

# Guy Starkey

---

## How Cinderella Came Late to the Ball : The Development of Radio Studies in the United Kingdom and Europe

---

Media – Kultura – Komunikacja Społeczna 12/4, 11-23

---

2016

Artykuł został opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie przez Muzeum Historii Polski w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego. Artykuł jest umieszczony w kolekcji cyfrowej [bazhum.muzhp.pl](http://bazhum.muzhp.pl), gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.

**Guy Starkey**

Faculty of Media and Communication  
Bournemouth University, United Kingdom

# How Cinderella Came Late to the Ball: The Development of Radio Studies in the United Kingdom and Europe

**Słowa kluczowe:** radio, radioznawstwo, medioznawstwo, edukacja, nauczanie

**Key words:** radio, radio studies, media studies, education, teaching

## Introduction: A Folk-Tale Heroine and the “Newsom Children”

Radio has often been labelled the “Cinderella medium,”<sup>1</sup> usually in relation to the financial and physical resources available to radio practitioners. However, the medium shares another characteristic with the fictional folk-tale heroine, most famously appropriated by the cinema screen: radio was late to arrive at the media studies ball. Academic study has long lagged behind the development of individual media, yet as radio broadcasting began experimentally in 1906, just eleven years after the Lumière brothers opened their first cinema, and thirty years before the BBC led the world in introducing the first regular television service, it might have been reasonable to expect that radio would figure more prominently in media studies as a cognate discipline struggling to establish itself in the twentieth century.

This paradox is particularly evident in the United Kingdom. With the growth of film appreciation in schools and the appointment in 1950 of the British Film Institute’s first Film Appreciation Officer, media study began to earn a begrudging respectability, if never a universal acceptance – something still absent in more populist media discourse. The Royal Television Society was founded in 1927, but it was not until 1983 that the Radio Academy was formed to promote the discussion and appreciation of radio, and as an interface between the industry and academia. The print media also became popular objects of study, especially during the 1980s when consolidation of the tabloid and broadsheet press by right wing newspaper proprietors provoked a largely left-liberal intelligentsia into a classroom critique of reporting and news values: one enlivened by the polarisation of the Thatcher years. So, the development of the media studies curriculum concentrated on film, television and the press.

---

<sup>1</sup> B. Halesworth, *Radio – The Cinderella Medium*, “Educational Broadcasting International” 1971, vol. 5, No. 3, pp. 189–191.

A small but growing number of academic books, such as the first edition of *Understanding Radio*,<sup>2</sup> and the 1996 launch of the Radio Studies Network as an international, mainly Anglophone community of researchers, combined with the increasing popularity of radio in vocational courses to belatedly raise its profile in UK further and higher education. Radio remains largely ignored by many media educators, though: even today, few of the concepts they develop within the media studies curriculum are routinely contextualised or exemplified in the “Cinderella medium.” For example the *Dictionary of Media and Communication Studies* definition of **voiceover** referred only to film and television.<sup>3</sup>

How did this happen? It certainly was not the death of radio, which has singularly failed to materialise because radio has proven to be a much more resilient medium than some commentators suggested it might be as a result of the rise of television in the last century, or even today, with many more competing platforms and devices from which consumers can choose in order to access information and entertainment. A crucial stage in the development of the media studies curriculum was, though, the so-called teen revolution of the 1950s and 1960s: the rock and roll music of the 1950s inspired a generation to exert its cultural independence and express it through new collective peer-group identities that drew together music and fashion. Neither the music nor the youth culture which were inspired by North American artists but subsequently customised and reinvented in the UK and elsewhere were extensively featured on BBC radio, leaving a market vacuum for monopoly-busting pirate radio stations to fill. First to arrive on the North Sea coast, in 1964, was Radio Caroline, an initiative of Irish entrepreneur and record company owner Ronan O’Rahilly. Others followed until the then government introduced legislation to make supplying, working for or advertising on unlicensed offshore radio stations illegal for UK citizens: the Marine Broadcasting (Offences) Act 1967. The pirate DJ turned radio historian, Keith Skues, described the era thus:

The sixties were a very important time for young people who were growing up. Music was an important part of their lives. The words of songs expressed their feelings, as young teenagers came to terms with themselves. Maybe their parents could not understand them and they did not identify with teachers at school, but the pirate stations had that special “something” which teenagers did identify with and they loved it!<sup>4</sup>

The BBC was required to launch a replacement, Radio One, which quickly established itself as an all-day pop music station that young people could relate to. However, the tardy response of both the BBC and the UK government to societal change was mirrored by the educational establishment. The Newsom Report, entitled *Half Our Futures*, suggested that half of the school population was being failed by the educational system in England. It proposed a number

<sup>2</sup> A. Crisell, *Understanding Radio*, London 1986.

