in campaigning for an open and democratic broadcasting environment (Mtimde, 2000). With democratization, the priorities of resistance by the social movements within the community media sector shifted to lobbying for the realignment of media policies within the paradigm of democracy, reconstruction, development and empowering of local communities (Bosch, 2003; Banda & Fourie 2004). The airwaves were opened up in 1994 by the parliament with the establishment of the Independent Broadcasting Authority (IBA) working with the objective to “…develop, protect and promote a national and provincial identity, culture and character” (ICASA, 2002). Since then a number of associations, organizations and authorities have been established to regulate community radio and to promote its developmental objectives. The most important ones are the Independent Communication Authority of South Africa (ICASA), the Media Development and Diversity Agency (MDDA), the National Association of Broadcasters (NAB), the National Community Radio Forum (NCRF), the Broadcasting Complaints Commission of South Africa (BCCSA), and the Freedom of Expression Institute (FXI).

---

3 ICASA was established in 2000 after a merger between the IBA and the South African Telecommunications Regulatory Authority (SATRA) and has the overarching responsibility to manage and control effective use of the radio frequency spectrum in South Africa, including issuing of licenses; enforcing compliance with rules and regulations, and; handle complaints and disputes against licensees (ICASA, 2014).
4 The MDDA is a joint partnership between the state, the media industry and the community media sector with the developmental objective to enable “…historically disadvantaged communities and persons not adequately served by the media” to gain access to the media” (MDDA, 2013). Drawing on similar partnerships in Europe, the MDDA was path-breaking in a developing country in promoting “…the media needs of poor and marginalized communities, in the interests of media diversity, access to information, and freedom of expression” (Pillay 2003, p.404).
5 The National Association of Broadcasters (NAB) represents a large number of television broadcasters as well as public, commercial and community radio stations. NAB has a committee for issues that concern community radio and provides a number of support mechanism for their members (NAB, 2014). The association provides a code of conduct signed by the members to ensure that professionalism, fairness, accuracy, objectivity and non-bias is exercised by their members (Odine 2013).
6 The National Community Radio Forum (NCRF) was established in 1993 but focuses solely on community media and has its key objective to forge a greater and united purpose for community radio stations in South Africa and to strengthen its partnership with civil society (NCRF, 2014). The NCRF Charter emphasizes the importance of community radio for the reconstruction and development of South Africa and the interdependence of community radio and civil society (NCRF, 2009, 2014). With about 105 members, the NCRF also represents their members and advocate and lobby for the advancement of participatory democracy and sustainable social development (NCRF, 2014).
7 Adherence to the code of conduct (signed by members of NAB) is enforced by the Broadcasting Complaints Commission of South Africa (BCCSA), which is an independent judicial tribunal established by NAB in 1993.
2.4 Social Media and Radio Use in South Africa

According to the World Wide Worx’s Social Media Landscape Report 2014 for South Africa, social media use in South Africa is steadily increasing with Facebook users increasing from 6.8-million users in 2013 to 9.4-million in 2014. Mxit, the South African-grown social network, is being challenged by Facebook, but still manages to keep a loyal user base. The most popular alternative cross-platform messaging app is Whatsapp, which offers cheap messaging compared to SMS. An important aspect that the report reveals is the increased use of these platforms on mobile phones, with 87% of Facebook users and 85% of Twitter users using their phone to access the platforms (World Wide Worx, 2014). Radio listenership remains high in South Africa and reached almost 90% of the adult population in 2010 and listeners are increasingly using their mobile phones as receivers of radio broadcasts\(^9\). While community radio is on the rise all across Africa, a recent study funded by the FXI (Mavindidze & Gondwe, 2014) found that ownership by the community through their involvement in listener’s forums and consultations is often stifled by the management of the stations as they experienced that those efforts were hijacked by interests groups and minorities (p. 26). The same study also found that community radio stations who fail to use the Internet and social media are losing listenership as the audience migrates to those platforms for information and communication (p. 23-24).

2.5 Community Radio, Social Media, and Community

The increased availability and affordability of mobile phones changes the way we view the digital divide as people are increasingly accessing the Internet via their mobile devices (Bosch, 2014b). The media environments that community radio is set within continue to converge and become more and more integrated into the work of radio stations (Jallov, 2012). Such convergence offers new possibilities and challenges in interaction and participation of the targeted community. The notion of community as defined by the radio stations changes as

---

\(^9\) In the wake of democracy in 1994, the non-govermentaly Freedom of Expression Institute (FXI) was established to protect and foster the rights to freedom of expression and access to information, and to oppose censorship (FXI, 2014). The FXI was the results of a merger between three organizations (the Media Defence Trust, the Campaign for Open Media and the Anti-Censorship Action Group) that played important roles during apartheid but especially in the shaping of media policy after the first democratic elections.

\(^8\) Blackberry mobile phones are a popular option in the low-income segment in South Africa due to its free messaging services and flat rate data plans (http://www.bnn.ca/News/2013/11/27/BlackBerry-gaining-strength-status-in-Africa.aspx).
the audience becomes less organized around identity politics or communal relations, but rather on their networked sociality (Bosch, 2014b). Bosch concludes that even though this does not necessarily imply greater participatory engagement with audiences it makes it possible to “...engage audiences and extend the broadcast and conversations beyond the airwaves” (p. 40). Community radios are starting to use social media, but since they often cater to segments of the community who are poor and marginalized the probability increases that they will not be able to afford the necessary devices and network charges (Bosch, 2014b; Jallov, 2012). Jallov (2012) argues for social media’s ability to work to strengthen the work of community radio but that it requires both literacy and connectivity, as well as access to the necessary equipment and funds. She sees the potential and value in the multi-directional communication of social media to enhance participatory community development and empowerment (p. 208). Furthermore, Jallov points to research that finds the ability to listen to radio shows retroactively on demand via online streaming services as a contributing factor to attract a young audience (p. 210). The possibility for broadcasters to interact with their audience 24/7 allows for the audience to give regular feedback to producers and for them to strengthen the links to the community and continuously assess their programs (p. 211). Jallov sees a future where community radio stations utilize multiple platforms that facilitate interaction with distant communities, both geographical neighbors as well as the diaspora (p. 212). A study conducted in South Africa on community radio journalists use of social media shows how the definition of community is changing (Bosch, 2014b) and how journalists at community radio stations are increasingly using social media as a professional tool and that it impacts their daily news routines as well as engages audiences online (Bosch, 2014b; Nassanga et al, 2013). Bosch (2014b) argues convergence between community radio and the Internet presents new opportunities of interaction with the audience by closing the gap between the radio consumers and producers. Furthermore, radio stations can bridge the gap in the digital divides by passing on news and information only accessible online (p. 432). Chiumbu & Liaga (2013) conducted a study on how ICTs affect radio cultures in South Africa and found that it changes the nature of participation and creates new public spaces for interaction. However, since the study focuses on all three tiers of radio (public, commercial and community) it does not problematize the specific convergence of public spheres in social media and community radio or more particularistic notions relating to the nature of community radio and social media.
3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This section concerns the theoretical underpinnings that will serve as the framework for analysis of the empirical findings. The guiding concepts in the theoretical framework require deeper understanding of definitions as well as contextualization and adoption for this study. Theoretical concepts of community, participation, empowerment on the one hand, and community radio, social media and public spheres on the other, will be accounted for.

3.1 COMMUNITY RADIO, PARTICIPATION AND EMPOWERMENT

As mentioned earlier, community radio is by definition participatory and aims to empower the community it serves. The notion of *participation* is a central core value to community radio, and Bosch (2003) defines participation in the context of community radio as “...meaningful action on the part of local citizens in a medium otherwise dominated by commercial and corporate interests” (p. 27). Jallov (2012) views participation as threefold: through ownership (direct involvement in the organization around the community radio); programming (as producers of content); and feedback (ability to give feedback and respond to broadcasts). Thus, the community (synonymous with the audience) can/should be part of all aspects of the community radio, from organization, presenting and feedback. An important part of participation in community radio and to achieve the sense of *ownership* that Jallov speaks of is the ability to give feedback to the station on the content broadcasted as well as to raise concerns that should be addressed. Depending on the context of the station, so-called listening clubs where listeners get together to listen and discuss radio broadcasts can serve as an important tool to create effective feedback (Jallov 2012). Similarly, ICTs can serve as another channel for listeners to offer their feedback and ultimately participate in their community radio station.