<sup>3</sup> J. Watson, and A. Hill, *Dictionary of Media and Communication Studies*, London 2000, p. 329.

<sup>4</sup> K. Skues, *Pop Went the Pirates*, Horning 1994, p. xvii.

of initiatives to tackle the problem, but of significance to this analysis is what it did not say about the importance of properly engaging young people:

The culture provided by all the mass media, *but particularly film and television*, represents the most significant environmental factor that teachers have to take into account. The important changes at the secondary stage are much influenced by the world offered by the leisure industry, which skilfully markets products designed for young people's tastes.<sup>5</sup>

Admittedly, the report predated the arrival of the pirates, but in 1963 there were high levels of listenership among young people to the English-language evening service of Radio Luxembourg, by then dominated by pop music programming. However, if O'Rahilly and Skues saw the relevance of popular music radio to the so-called "Newsom children," it is hard to understand why left-liberal teachers did not as they strove to forge a subject out of their pupils' interest in the visual media. Of course, Radio Luxembourg was a foreign radio station, and when they arrived, the pirate broadcasters presented a challenge to authority which might have deterred some from any classroom endorsement of their activities – but by 1967 the all-day pop music format achieved a new legitimacy with the launch of Radio One.

Over the next three decades a mushrooming of the radio industry did little to spur media educators into recognising the importance of the medium, despite the further launch of a network of BBC Local Radio stations in England (initially in twenty areas but rising to forty), and national regional stations in Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, as well as the ending of the BBC's monopoly in radio in 1973, with the development of commercial radio on local, national and then regional scales. There was little corresponding interest among media educators, as Andrew Crisell noted mid-way through the period:

Despite the enormous growth in recent years of academic interest in the mass media, studies have almost invariably focused primarily on newspapers, television and film.<sup>6</sup>

It could be argued that a single medium would not have the potential to constitute a subject, if, of course, it were not for the growing popularity at the time of film studies as a discrete discipline and an "A"-Level subject. However, academic minds which devised whole terms of work in media studies around such genres as television soap opera, could easily have constructed at least part of a syllabus centred upon radio. Furthermore, study of a single medium is used elsewhere to stimulate comparative studies of others, just as one might compare narrative structures in film and television drama: similarly, the module on soap opera could easily accommodate television *and* radio and draw distinctions between the characteristics of the genre in the two different media. In the tradition of one of the earliest media educators in the UK, Frank

---

<sup>5</sup> J. Newsom, *Half Our Future: A Report of the Central Advisory Council for Education (England)*, London 1963, para. 475 (my emphasis).

<sup>6</sup> A. Crisell, *op. cit.*, back cover.

Raymond Leavis,<sup>7</sup> teaching an element of discrimination might even have been attempted – between what some commentators called the “pop and prattle” of Radio 1 and the more culturally “uplifting” diet of Radios 3 and 4 – especially as John Newsom had warned of the potential effects of “products designed for young people’s tastes.”<sup>8</sup> Writing in the 1930s with Dennys Thompson, Leavis perceived education as having great potential for “innoculating” children against influences which could cause great harm – but radio was not among them:

MANY teachers of English who have become interested in the possibilities of training taste and sensibility must have been troubled by accompanying doubts. What effect can such training have against the multitudinous counter-influences – films, newspapers, advertising – indeed, the whole world outside the class-room?<sup>9</sup>

Those who in school are offered (perhaps) the beginnings of education in taste are exposed, out of school, to the competing exploitation of the cheapest emotional responses; films, newspapers, publicity in all its forms, commercially-catered fiction – all offer satisfaction at the lowest level, and inculcate the choosing of the most immediate pleasures, got with the least effort.<sup>10</sup>

## A World Without Radio

Evidence that very little radio was allowed to permeate the Media Studies syllabus is to be found in abundance. The University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate (1994/5 “A” syllabus) offered two pages of “general guidelines for teachers” which were most explicit:

Scholarship within these subjects has extended, crossed and developed to deal with media products more generally, not only television but also pop and home videos, not only literary texts but comics and advertisements.<sup>11</sup>

A benevolent reading of that syllabus might assume “advertisements” to include radio as well as television, but that is unlikely to be what was taught in schools and colleges, most of which had not made any provision for “radio” studies. Of course, the “A”-Level route was not the only one on offer to post-16 students in the 1990s. Particularly in colleges of further education, more vocational courses, such as the City and Guilds of London Institute 779 Certificate in Radio and Journalism were proving attractive to small numbers of students who would study them alongside one or two more traditional “A”-Levels. In 1996, the introduction of the General National Vocational Qualification (GNVQ)

<sup>7</sup> Co-author of: F.R. Leavis, and D. Thompson, *Culture and Environment: The Training of Critical Awareness*, London 1933.

<sup>8</sup> J. Newsom, op. cit.

<sup>9</sup> F.R. Leavis, and D. Thompson, op. cit., p. 1.

<sup>10</sup> Ibidem, p. 3.

<sup>11</sup> University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate, *1994/5 “A” Syllabus*, Cambridge 1994, p. 8.

in a number of disciplines had the potential to lend vocational media studies (or “media production”) greater parent appeal than the existing BTEC National Diploma aimed primarily at 16–18 year olds: the GNVQ was to become, at Intermediate and Advanced levels, a “gold standard” qualification to rival the “A”-Level. The attraction of the GNVQ was that the Unit Specifications<sup>12</sup> for both Intermediate and Advanced levels could be read as giving almost equal emphasis to practical production in the audio and visual media. The drawback was that the media theory tested by fixed-response questions covered a very broad range of media (newspapers, magazines, comics, books, slides, radio, television, film and video), in which radio was but one element. The net result of centres switching to the GNVQ might even have undermined radio where it had already become established in the City and Guilds 779. However, at least radio was represented in the growing vocational qualifications market.

This may have been a false dawn, however. In vocational courses, television was already the medium of choice for the majority of media students, despite its being much more expensive to resource adequately. Almost every cost in setting up a television studio or buying location recording equipment is far greater than its equivalent in setting up a radio studio or acquiring a microphone and an audio recorder. Parallel to the introduction, and subsequent withdrawal in 2006 of the GNVQ, the ratio of registrations on the BTEC National Diploma Moving Image pathway compared to the Audio pathway was 8:1. On the GNVQ and the AVCE Media: Communication and Production, the optional units in audio introduced in 2001 suffered from very low take-up.<sup>13</sup> One replacement for the AVCE, the Edexcel GCE Advanced Media: Communication and Production offers a choice of four different media at AS and A2, but again the radio options suffer from a very low take-up. Meanwhile, AS and A2 Media Studies teachers rarely contextualised media theory within radio genres, preferring moving image or print (a phenomenon we might here label “Citizen Kane syndrome”), while practical video is perceived as “easier” to teach by teachers with no personal vocational experience of the media – often being assigned to the subject from a related field and told “just show them how to shoot a video on a camcorder.” Well, who has not done that at home?

Vocationalism aside, to what do we owe the status quo, in which media education is dominated by the visual forms? In their chapter, “Histories,”<sup>14</sup> Manuel Alvarado, Robin Gutch and Tana Wollen offer a useful study of the development of Media Studies. A critical analysis of the text provides a number of clues. Echoing Leavis, they cite worries over the possibility of film and

---

<sup>12</sup> National Council for Vocational Qualifications (NCVQ), *GNVQ: Media and Communication, Unit Specifications*, London 1994.

<sup>13</sup> The author was Chair of Examiners for the awarding body Edexcel (formerly BTEC) from 2001 for the continuing intermediate-level GNVQ Media: Communication and Production and for the advanced-level GNVQ, which was then renamed the Advanced Vocational Certificate of Education (AVCE) Media: Communication and Production.