Finding one definition for *empowerment* can be difficult as it is a term that is used in many different areas and its meaning can vary depending on who uses it. The confusion and debate over the definition of empowerment is not without reason. The term is widely used in development discourse and other disciplines and has changed radically since its initial inception. In development discourse, the use of the term meets (fair) criticism of being used only as a must-use buzzword to get further funding for projects (Leal, 2010; Page & Czuba, 1999). According to Page & Czuba (1999), the central concept is that empowerment builds on the idea of power. Empowerment is dependent on the possibility of power relationships'
ability to change and that power can expand. Power does not exists in isolation, but rather between people and things, creating a relationship that can change. A common view of power is that it is dependent of domination, and that gaining power inevitably needs to diminish someone else’s power. However, power can expand and therefore be characterized by collaboration, mutual sharing, where increased power also increases the power for others and provides the possibility of empowerment (Page & Czuba 1999). According to Luttrell & Quiroz (2009) there are four dimensions to empowerment: economic; human and social; political; and cultural. Leal (2010) asserts that empowerment, in the institutional understanding of the term, is viewed as something that can be given by the powerful to the powerless. But the original definition would state the opposite: empowerment cannot be given - it must be taken by conquest (p. 96-97). Yet, within the discourse of community radio, the terms participation and empowerment go hand in hand, and can be understood in the organizational context. The discourse of empowerment emphasizes local ownership and participation as crucial for community radio to serve as a development tool and to fulfill its purpose of empowering individuals in the overall media landscape. A well-organized community radio station becomes a community channel that carries the voices of everyone, including those that are poor and marginalized and who have nowhere else where they will be heard (Jallov 2012, p. 20).

On the other end of the spectrum, the inability or restriction to participate in media production for particular social groups can amount to voices and perspectives being marginalized and essentially have a disempowering effect (Arnold, 2012). Research on “radical media” channels, which provides access to production for typically unheard voices, has indicated the power that can be created in social and political processes via nonmainstream media venues (Kosut, 2012). Page & Czuba (1999) define empowerment as a “…multi-dimensional social process that helps people gain control over their own lives. It is a process that fosters power (that is, the capacity to implement) in people, for use in their own lives, their communities, and in their society, by acting on issues that they define as important” (p. 2). In similar words, Jallov (2012) defines empowerment as “…processes and action which generate the self-confidence, power and insight needed for persons and communities to take control of their own lives” (p. 23). Rodriguez (as cited in Rennie, 2006) adds that this empowerment, in the case of community media, is achieved by “…strengthening the symbolic dimension of everyday life: that is, opening social spaces for dialogue and participation, breaking individual’s isolation, encouraging creativity and imagination, redefining shared social
languages and symbols, and demystifying mass media” (p. 189). Rennie (2006) emphasizes the role and value of community media as citizens’ ability for self-representation and self-expression. In other words, simply the ability to voice your own concerns and represent yourself in your own community, are fundamental empowering and democratizing principles. Even though empowerment can be understood in different ways, a broad understanding of the term will be undertaken in this study. It’s the relationship between participation and empowerment that will work as a theoretical framework to analyze how participation occurs in social media, and if (and ultimately who) this participation empowers.

3.2 Participation, the Media and the Public Sphere

So far, the framework has covered community radio and its qualities in terms of participation and empowerment. However, since any medium is situated within a media landscape, and social media converges with community radio, so do their communicative spaces. Thus, understanding participation, the media and the spaces where these converge is essential.

Carpentier (2011) provides an extensive and theoretical framework to understand participation in the media, arguing that democracy is a key site for the articulation of the concept participation. Media makes up part of the public sphere, and Carpentier adopts the definition by Habermas (1991): "By the ‘public sphere’ we mean first of all a realm of our social life in which something approaching public opinion can be formed. Access is guaranteed to all citizens". Carpentier argues that there are two types of participation by the audience: either through or in the media. The audience participation through the media concerns the mediated participation by self-representation and opportunities to voice opinions and experience as well as to interact with other’s voices. The political ideological and democratic environment in which the media engages affects the level of participation. Moreover, participation in the media refers to the audience as content-producers of media output (content-related participation) as well as organizational decision-making (structural participation). This allows for citizens to engage in the spheres of daily life and to exercise their right to communicate. In contrast to mainstream or commercial media, community media utilize the notions of participation as self-representation as well as self-management. Carpentier also looks at dimensions of participation in the media sphere in terms of maximalist and minimalist. The minimalist form is more controlled by professionals and participation is restricted to access and interaction. While considered a contribution to the public sphere, the participation is essentially serving the interests of the mainstream media.
The maximalist form aims to balance control and participation and in contrast to the minimalist approach the audience’s heterogeneity and diversity is recognized.

![Diagram](image)

Figure 1: The three components (or types) of participation, by Carpentier (2011, p.67).

Figure 1 (above) visualizes the combination of the dimensions of participation in terms of maximalist/minimalist with the notions of participation in/through the media to demonstrate three dimensions: 1) interaction with media content, 2) participation in media production and 3) participation in society (Carpentier, 2011). While the three dimensions represent different levels of participation, each level can have the ultimate indirect effect of participation in society. For example, interaction and feedback given to content can affect a producer of media, leading to participation in society. Viewing Carpentier’s notion of participation in society we can see it’s close relationship to the concept of empowerment discussed earlier. The definition of community radio - where ownership and participation in, and interaction with media production, by the audience is central - offers a maximalist form of media sphere.

### 3.3 Internet and Social Media as Public Spheres

To assert whether the Internet at large, and social media in particular, can be considered public spheres, we need to delve deeper into the definition of a public sphere. The notion of the public sphere as articulated by Habermas (1991) constitutes spaces between the private and the state where people can debate and speak freely on matters that concern them. According to Goldberg (2010) Habermas’ definition of the public sphere is one that is free from state and corporate ownership and needs to be protected from economic interests. Moreover, the dominant mass media must be excluded from the public sphere, and Fraser (2007) adds that the subordinate, oppressed and underrepresented must be included. Benkler (2006) argues the Internet democratizes by allowing individuals to reorient themselves to become participants, creators and primary subjects in the public sphere instead of mere
spectators (p. 213). Furthermore, while Papacharissi (2002) questions the Internet as a public sphere, she argues that the Internet allows for those who would not discuss political matters offline to do so online. Fraser (2007) summarizes the public sphere theory critiques as legitimacy- and/or efficacy-oriented. Legitimacy concerns the lack of inclusiveness of historically marginalized groups and efficacy points to the inability of the public to communicate their will to institutions that they are intended for as well as the institutions’ capacity to realize the public’s will. In order for public sphere theory to retain its critical edge, Fraser (2007) argues that the two notions are required and even though they are analytically distinct, they are practically entwined (p. 24).

The economic character of the Internet and its complication for the notion of public sphere demands further understanding. Goldberg (2010) discusses the cost of participation and argues that the corporate ownership of much of the services used on the Internet makes participation into a commercial act. It becomes a “...transfer of data which has been economized, driving the profitability and viability of the networking industry” (Goldberg, 2010, p. 747). However, Goldberg also questions whether the commodification argument is legitimate if it does not have any affect on who participates and the content of that participation (p. 748). According to Fuchs’ (2014) analysis of social media as a public sphere there is a contradiction between social media and Habermas’ definition of the public sphere. While Habermas’ definition of the public sphere is a sphere free from both state and private and state ownership, social media exists under control and ownership of both the state and private corporations. Fuchs (2014) presents three antagonisms of social media in the economic, political and civil society spheres. In the economic sphere, the conflict lays between the users’ interest in privacy and protection of data versus companies’ desire of commodification of that data. The political antagonism is found in the conflicting interests of civil society to hold those in power accountable and the powerful’s interest in keeping power structures secret and criminalize leaking of information. Thirdly, civil society faces a conflict “...between networked protest communication that creates political public spheres online and offline and the particularistic corporate and state control of social media that limits, feudalizes and colonizes these public spheres” (Fuchs, p. 89). In this sense, social media has the potential to be considered a public sphere but is limited due to corporate and state
ownership and surveillance\textsuperscript{10}. The point made by these scholars is that the Internet in general, and social media in particular as public spheres, is highly contested. When looking at social media as a public sphere, it is important to at least make a note of the Internet and the private/public dichotomy. The focus so far has been on social media as a public sphere, but cyberspace is a virtual sphere and constitutes both public and private spheres. Papacharissi (2002) argues that the dual nature of cyberspace allows for reinvention of our private and public lives and that it “…provides new terrain for playing out of the age-old friction between personal and collective identity: the individual and community” (p. 20). She also argues that cyberspace changes our perception of ourselves and fundamentally impacts how we behave online as compared to offline (p. 21).