<sup>14</sup> M. Alvarado, R. Gutch, and T. Wollen, *Learning the Media: An Introduction to Media Teaching*, London 1987, pp. 9–38.

television – but not radio – violence corrupting society, particularly children, as inspiring research of different types and by different kinds of organisations:

Anxieties about the moral influences and (invariably bad) effects of commercial films have been the strongest determinants of media teaching initiatives... American interest in teaching commercial cinema in the 1930s was a direct result of the moral panic about Hollywood which occurred in the USA in the 1920s – the same panic that led to the establishment of the Hays Office to censor films.<sup>15</sup>

This analysis suggests that perhaps radio “behaved itself” too much in those formative years – needing no body to be constituted solely with the purpose of censoring its content. Certainly, as a medium it was just as capable as film and television ever were of creating panic, as evidenced by the one oft-quoted instance of a radio station shocking its audience so severely that reactions to it hit the headlines: Orson Welles’s 1938 radio dramatisation of *The War of the Worlds*. Perhaps a few more radio plays causing listeners to get in their cars and flee<sup>16</sup> might have changed the course of media education history. Indeed, the “positively demonic heresy” which early popular cinema was perceived to be,<sup>17</sup> rather than keeping the cinema out of the classroom, was instrumental in putting it on the curriculum.

Several accounts of the history of media education identify the work of Leavis and Thompson as pioneering the use of media texts in the UK classroom “[...] in order that they might be used in a defensive discriminatory training against the media. Alerted critically to false values, students could be led to better things.”<sup>18</sup> Radio, though, was apparently considered too benign to be “taught.” Under its first Director-General and self-appointed moral guardian, John Charles Walsham (later, Lord) Reith the BBC was already “[...] preoccupied with broadcasting only sufficient popular music to be able to ‘lift’ the listeners’ ‘present standard of musical appreciation’ to where it could appreciate classical music, which was, of course, ‘better, healthier music’.”<sup>19</sup> From inoculation against the evils of the cinema to the teaching of film appreciation, this early media education remained obsessed with the cinema, developing the “film grammar” approach to textual analysis.<sup>20</sup>

Parallel to the early development of film studies in schools was the creation of various *fora* intended to promote the discussion of film: the London Film Society and the British Documentary Movement in the 1920s and 1930s preceded the British Film Institute. In 1950, a new journal “School Film Appreciation” was published, and The Society of Film Teachers was formed at the University of London’s Institute of Education. There were no corresponding developments

<sup>15</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 15.

<sup>16</sup> A. Crisell, *op. cit.*, pp. 196–197.

<sup>17</sup> M. Alvarado, R. Gutch, and T. Wollen, *op. cit.*, pp. 15.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 161.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibidem*, p. 16.

<sup>20</sup> A. Lovell, *The BFI and Film Education*, “Screen” 1971, vol. 12, No. 3, pp. 13–26.

which might have encouraged the discussion and study of radio until the formation of the Radio Academy. Today the Academy boasts few of the resources, training programmes or high profile activities of the BFI – largely because of insufficient funding. Under the guidance of a board of trustees, and benefiting from considerable industrial and academic goodwill, it saw itself as more of an interface between industry and academia, at least able to “orientate” a researcher to other sources. More recently, it has organised an annual Radio Festival which is raising the profile of radio very effectively and going some way to demonstrate the potential of the medium as an object of study.

The National Sound Archive offers resources from which practitioners of radio studies could benefit – but neither body has even approached the proactive role of either the BFI or the SFT in offering classroom resources to teachers. The emergence of television, by comparison, was timely. The Reithian brand of Puritanism largely prevailed on the BBC’s single channel until the advent of ITV in 1954. The effect on viewing (and listening) patterns of the earlier ending of the BBC monopoly of television was dramatic:

Commercial television had captured 57 per cent of the audience by 1957 in a cultural onslaught on the BBC which Lord Reith likened to the spread of smallpox and bubonic plague. The BBC’s curriculum was being decisively rejected; how could the inherited academic grammar school curriculum compete?<sup>21</sup>

What had worried Reith were the American-style game shows and “crass” popular entertainment the BBC had so far eschewed. With his departure and the inevitable need for BBC television to compete in order to retain audiences, the public service channel began to change, though. It was then that the Newsom Report was published, echoing Leavis in warning of the need for an inoculatory, but discriminatory, approach in the classroom:

We need to train children to look critically and discriminate between what is good and bad in what they see. They must learn to realise that *many makers of films and of television programmes* present false or distorted views of people, relationships in general, besides producing much trivial and worthless stuff made according to stock patterns.<sup>22</sup>

If BBC radio had also changed by then due to the arrival of serious commercial competition from the North Sea pirates, Newsom might well have included the wireless in his warning – but there were also news reports and documentary programmes being broadcast on the radio then, in which their “makers” might well have been “presenting false or distorted views,” against which inoculation – or at least, media literacy – might have been a desirable preparation for adult life.<sup>23</sup> Increasingly sensitive to criticism, the television

---

<sup>21</sup> M. Alvarado, R. Gutch, and T. Wollen, op. cit., pp. 20–21.