We find both common and contradictory values in the convergence of community radio and social media. While they in essence share the same notions of participation and interaction, the platforms where these actions take place have radically different underlying values and challenges in terms of public spheres. Social media platforms are based on commercial interest where every act of participation is a type of economic transaction, while community radio represents civil society, free from those same interests.

\textbf{3.4 Rethinking community}

As stated earlier, one feature for community radio is that it is \textit{for, by and of} the community. But what is a community? It is difficult to try to establish an all-encompassing and unified definition without it becoming limiting, excluding or too unspecific as it varies from case to case and can be multi-faceted. Or as Myers (2011) explains it:

\begin{quote}
A community can be many things: from a small village, to a sprawling city, believers of a particular religion, or a diaspora united by a common language. The way groups define themselves is fluid, depending on the socio-historical conditions of a particular moment, which means that defining the term “community radio” with any precision is almost impossible (p. 7).
\end{quote}

The reality of communities is that they are difficult to limit in terms of geographical borders and that what is local is heavily influenced by the global, and vice versa. The glocal is now a reality for communities and is manifested by an on-going flow and exchange of locally and

\textsuperscript{10} In his critique, Fuchs goes on to explore the possibilities of social media networks based on the logics of the commons and public service. He argues: "We need the decolonisation of the world and the Internet so that they are less based on bureaucratic and economic power and more on communicative rationality and the logic of the public sphere. It is no problem if more private information becomes public for communicative purposes if companies, the state and others do not have the power to misuse it and to harm citizens with it" (p. 93).
globally traceable features. Howley (2010, p. 40) underscores this defining feature of community media by saying: "...locally oriented, participatory media organizations are at once a response to the encroachment of the global upon the local as well as an assertion of local cultural identities and socio-political autonomy in the light of global forces." With social media and increased use of web services, we are witnessing another shift and dimension of community based on network sociality that challenges the traditional view as organized around identity politics or communal social relations in a geographically defined place (Bosch, 2014). Moreover, Rennie (2006) argues that as technologies have become more participative, the view of the notion of community itself becomes more relevant.
4. RESEARCH DESIGN

This chapter accounts for the methodology of this study in a reflexive manner and discusses the challenges encountered in the process of the fieldwork as well as the limitations of the data collected.

4.1 METHODOLOGICAL DESIGN AND DISCUSSION

The research design uses mixed-methods approach and consists of interviews with program hosts and station/program managers; survey of social media interaction and web presence; and netnographic observation of social media interaction. Combining multiple methods is generally considered beneficial for the research since it allows for deeper understanding and adds rigor to the research design (Stewart-Withers et al., 2014). Using a mixed-methods approach will increase reliability and avoid a common limitation where studies only rely only on interview material with staff, whose claims of practices can be hard to test (Bosch, 2014). All methods come with both strengths and weaknesses (Stewart-Withers et al., 2014) and to harvest the advantages it is also crucial to consider which methods to combine and how each of them will provide added value to the data (Hansen et al, 1998). Hansen et al (1998) also argue that while the methods should not be a goal in itself, but rather serve as a means to an end, due attention must be given to them in order to avoid reducing knowledge to mere perspectivalism. Attending to methodology means to reflect on the extraneous influences that both the questions, methods and the researcher are subject to which might affect the research process (p. 11). The research is guided by its questions, and sophisticated methodology does not necessarily improve the research if the wrong questions are asked. Irrelevant and inadequately formulated questions run the danger of making spurious correlations and conclusions of the findings. In mass communication research that is set within the social sciences, asking what people do with the media is more valid than asking what media does to the people (Hansen et al., 1998). I would argue that this becomes even more essential when researching social media/web in relation to community radio, or media convergence, as the interaction between the two is at a conjunction of the media environment, with the people in the middle. Examining this relationship is especially interesting given the complexities of influence by the people on the media, and it demands well-developed questions that reflect the complexity (Hansen et al., 1998).

In order to capture the convergence of social media/web and community radio and its potential to create synergies for increased and changing participation by the community with
the content of stations, multiple methods have been deemed important. The data collected is of both quantitative and qualitative nature, working to complement each other. The quantitative data is represented in the survey where the program hosts and producers are asked to map out what channels they use for interaction and to what degree the feedback they get is important and affects the content of their shows. In order to fill the gap in what this data can offer, the interviews and netnographic data collection through social media observations add depth and qualitative dimensions to the quantitative data set. The research design has its limitations and a few weaknesses and challenges should be noted. While the design is meant to provide reliable data, all methods are aimed at the community radio’s staff, and not the listeners. Thus, there is a risk of biased informants, but including the netnographic observations as an additional method has partly minimized such influence. Including the listeners in a survey or interviews would have been desirable, but as Cottle notes in Hansen et al (1998) “…research will take place within inevitable confines, principally those of time and resources” (p. 49).

In order to make sense of experiences articulated in the interview, the questions will also be guided by the concepts in the theoretical framework (Pickering, 2008). The two approaches will work in a complementary way and offer insights to each other and provide a more holistic picture (Hansen et al., 1998, p. 19). Moreover, the research design and the theoretical framework have been developed simultaneously, influencing each other as the study has progressed. The progressive approach in development of the study has been helpful to explore the subject by continuous reevaluation of early preconceptions as well as theoretical starting points and methodological approaches.

4.2 COMMUNITY RADIO PROFILES

The stations in this study were Bush Radio, Radio Zibonele and Valley FM, all based on the Western Cape, South Africa. Bush Radio is often referred to as ‘the Mother of Community Radio in Africa’ and is located in Woodstock, a few kilometers away from downtown Cape Town (Bush Radio, 2014). Radio Zibonele is located in the township Kayelitsha and while it reaches large part of the Cape Town municipality, it mainly caters to the poorer segments of the society (Radio Zibonele, 2014). Valley FM is located in Worcester and caters to the Breede Valley, Witzenberg and Langeberg municipalities (Valley FM, 2014).

4.3 INTERVIEWS

Using a semi-structured interview approach allows for an open discussion and allow for the interviewee to respond to the questions and emphasize things that they find important.
According to Mason (2002), it is crucial to first identify where the social phenomena that is to be investigated is located, and secondly to determine which informants (and how) they can help illuminate it (p. 226). In this case, the social phenomena of participation and empowerment are located within the various channels used by the radio station. Therefore, the station manager, program manager and program hosts of the radio stations could offer insight into how these channels serve that purpose. Mason (2002) goes on to argue that interviewing is a theoretical process, and a matter of construction rather than excavation, and that it is essential to organize the asking and listening in a way that allows for meaningful knowledge to be generated (p. 227). The knowledge that is generated is attributed to the combined effort by the interviewer and the interviewee as co-producers. According to Pickering (2008) there is an increased recognition that research methods should be more participatory and that the researcher and the researched should be on a subject/subject basis (p. 19). By using a semi-structured interview method the interviewee is therefore able to take part in shaping the interview on such basis. The questions posed were open and look for the particular rather than the general. By asking the interviewee to state specific examples and narrate their experiences rather than answering general questions, s/he can actively construct/deconstruct issues of participation and empowerment. The interview guide served as a starting point for the discussion on how the stations uses social media and blogs, and encourage elaboration on their function as a participatory channel. Mason (2002) argues that the importance of avoiding the general and instead be specific and seek the ‘particular’ is due to the inability of general answers to tell anything about what it actually means in practice. This became very important in the interviews as the examples provided served to bring meaning and context to the arguments made by the interviewee. But the narrative accounts of experience also requires close examination, and a recognition that these are ‘storied’, and that they should be contextualized and analyzed in the discursive form that they are expressed (Pickering, 2008, p. 26). By interviewing the program hosts that use the channels directly allowed for first hand accounts on how and why they use those channels and if it shapes the radio show. Since the program hosts are prone to bias; exaggerations, overemphasis and a defensive approach to the questions regarding their shows have been a real risk. In that case, encouraging the interviewees to elaborate with specific examples has been essential.

**4.3.1. Reflection on interview procedure**

Before departure to South Africa one formal contact and meeting had been established with Bush Radio in Cape Town. While some effort was put into establishing contact and set up
meetings and interviews with other stations in advance as well, it was found more effective to call with a few days notice and ask for permission to visit the stations and to conduct the interviews. Consequently, the interviews were set up at arrival to Radio Zibonele and Valley FM and conducted during the same day, while the interviews at Bush Radio were scheduled in advanced and conducted on separate days, spread out over a few weeks. This approach offered both benefits and challenges. The interviews at Radio Zibonele and Valley FM were quick and efficient, and the data collected provides many perspectives and also quantitative, confirmatory data on other interviews. However, the short amount of time in between these interviews offered little time to reflect, revise the interview guide and follow up on findings in previous interviews. The interviews at Bush Radio were spread out with ample time for transcription in between each interview, allowing for both theoretical as well as methodological reflection. An example of the benefit of allowing ample time between interviews for transcription and reflection is noted in my field diary after a few interviews:

Transcribing the interviews I came across some interesting theoretical concepts which would be interesting to include in a framework. For example, ‘lateral communication’ or ‘lateral interaction’ to explain the interaction between listeners that occurs in social media, and especially in Facebook groups (Field notes, August 27th, 2014).

In retrospect, planning for such time for reflection would have been valuable and might have allowed for further progressive advantages and development of the study, both in terms of research design as well as theoretical considerations.

The challenge of gender power relationships in the interview situation was noted and deserves room for methodological reflection. The situation arose while interviewing two people of opposite gender, at once. During the transcription of the first interviews I noticed that it was mostly the male that responded to my questions. I noted that there might be at least two (possibly more) explanations for this. The first is that the power dynamics between the two interviewees made it natural for the female to be more passive and careful. Another reason could be that I, unconsciously - through my gestures and eye contact – predominantly directed the questions to the male respondent. However, the gender balance amongst the respondents was very even with seven being female and six being male.

4.4 Online survey & Netnographic observations

The survey was designed to provide quantitative data on the community radio’s use of social media, its importance and its challenges. The survey was made available online and
distributed by the station managers via e-mail. One station provided a good number of responses (11), but it proved difficult to get a substantial number of respondents to the survey from the other two stations for reasons that are unknown. A possible reason might be inability to access the survey on devices available; however, all hosts and producers should have access to computers at the station. Reminders of the survey were sent out several times during both September and October, but without successfully improving the response rate. Due to the low number of respondents the quantitative nature and purpose of the survey has been largely missed and it will therefore not be used too extensively in the analysis. The interviews raise similar questions as the survey and partially tangents the material. The survey also posed questions that were of interest at the start of the project but that have later been disregarded. The study’s progressive development allowed for reevaluation of methodological approaches during the course of the study. Thus, after the interviews and the survey had been conducted and analyzed, as a researcher, I experienced a need to exemplify key findings by demonstrating them using observations in social media. Even though the netnographic approach was part of the initial draft and planning of the study, the decision to include screenshots of social media interaction to support and complement the other methods was made at a later stage. While the netnographic material could have been relayed and compiled in various ways, I my opinion, presenting as much raw empirical material as possible to demonstrate points and key findings makes the study both more approachable, transparent and lucid.
5. FINDINGS

This chapter presents the result of the findings in the interviews, the survey and the netnographic observations. Since the interviews were semi-structured, each interview was different in terms of how each question was asked and also responded to. Thus, the findings will be thematically presented in relation to the research questions and relevant concepts identified in the theoretical framework. Moreover, the last section will present a case in point to demonstrate the convergence of community radio, social media and web services.

5.1 PLATFORMS AND SOCIAL MEDIA USE

All respondents were asked about what social media platforms (figure 3) and web services (figure 4) they use and how they use them. The findings show that a number of different platforms are used to interact with the audience, where Facebook, Twitter and the messaging service Whatsapp are the three most popular ones. Some stations also use Mxit and BBM (the Blackberry messaging service), YouTube and podcasts. Both the BBM and Whatsapp platforms allow for voice notes to be sent at a cheaper rate than a phone call. All respondents say that social media platforms are more popular because they are cheaper than regular SMS or phone calls as it uses data, and not airtime from the user. All three stations have a website and stream their broadcasts online, but only one frequently updates and maintains a blog. However, some programs have their own blogs and also make their shows, or part of their shows, available as podcasts. Two stations frequently use the voice note function on Whatsapp and BBM that sometimes work as a replacement for voxpops or live phone calls. In order to prompt interaction, topics are usually posted on the group or page of the show in advanced, as well as announced on air, and comments are often read, live, during the show.

Figure 2: Apart from social media platforms, the three community radio stations use a number of web services.

11 Vox pops are short voice recordings that are commonly recorded in the field by journalists at the station and the recordings are integrated into the live shows.
Only one of the three stations have a social media strategy while the other two let all hosts decide for themselves about what platforms to use and how to use them as part of their show. This has proven to have some implications where some hosts use their personal accounts on Facebook for the show. Because of the often voluntary-based work at the stations, they have interns hosting many of the shows and the hosts can be replaced one or two times a year. A few respondents reflected on the fact that the following\(^\text{12}\) that the host has built up for the show via their personal account will be lost when they are replaced with a new host. This is to be compared to the popular music-based show Headwarmaz at Bush Radio that has managed to build an online community in a Facebook group consisting of almost 6000 members. The host for that show said that when they took over the show, the online community - or following - was already there and they did not have to start from scratch. Two hosts argued that they used their personal profile only for professional purposes and wanted to build a following on their own accounts for that reason. How each show is set up technically also shows some implication as to the ability to build an online community. Many pages on Facebook were found to be set up as a personal profile, meaning that the profile can only have 5000 friends, thus limiting the ability to grow as an online community.

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{social_media_platforms.png}
\caption{The social media platforms used by the stations have similar but also different features and are used to a varying degree by the shows. All informants in this study use a combination of different services.}
\end{figure}

\(^{12}\text{Following} \text{ is a term often used for the number of users that have liked, joined or follow a group, page or account on social media.}\)
The interviews also revealed that social media has become a source for local news. Something newsworthy is picked up on the platforms and then followed up and double-checked before being broadcasted as a story. One host also used his private Whatsapp account to get tips from the community about stories, which is then followed up.

5.2 Participation and Interaction

All except one informant says that the interaction on social media affects the content of their shows. The survey conducted at Bush Radio indicates that 9 out of 11 respondents find that social media is moderately important, very important or essential for the content of their shows. 7 out of the 11 also state that they incorporate the feedback they get either sometimes, often, or in every show. The interview informants explained how new community-driven content is created via the interaction on social media. The informants express how the comments can either confirm that they are on the right track with a topic or reveal that the host and producer had not done their research properly as the listeners on social media provide new perspectives. One informant said that she uses Facebook to collect and build on local stories from the community. Another effect of the interaction between listeners on social media can be that the discussion gets off topic, which also results in new content for the show. This is demonstrated by how one informant expressed how they handle those situations:

“OK, the easiest way is to say, "OK, OK, this is how we should do, let's talk about this today, but tomorrow, I promise, we can talk about what you want. We can talk about that one. Only tomorrow, but not today." It happens a lot.” Informant #10, Radio Zibonele.

Participation, through comments and interaction on the platforms occurs not only during the show but also when it is off air, which is especially evident for shows that have set up a group for their listeners to join:

“…the people don't only engage when the show is on air, like, they engage all week long. Like, some discussion can maybe come out of the show, but then you find that when you wake up tomorrow morning on a Saturday people are still talking about what you were talking about on the show last night. So, it's deeper, it's deeper than...the show.” Informant #7, Bush Radio.

Some respondents expressed that the popularity of the host in social media can affect how much the audience interacts via that platform (figure 5) while other informants expressed a struggle to get the same amount of feedback (see figure 6): "It's the strangest thing, you are

13 See appendix 3.
fighting for comments…this is the challenge of our show. You have to suck it out of people"
(Informant #1, Bush Radio).

Figure 4: This status demonstrates how the popularity of a host can be a reason for high participation. The rather arbitrary status generates 635 comments in two days time.

Figure 5: This status demonstrates the struggle to engage the audience on Facebook. This status is posted via the hosts personal account and the show does not have its own page or group.
Another informant had a similar experience and reflects on the public nature of social media versus private spaces:

“I would however like people to participate more, especially on Facebook. People...I don't know...maybe it's...people are still a bit maybe afraid to come out and say what they actually want to say. Because you will be in a taxi for example, I use taxis, and you listen to people saying, commenting on government issues and social issues, crime and all of those things. But when you give them the platform to do that, either by trying to do vox pops, or by posting a question on Facebook, people are not as forthcoming as they are in their own private space. And I don't know why that is the case, but over the years it has been getting better, especially on Facebook. I think on Facebook people feel a bit more free...to have their say, but it's not at a level where I would like to see it, you know.” Informant #11, Valley FM.

Similar experiences of the limitations of social media is argued by another informant:

“I think we still have a culture where it's easier for people to deal with the presenter face to face like when we are at the [Outside Broadcast]...or a community event... So, I think that sometimes, with social media we are a bit too advanced for where we actually should be. I just sometimes think we should more face-to-face work than necessarily the online only.” Informant #6, Bush Radio.

Informal channels of feedback are also important as demonstrated by this experience by an informant at Valley FM:

”...people from the Worcester area will come with their piece of paper...//'...this is what I would like you to talk about.' And if they know where you stay they will come to your house! '...is it possible that you can talk about that...?' Hahah.... But that's the...I think that's the whole thing about community radio. People know you.” Informant #13, Valley FM.

Despite the challenge for some to prompt interaction, informants at all three stations express the positives of social media in terms of increased listenership, especially from a younger audience. A common view was also that the incentive that one’s comment might be read aloud on the radio was a reason that many young people engage on social media and also tune in to the radio shows.

"It has a good impact on the radio because now we are gaining more listeners of young people than before. Because we do have listeners who are young people, we do have fans who are young people, young people who recognize radio presenters more than before. Because radio was like, it's for older people, but now we interact more with younger people, we interact with teenagers... ...if a 14-year old can see a topic which is posted on Facebook "we're just going to be live on radio", and then they comment, surely they are gonna listen to radio because they are going to want to hear if I will read their comment. You see? So they want to know, "OK, is she gonna mention my name? She's gonna read my comment?" ...That's how good it is for the radio.” Informant #10, Radio Zibonele.
Social media presence by the stations expands the reach, not only in terms of listeners, but also in terms of people who interact with the shows’ topics and content. As the topics and content of the show is partly available by accessing social media, tuning in to the show is not a prerequisite to engage in the content.

"They don't have time to listen to the radio. But, the minutes you are sitting in front of your PC and you see Facebook or whatever, and then you see a status that everyone is following. "(...) check this out!" You are doing your work, but you are sitting in front of your PC and you're like "let me check this out". You see that status and you're like "I've been wanting to say something about this...", you add something on that. So now, we're getting...we're getting old people to be part of it, we're getting young people to be part of it. People that are not in the Breede Valley, which is Worcester now, they're gonna be part of it, because they see it from other friends who are friends with the Valley FM on their Facebook, you know?... So you're getting a lot of people, you know, that are part of that one status. That's why I'm saying that social media is the thing (informant’s emphasis).” Informant #12, Valley FM.

Another informant expressed the same positive effect of social media by making it possible to interact with radio content without actively listening to the radio.

“You can be out in the club and you have your Facebook, and "oh, they are talking about this, this is interesting to me", and then you can just comment. But you know, you cannot be in a club and listen to radio. It's something that you really have to commit your time to.” Informant #7, Bush Radio.

5.3 Community

The findings show that building the online community, using for example a Facebook group, connects the audience with each other, making it possible for them to discuss issues and share things outside of the show. A station manager reflects on the online community of a popular music-based show:

“And what we find, when I look at the comments, it's a lot of interaction between listeners so they feel very...connected as a group of people listening to...to the show. So, for instance, you'll post a status and somebody asks something about something totally different, so there can be this conversation amongst listeners...um...around there...which is quite nice and interesting to see.” Informant #6, Bush Radio.

The interviews also reveal how the community can invite the station to take part in their conversations. The messaging service Whatsapp allows for anyone to create a messaging group, and the stations’ accounts are often added to be a member of messaging groups created by members of the community.
The online streaming\textsuperscript{14} allows the stations to reach a global audience, and the informants stress the importance for both national and international diaspora from the local community. One informant reflected on the importance of reaching this part of the community:

"Some people listen to us from Johannesburg or the Eastern Cape, some people are sitting in New York, some of them in London, New Zealand...so there are a few people who are coming from this area but are not necessarily in the country. But they feel that nostalgia and they feel the need to tune in so that it can bring them close home." Informant #8, Radio Zibonele.

The stations seem aware of the dual community that is listening to their programs, but in terms of programming one station manager expressed: "...\textit{I think we are becoming more and more aware that there is an other audience, there is two audiences, but not necessarily that we program for that}" (Informant #6, Bush Radio).

5.4 Challenges

All informants expressed that access and the cost for the listeners to use social media are big challenges. Even though social media is cheap and many users get access to free data bundles each month, one informant argued that the interaction on social media correlates with the access to the bundles. They could observe how interaction was the highest in the end and beginning of each month when new data bundles had been received.

While all respondents view social media as very valuable, many expressed that their use of the platforms is limited due to lack of time to manage them, both during the live show and in between shows. There was also a fear that setting up a group or a page instead of using their personal accounts would increase administration requirements. One informant argues that their following on social media, particularly on Twitter, also translates to financial opportunities because companies that are interested in giveaways, sponsorship and adverts are showing more interest in them. The same informant also reflects on the need to develop a strategy to make use of the potential of social media, and Twitter specifically: "\textit{I think it could become a potentially powerful tool. And I think that is where we need to think about our activism role, and our lobbying role, because I think we do have a voice on that platform now as well}" (Informant #6, Bush Radio).

\textsuperscript{14} The ability to stream the broadcasts makes it more suitable for cell phones, which has been particularly useful for those who use the Blackberry Internet Service. One informant expressed concern about the new Blackberry models that do not include BIS and that this would negatively impact their listenership.
5.5 A CASE IN POINT: TALKING ELECTIONS ON HEADWARMAZ

To better understand how social media, community radio and web services converge; the case of the hip-hop show Headwarmaz at Bush Radio provides a telling example. The show largely focuses on the local hip-hop scene in Cape Town and is broadcasted every Friday evening. The show has a Facebook group\(^\text{15}\) with almost 6,000 members (as of November 2014). Interaction in the group is almost constant throughout the week with a peak during and after the weekly show. The last show before the general elections in May 2014, the host, Sabelo Mkhabela, posted the following status:

\[
\text{Figure 6: The host of the show Headwarmaz announces the topic for the evening (Topic post in Timeline, figure 12).}
\]

The status generated 36 comments and the conversation continued during and after the show (May 2nd, 9:38 PM – May 3rd, 1:51 AM). The following status, posted towards the end of the show, simply states the artist and title of the song currently playing\(^\text{16}\), generated 141 comments (May 3rd, 12:18 - May 10th, 9:41 AM, figure 6) and a heated discussion about politics and the elections.

\[
\text{Figure 7: The host posts the title of the song now playing on air (Antivoti-post in Timeline, figure 12).}
\]

\(^{15}\) https://www.facebook.com/groups/33906615201/

\(^{16}\) The song, Antivoti, by Ndluamthi, means “I’m not voting” and can be found online: http://kasimp3.co.za/song.php?id=vK4
Simultaneously, a listener makes a separate post to the group, generating another 93 comments (May 3rd, 12:18 AM – May 8th, 4:17 PM, figure 7).

Figure 8: A listener posts a question to the group about the elections (Listener question in Timeline, figure 12).

The same day, another post is made by a listener about the upcoming elections spurring continuous debate (May 3rd, 6:33 AM - May 6th, 6:33 PM).

Figure 9: Another listener posts some thoughts about the upcoming elections (Listener post in Timeline, figure 12).

On May 6th, the host, Sabelo, posts a link to a blog post entitled “20 Years of Freedom: What Hiphop Heads In Cape Town Make of the Elections”, published on AfricaIsACountry.com. It is a blog post largely based on the comments and content of the discussion by the members in the group, but also from the live broadcast. He also informs the online community in the Facebook group about the publication of the blog post.
Figure 10: The host of the show posts a link to the blog post with his reflections and findings in the Facebook group (Blog post in Timeline, figure 12).

The timeline below (figure 12) demonstrates how the topic of elections was discussed over a much more extended period of time than the live broadcast and how the interaction in social media sparked not only comments and posts from other listeners, but also resulted in a blog post, available to a wider global audience. At the time of writing the blog post on AfricasACountry has been shared 48 times on Facebook, 37 times on Twitter and 32 times on Google+.

**Timeline: talking elections on Headwarmaz**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic post</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Live show</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP Antivoti-post</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listener question</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listener post</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blog post*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2-May 4-May 6-May 8-May 10-May 12-May

Figure 12: This figure demonstrates the time span of the live broadcast, various posts in the Facebook group and a blog post as a result of the interaction in social media. *Refers to both the Facebook post announcing the blog post, and the blog post on AfricasACountry.com.
6. Analytical Discussion

This chapter applies the theoretical framework presented in chapter 4 to provide an in-depth analysis and understanding of the findings. The concepts in the findings and the theoretical framework often interconnect at different levels and are all closely related. Thus, the analysis has been divided into parts that have been deemed most essential, but it is also recognized that there are many possible ways to make these divisions.

6.1 The Duality of Convergent Public Spheres

An extensive analysis about the convergence of social media and community radio as public spheres could be conducted from a mere theoretical perspective, but such an in-depth analysis is beyond the scope of this study. However, the empirical material in this study offers valuable insights into these dualities and contradictions worthy of analysis. The use of ICTs by radios in South Africa creates new publics (Chiumbu & Ligaga, 2013b), but there are important tensions between the respective public spheres of community radio and social media to consider. The theoretical framework briefly discusses the implications of social media in terms of a public sphere and a number of those dualities and critiques can be identified in the findings. The theoretical framework in chapter 3 presents the two main critiques against the public sphere, regarding legitimacy and efficacy (Fraser, 2007b). In terms of efficacy, the findings reveal very few (or any) examples where social media has been an important factor in mediating public opinion to institutions. It would be an unsupported claim to suggest that social media does not carry that potential, but it can also be argued that the lack of such evidence in this study supports the core of the efficacy critique. However, the empirical material does not allow for conclusions in that regard. The legitimacy critique on the other hand, reveals some interesting points. The two aspects of legitimacy impediments that can be identified in the findings are in terms of access, and literacy. Access refers to technological access while literacy refers to both digital literacy and alphabetic literacy.

Starting with access to social media, it is one of the major challenges identified in the findings. Even though the informants emphasize how social media is widely available, cheap and accessible using very simple and cheap devices, it is recognized that many do not have access to those devices and are therefore unable to participate. But access is also an issue for those who have the devices and use social media, which is demonstrated by the dependency on free data bundles and airtime from operators. Limitations of the data bundles limits access

17 It can be noted as a limitation of the study (and perhaps as outside the scope of the study) that not enough attention was paid to efficacy aspects.
and the audience’s participation is economized. Participation becomes dependent on the financial means of the participator, making the act of participation more or less an act for the financially privileged. The economization of participation clashes with the Habermasian idea of a public sphere as a place where people can speak freely as well as with the definitions by Goldberg (2010) and Fuchs (2014) that argue that such a sphere should be free from state or corporate ownership. The commodification of participation can be identified in two major regards. Firstly, social media platforms as commercial and corporately owned entities, and secondly; operator fees as gatekeepers of access to the Internet. The first aspect refers to the very nature of the platforms while the second pertains the provision of access to those platforms. Goldberg (2010) speaks not only about social media, but the Internet in general, and also opens up to question whether the commodification argument is legitimate if it does not affect who participates (p. 748). Indeed, it would be quite cynical to propose that corporate social media platforms do not strive for participation and community for their inherent values. However, the findings dispute Goldberg’s question since digital divides persist partly due to the commodification of access and participation, which does impede and discriminate against marginalized and poor segments of society. Even though apartheid was officially declared dead as the first democratic elections were held in 1994, institutionalized racism lives on (Lloyd, 2013) and South Africa remains one of the most unequal societies in the world according to the World Bank.18 As a consequence, segregation is still prominent as a remnant of apartheid racial laws and the poor remain being predominantly black. Thus, where digital divides persist they also align with segregation and historically discriminated groups. What is important to understand in this context is that participation via social media remains a privileged act until access is guaranteed for all. Meanwhile, it is important to note recent developments in South Africa where the government recognize Internet access as a basic human right19 and a requirement for community development and economic growth (Department of Communications, 2013). The policy aims to support initiatives concerning Internet access as well as development of cheaper devices20. One such initiative is the non-profit Project Isizwe that offers free Wi-Fi to low-income communities and they have already

---

18 The World Bank’ dataset shows that South Africa is the most unequal country with a Gini-coefficient of 0.65 (http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SI.POV.GINI).
19 This recognition is a direct consequence of applying the South African Constitution and the South African Bill of Rights in the digital age in alignment with the declaration by the Human Rights Council of the UN General Assembly. The declaration states that access to the Internet is a human right that enables individuals to "exercise their right to freedom of opinion and expression" (La Rue, 2011).
20 A recent study attributes the limited use of technology in low-income communities in Cape Town to limited knowledge about existing opportunities of similar projects (Lorini & Chigona, 2014).
launched their services in several locations, but Cape Town is not yet covered\textsuperscript{21}. If the commodification of access to the Internet is eliminated, Goldberg’s (2010) question is more legit, but I would still agree with Fuchs’ (2014) critique that the nature of these platforms, as colonized by state and corporate interests, conflicts with the Habermasian idea of a public sphere. As long as historical privilege persists as a gatekeeper to these publics, their characteristics as a public sphere should be questioned. Susen (2011) argues that the expansion of the public sphere paradoxically contributes to its own decomposition and that capitalist imperatives of society increasingly transform it into a market sphere (p. 58).

Community radio, however, serves as a counterweight to economized communication spaces with its objective to be the ‘voice of the voiceless’ and its innate power lies in being the voice of everyone in the community (Jallov 2012, p. 16-18). In contrast to the Internet, community radio is mandated to be the voice of those who do not have access and serve as a non-economized and independent channel that represents the community. Jallov (2012) emphasizes community radio’s role as a voice of the marginalized and those who have nowhere else to be heard (p. 20). A clear example of what community radio can do is how some listeners in Worcester find the home of station staff and hand over topic requests on handwritten notes (see informant #13, p. 26). When social media or even SMS or phone calls are out of reach, community radio can still accommodate one’s voices. If there is such a thing as a ‘true’ public sphere, the values of community radio has greater potential than social media to meet the objectives of being accessible by all citizens and free from state and corporate ownership.

But the nature of social media as corporate platforms could possibly offer possibilities in terms of sustainability for community radio stations. One of the main challenges for community radio is financial sustainability (Bosch, 2014a; da Costa, 2012a; Myers, 2011) and finding opportunities for funding and sponsorship can be crucial for survival. Mavindidze & Gondwe’s (2014) report expresses the need to explore new opportunities to finance community radio (p. 27), which makes it interesting to note that the findings indicate that the commercial aspects of social media platforms could be a financial opportunity for community radio. The number of following and reach in social media can be of interest for companies and could be a potential new source of income\textsuperscript{22}. However, commodification of these

\textsuperscript{21} For more information about the project, visit \url{http://projectisizwe.org/}.

\textsuperscript{22} Advertising and sponsorship from companies comes with its own challenges and ethical concerns, which community radio stations must consider. Some of these concerns are outlined by the online Community Radio Toolkit: \url{http://www.communityradiotoolkit.net/the-toolkit-handbook/toolkit-chapter-fourteen/advertising-and-sponsorship/}
communicative spaces can be a risky path to follow as “…we have more consumers than citizens in the public sphere, and economic values overshadow the political” (Saeed, 2009), and the audience itself inevitably becomes a commodity for sale to advertisers. Social media, especially Facebook, is built upon private relationships but often act within more or less public spaces23 and the condition under which interaction takes place and the quality of the space it inhibits affects the proneness to participate. Papacharissi (2002) argues that cyberspace extends our channels of communication without changing the nature of communication. However, she also suggests that cyberspace changes our perception of ourselves and our behavior online, as compared to offline (p. 21). The empirical evidence in this study suggests that this notion has an effect on who participates even if access and digital literacy requirements are met. This is reflected in the struggle by radio hosts to prompt interaction on social media, and particularly on political and community issues. The informants express that they experience reluctance by the community to express their concerns on social media and seem to have a preference to do so in enclosed or ‘private’ spaces located offline, such as a bus taxi (see informant #11, p. 27, chapter 5). Community radios’ could possibly affect the sense of privacy experienced by their audience and increase participation by creating groups that serve as more or less enclosed publics similar to the semi-private space of a bus taxi experience.

There are also two levels of literacy that affect access and consequently the legitimacy of social media as a public sphere: alphabetical and digital literacy. South Africa has an alphabetic literacy rate of 93%24, which means that social media becomes out of bounds for the 7% who are illiterate. Even though economic and educational levels often go hand in hand - since alphabetical literacy is a requirement to use social media - economic means to devices and data is not enough to access those communicative spaces. Similarly, economic means and alphabetical literacy is not enough in itself since a certain level of digital literacy,25 in terms of knowing how to use social media, is required to participate. Lorini & Chigona (2014) find that the lack of e-skills has been attributed as a major reason for digital exclusion in Cape Town, which is also reflected in this study. An interesting aspect of legitimacy in terms of digital literacy in the findings is how interdependent the quality of the communicative space

23 This depends on privacy conditions of pages and groups on social media.
25 Wikipedia defines a digitally literate person as someone who possess a certain rage of digital skills such as”… an ability to engage in online communities and social networks while adhering to behavioral protocols…” (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Digital_literacy).
(that social media offers) is on digital literacy of both users and community radio staff. This is demonstrated by the often unstructured and unstrategized use of social media by radio hosts and producers, revealed in the fact that many shows do not utilize the possibility of setting up communicative spaces (such as groups or pages) but rather use the hosts personal accounts that results in limitations for online community building and participation. Conversely, those who have prioritized social media and strategically set up inclusive communicative spaces have often successfully managed to build an active online community. The effect is that there is a reduced dependence on the popularity or network sociality of the hosts, as the online community exists irrespectively. These online communities and communicative spaces creates new publics or, ‘communities of strangerhoods’, that allows for horizontal communication amongst the community members (Chiubuntu & Ligaga, 2013). As the case of Headwarmaz demonstrates, these publics allow for discussion and exchange of opinions concerning democracy, politics, corruption and development.

6.5 EMPOWERMENT AND PARTICIPATION 2.0
Cammaerts & Carpentier (2007) argue that one’s participation and interaction with media content and production ultimately means that one is participating in society. The findings demonstrate this in a number of ways where social media platforms offer the possibility to interact with the content of community radio. Of the three ways that participation occurs in community radio as stated by Jallov (2012), social media can be categorized as affecting programming and that it serves as channels for feedback. Programming is affected by the interaction with content, leading to co-production of new content as the hosts identify issues that are articulated by the community online. The findings show that it is common that interaction on social media results in new content for upcoming radio shows. Recognizing how social media bridges community radio to the online world is also vital. Even though community radio is one of the starting points of analysis in this study, evidence of participation in media production can also take completely different routes. As Headwarmaz’ host Sabelo Mkhabela relays the political discussion on the upcoming elections in the Facebook group to a global audience, everyone involved are co-creators of globally accessible media that serve as self-representation of local issues that are of global interest. Another piece of the puzzle that offers an alternative representation of Cape Town, South Africa, hiphop, youth, development, democracy etc. becomes visible in the global mediascape. Thus, social media acts as empowering platforms for citizens to participate in media production and
ultimately their society (Cammaerts & Carpentier, 2007b) as citizens of the local, the national, the transnational and the global.

There are a number of possibilities that social media offers the listeners and their community to participate. Firstly, social media allows for participation to take place outside of the broadcast, creating interactive spaces that are not bound to a specific time or place. This means that the community can engage in a topic articulated in community radio through social media at any time they want. In fact, this ultimately means that participation in community radio broadcasts is not dependent on active listening to the broadcast itself as topics are also discussed in social media. Secondly, as many informants expressed, they reach a new audience of individuals who do not have time or the habit of listening to the radio. Thus, in terms of empowerment, social media expands power through the possibilities to participate by those who otherwise would not be able to. Page & Czuba’s (1999) argument that power can expand and that it builds on collaboration and mutual sharing is demonstrated in this case. Comparing community radio with social media and the possibilities to interact with content, social media offers extended opportunities. Thirdly, platforms such as Whatsapp make it possible for community members to invite the community radio station to join group chats. Even though the informants say that they do not engage in the conversations in these groups, the community is empowered by the fact that their community radio is so easily available and the conversations by the community in these groups could possible give insights into issues that matter to them. Fourthly, interaction between listeners (and/or the online community) can occur in a way that community radio does not have the ability to provide through their broadcasts. Social media as a platform separate from community radio allows for interaction between the users without the gatekeeping function of radio hosts and the time-constraints of a live broadcast. This becomes especially evident when the shows have set up online groups where listeners can engage with other listeners at any time outside of the show. This corresponds well with Cammaerts & Carpentier (2007) and the notion of participation through the media as it allows for self-representation, the ability to voice opinions and to interact with others (see chapter 3). The Headwarmaz example demonstrates how the online community effectively voiced their opinions on the topic of elections for an entire week (and much longer if they would have desired) even though the radio show was bound to three hours, 10 PM-1 AM on Friday nights. The interaction was both vertical (with the community radio) and horizontal (with each other) and resulted not only in content for the live radio
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show, but online content on a globally accessible blog reflecting those voices and opinions (see figure 12).

![Diagram showing the interaction between Community Radio, Blog, Audience, and Interaction](image)

Figure 11: Interaction occurs both vertically and horizontally. The interaction results in production of new media content.

This effectively shows how the convergence of community radio, social media and web services (a blog in the case) empowers those who actively participate. Empowerment in this case does not only refer to those who participate on social media but also the host and/or producer of the show. In contrast to commercial radio, community radio’s function of being owned and run by the community means that the hosts and producers at the station are part of the community (Jallov, 2012). Once again, power expands from the host and producer to converge and include those who participate in social media. Expansion of power can also be identified in the sense that the audience empowers the host as a community spokesman to reflect his opinions as well as the audience’s, making it available to the global community.

Headwarmaz demonstrate a great example of how social media can be used by community radio to enable and encourage participation in the media. What sets them apart from many other shows has mostly to do with technicalities, such as the choice to use a closed group that provides a semi-private space where the audience can interact with each other and the show. To what degree the public/private character of the group or page affects interaction is difficult to say, but the public/private dichotomy (as reflected upon earlier in this analysis) might come into play. Another important factor for Headwarmaz is that the host and producer of the show prioritizes social media and are dedicated to sustaining it between the shows. Other informants express a certain degree of frustration about the difficulties to prompt interaction from their audience on social media. The difficulties can be due to many reasons, but the interviews identify at least two: 

unstrategized social media use and networked sociality.

Successful use of social media often contains some degree of strategic thinking and awareness of online community building. The degree of strategic social media use can be affected by
digital literacy or commitment to using social media of those involved in the radio show. Digital literacy in this case refers to social media awareness, best exemplified by those who have set up groups or a page for their show, post topics before the show and makes sure to incorporate the response they get into the live broadcast. The interviews suggest that the reason for the latter is that their audience comment on social media with the hope of having their opinion voiced on air. In other words, the listeners are well aware of the possibility of getting their voice heard through these channels and that they value being heard on community radio. Despite the inevitable monetized act of submitting data through participation on commercial social media platforms, the interaction with the non-profit community radio empowers the user when their participation affects content and their voice occupies the airwaves. But awareness is not enough and all informants expressed that social media requires time and attention to administrate, which affects the degree of interaction that can be achieved. As community radio’s struggle with sustainability it is understandable that priorities have to be made and resources in terms of time spent on social media must be limited. Network sociality is the other factor that builds on the notion of individuals’ social media networks and ability to build social media capital. Bosch (2014) finds network sociality a basis for newsroom journalists in finding news stories (which also rings true in this study), but the other aspect found in this study is how participation of the audience can depend on the hosts popularity on those platforms. Thus, network sociality becomes an important factor in determining the reach and impact of participation. However, these influences can to some degree be avoided by creating groups that encourage online communities to take shape and grow organically irrespective of the host.

6.7 RETHINKING COMMUNITY AND DISTANCE

Myers (2011) definition of community in community radio is multifaceted and fluid, and the use of social media adds more layers of complexity to that definition. The community is affected in both quantitative and qualitative manners. Quantitatively, online streaming expands the community to include diasporic and distant audiences. While the stations admit catering to specific geographical areas, they are also aware of, and recognize, these new audiences. Through streaming, the diaspora can take part in their former local community despite spatiotemporal distances and satisfy feelings of nostalgia and homesickness. The nature of social media as built upon network sociality can also expand the reach of the

28 Most of the qualitative effects of social media have already been covered earlier in the analysis and will not be explored further in this section.
community radio to the new contacts of the diasporic listenership in their new location. Moreover, the use of social media adds a qualitative layer of direct engagement and participation with their former community that has not been previously possible. The engagement of distant communities without any relation to the primarily targeted geographical community or the diaspora could be viewed as intrusive and unwanted (see Howley, 2010, p. 40), but I would rather argue that the accessibility and openness that social media and web services provide enable and harmonizes values that are intrinsic to community radio. Self-representation and self-expression are fundamental values of community media (Rennie, 2006), and the possibility for those expressions and representations to reach distant audiences is important from many perspectives. Firstly, self-representations minimize the distance and eliminate second-hand and filtered reproductions of local voices. Secondly, the availability offers direct access to post-colonial perspectives that can challenge established misrepresentations and add important nuances to the plethora of global media voices that is often heavily skewed towards perspectives of the West/Global North. Gumucio-Dagron (2014) argues that in order for a culture to evolve and develop itself, it needs to have contact with other cultures.

A process of negotiation takes places among cultures that begin a dialogue, however this negotiation is not always symmetric and equitable. For the interaction to be horizontal, among equals, cultures need to strengthen their communication processes. A culture that is strengthened by communication, a culture that communicates and is communicable, participatory and democratic, is in best condition to negotiate with other cultures so that the exchanges within a framework of plurality are balanced (p. 110).

This argument is valid both on a local and global scale as cultural diversity exists within both the local and the global. On the local scale, community media has the objective of inclusiveness and on a global scale, I would argue, access to social media and web services evens the communicative playing field and unites distant cultures on common platforms to enable the process of negotiation. Consequently, there is not necessarily a conflict between the notion of community media as a voice of the voiceless with a (local) community development imperative and it’s global accessibility and interaction with distant communities. Rather, it works as an extension of self-representation within the global, while negotiating interculturally29 to reimagine its own local community development ambitions.

---

29 Gumucio-Dagron distinguishes interculturality from multiculturalism as the process of dialogue and interaction between cultures through "...proactively sharing knowledge and values through communication" (p. 109).
7. CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter concludes the thesis by answering the research questions and recommending future research triggered by questions generated through the process of the study.

7.1 CONCLUSIONS

The convergence of social media and community radio is like the marriage of an odd couple, and just like love knows no boundaries and finds unity where it can, this marriage builds on the unifying value of participation. However, the unity is challenged by fundamentally contradictory values pertaining to the corporate vs. non-profit, privilege vs. inclusiveness and community vs. distance that impugn on the validity of their convergent public spheres. This study set out to explore how community radio stations in the Western Cape, South Africa, use social media and web services as an extension of their broadcasts and how it affects notions of participation, community, empowerment and the public sphere.

The study shows that social media and web services are used extensively to varying degrees and success in promoting community involvement and participation. These channels have become essential for many shows but digital literacy, access and resources are major obstacles for non-exclusive use of these services. The findings also show how successful use of social media and web services can empower the online community members as participant in their society by increasing the quality of participation and involve the audience as producers of content for community radio. Even though the public spheres of social media and community radio are contradictory by nature and the economization of participation in social media is exclusionary, the use of social media increases listenerhip and extends possibilities of interaction quantitatively and qualitatively. It enables communication to occur both vertically (audience ➔ radio) and horizontally (audience ➔ audience) independently of the spatiotemporal limitations of broadcasts. The participation in the new converging spaces also generates new content for the community radio broadcasts as well as other online mediums, such as blogs. Social media attracts new audiences, previously unaware or uninterested in community radio and it radically increases the opportunities by citizens to engage in the media. The participatory opportunities also extends the community of listeners to include both distant and diasporic communities that allows for self-representation in the global mediascape and a possible reimagining of local development objectives sparked by glocal intercultural tensions. In order to create inclusive and effective communicative spaces that utilize the full
potential of the participation and community building capabilities that social media platforms offer, community radio stations need to be strategic and strive to increase digital literacy of staff. It is also vital that community radio stations develop strategies to make the most of these channels within the resources they have available while balancing their role as a voice (perhaps the voice) for the marginalized and unprivileged in their communities that are still excluded from social media and the Internet.

7.2 LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH
This study has been limited geographically, contextually and methodologically. All stations included in the study were in urban areas (even though they also served rural areas as well) with a relatively high degree of connectivity and use of social media. The contexts where many community radio stations operate are often quite different, serving primarily rural areas with very limited connectivity and/or use of social media. Future studies could possibly explore whether social media can promote inclusiveness and increase participation without further marginalizing those who are still excluded. Another limitation in this study is the lack of audience-, or end-user-data. A focus on end-user experiences and use of social media would be desirable to delve deeper into their perceptions of participation, empowerment and community. I also see a need to further explore the efficacy of converging community radio and social media (based on Fraser’s efficacy critique) and conduct case studies that demonstrate how it can promote social change and enhance community radio’s activism role.


APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: LIST OF INFORMANTS

Informant #1: Program host, Bush Radio
Informant #2: Program host, Bush Radio
Informant #3: Program producer, Bush Radio
Informant #4: Program host and producer, Bush Radio
Informant #5: Station manager, Bush Radio
Informant #6: Program manager, Bush Radio
Informant #7: Program host and producer, Bush Radio
Informant #8 Program host, Radio Zibonele
Informant #9: Program manager, Radio Zibonele
Informant #10: Program host and producer, Radio Zibonele
Informant #11: Program host and producer, Valley FM
Informant #12: Program host and producer, Valley FM
Informant #13: Program manager, program host and producer, Valley FM
APPENDIX 2: INTERVIEW GUIDE

Name:
Station:
Show:
Gender:

1. Why are you engaged in community radio?

2. What is the aim of your radio show? The content?

3. In what way do you think your show impacts your community? Can you give an example?

4. How would you define the community that you are intending to reach?

5. You have mentioned a number of ICT channels that you use, can you explain more in detail how you use these tools?

6. You use a number of ICT tools as an extension of your show, can you tell me why?

7. Is there a difference between the community you reach via these channels compared to just the airwaves? How are they different?

8. Do you know who those who interact with your show are (what kind of profile)?

9. Does your audience interact with your show through these tools? In what way?

10. This interaction, does it affect the content of your show? Can you give an example?

11. What challenges have you encountered in using ICTs as an extension of your show?

12. Do you spend much time handling interaction off the airwaves in social media? What do you do? Can you give an example?

13. Do you get uncomfortable feedback sometimes? What can it be like, and how do you handle that feedback?

14. Since you use both social media and community radio, you are part of the media. What difference do you make between the two? Why use the radio if you could just have a blog? How are they different?

15. Do you have anything to add regarding community radio and social media?

16. If you would do something different than what you do now, what would it be?
APPENDIX 3: RESPONSES TO SELECTED SURVEY QUESTIONS

Which of these ICT services do you use as a program host?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phone calls</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMS/text messages</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mxit</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twitter</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instagram</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Google+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blog</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website (not only as a blog)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podcast service/radio/television</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video service (YouTube/Vimeo etc)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How important is the use of these channels for the content of your show?

- Essential: 4 (33%)
- Very important: 3 (25%)
- Moderately important: 2 (17%)
- Not so important: 1 (8%)
- Completely unimportant: 0 (0%)

How often do you incorporate issues/feedback raised via these channels?

- Every show: 3 (25%)
- Often: 3 (25%)
- Sometimes: 1 (8%)
- Rarely: 3 (25%)
- Never: 0 (0%)