<sup>22</sup> J. Newsom, op. cit. (my emphasis).

<sup>23</sup> For a discussion of the potential for bias in radio (and television), see G. Starkey, *Balance and Bias in Journalism: Representation, Regulation and Democracy*, London 2007.



companies were quick to promote academic research which might better inform debate. The Royal Television Society was used as such a forum, although it is inevitably dominated by practitioners.

## Growing Respectability: Film and Television Studies

Apologists for the primacy of television studies over most other media in classroom teaching cite the use of the medium both as a teaching aid, and as being omni-present in our lives as twin motives for teaching understanding of how it makes meaning:

Film and television were perceived as “relevant” to education simply because they modernised classroom activities. The Newsom Report gave teachers who used film and television official benediction by advocating their use to open educational windows on to new and strange worlds. This remains the most prevalent use of video and television in classrooms to this day.<sup>24</sup>

Years before the television entered the classroom, though, schools radio broadcasts were opening wide “educational windows” in a metaphorical sense. The author’s own earliest personal recollection of this is as one of a group of five year olds listening to *Time and Tune* (BBC) in the school hall as part of a “movement” lesson. Influential texts cited by historians of media education as playing a catalytic role in the 1960s were *Talking About the Cinema*,<sup>25</sup> and *Talking About Television*.<sup>26</sup> The journals “Movie,” “Sight and Sound,” “Screen Education” and “Screen” contributed to a growing body of academic writing: one which would be a pre-requisite if media education were to become established in an already overcrowded curriculum.

The appeal to liberal teachers of what was fast becoming an oppositional pedagogy was clear. In 1972, the first GCE “0”-Level in Film Studies was begun and the new name, Media Studies, was coined:

Teachers and students responded (to the decline in the cinema) by developing ideas that had originated in Film Studies for studying the other more pervasive, and therefore accessible, media forms. Newspapers and magazines were obvious classroom material, but then so was television as video recorders became ubiquitous.<sup>27</sup>

The work of Len Masterman was particularly influential. In its first chapter, *Teaching About Television*<sup>28</sup> provided a rationale for the inclusion of a number of media into the curriculum. It is significant that an early chapter entitled “Television, Film and Media Education” should do this, while disappointing

<sup>24</sup> M. Alvarado, R. Gutch, and T. Wollen, op. cit., p. 21.

<sup>25</sup> J. Kitses, and A. Mercer, *Talking about the Cinema*, London 1966.

<sup>26</sup> A.P. Higgins, *Talking about Television*, London 1966.

<sup>27</sup> M. Alvarado, R. Gutch, and T. Wollen, op. cit., p. 27.

<sup>28</sup> L. Masterman, *Teaching about Television*, London 1980.

that the remainder of the book – unsurprisingly, perhaps, given its title – abandoned discussion of all other media and concentrated on television. That rationale was as follows:

The difficulties of developing a coherent and organic framework which would comprehend each and all other mass media are only too evident... Simply in terms of their organisational structures – particularly since the advent of commercial radio... – (radio and television) ought to be considered together under the heading of broadcasting. [...] The mass media are not isolated phenomena but significant links in a capitalist chain.<sup>29</sup>

Promisingly, Masterman credited Richard Collins<sup>30</sup> with this hypothesis and then, sadly, refuted it:

There is much that relates to the study of television to which radio and newspapers are an irrelevance... and I have seen no evidence in visiting schools that cross-media work... has illuminated either the specificity of a particular medium, or generated cross-media generalisations in a way that study of an individual medium could not have done equally well. [...] Quite simply there is too much ground to cover, too much information.<sup>31</sup>

Quoting from the recommendation of the Television Commission that media studies should comprise “Film, TV, Radio, Music, the Press, Advertising, etc.”<sup>32</sup> he posed a number of questions apparently intended to justify teaching just about television:

What insights or understandings would a one- or two-year course [...] give pupils in each of the media mentioned [...]? (One wonders about the additional media suggested by that “etc.” Books, perhaps? Telephones? Photographs? Cars?) What would a half-term component in television or music look like? Could it be anything but superficial? If so, is it worth doing at all?<sup>33</sup>

So, with a little *argumentum ad absurdum* over two or three pages, a rising authority on media studies dismissed a multi-disciplinary approach to media studies in order to champion his own main area of interest. Film and the press weathered this onslaught (probably because they were well established), but radio did not. Five years later, when writing *Teaching the Media*, Masterman had come to recognise some of the shortcomings of his earlier book (“Indeed, I now find the unconscious sexism in [it] so offensive as to be virtually unreadable”<sup>34</sup>). More specifically he confessed that “Other media (than film and television) have suffered from systematic lack of attention. Radio has been a long-neglected field.”<sup>35</sup> He then proceeded to further neglect the medium

<sup>29</sup> Ibidem, p. 4.

<sup>30</sup> R. Collins, *Television News*, London 1976, pp. 39–40.

<sup>31</sup> L. Masterman, op. cit., p. 4.

<sup>32</sup> R. Collins, op. cit.

<sup>33</sup> L. Masterman, op. cit., p. 3.

<sup>34</sup> L. Masterman, *Teaching the Media*, London 1985, p. 211.

<sup>35</sup> Ibidem, p. xiii.

in the majority of the book which, while it did make a small number of references to radio, did little to redress the balance. His justification was simple:

On all of these counts the primacy of television seems to me to be unchallenged, with the press, radio and cinema lagging some way behind. That primacy is reflected in the emphasis given to television in the pages which follow. But it is an emphasis which is itself strictly subordinate to the need to establish critical approaches *which students can apply to any media text*.<sup>36</sup>

While Masterman's rehabilitation was qualified, he did do two things: he recognised the neglect of radio that had taken place, and he acknowledged the transferability of the concepts whose centrality to media studies is not now in dispute. Gone are his earlier worries that breadth of coverage implies superficiality and, hence, lack of worth. Given a more open approach, then, from such a significant figure in the development of the discipline, it should have become possible to interest media educators in teaching the core concepts in media studies through the study of radio. But the low adoption of radio into teaching does suggest that few of them had that open mind.

## Discriminatory Discourse Versus Curricular Transparency

In the ensuing debate over the pedagogy of this developing discipline, other influential commentators contributed to radio's exclusion. For example, in an important collection he edited with Oliver Boyd-Barrett, Alvarado rationalised a televisual focus thus:

I began by saying that I would deal with "television" in its specificity, despite the substantial areas of overlap and mutual determination that exist between the various media [...] and I did this for two main reasons [...]. The second reason is that *television [...] operates within the ideological sphere of human existence, and that raises all sorts of questions and... problems*.<sup>37</sup>

These were significant contributions by progressive educators carving a niche in the school curriculum for a pioneering subject, but the central implication here is arguably a nonsense: that only television "operates within the ideological sphere of human existence" and can be problematised. It would have been reasonable to ask in which sphere, then, did radio, the press and other media operate. Similarly, why could not they raise questions and problems of "all sorts"? Perhaps he means they can raise some sorts of questions but not others – but if that were the case, might it not also be true that non-televisual media might occasionally raise questions that television alone cannot? Or was this just another one of those rationales people invent when searching for

<sup>36</sup> *Ibidem*, p. xiv (my emphasis).

<sup>37</sup> *Media Education: An Introduction*, eds. M. Alvarado, and O. Boyd-Barrett, London 1992, p. 95 (my emphasis).

a justification to work in a favourite medium and not others? Another leading media academic of the period, Edward Buscombe commented that:

Television is a major, perhaps the major, source of most people's information about the world, or at least about social and political events as well as the minutiae of personal behaviour and life styles.<sup>38</sup>

This observation defied a widely-accepted wisdom that teenagers learn most about sex, for example, from their peer group. Less controversially, but with the same focus on television, David Buckingham argued what media education ought not to be:

If media education is merely a pretext for ill-informed discussion of last night's television programmes, it will serve little purpose. If it is seen as a covert means for teachers to control children's viewing and to attempt to mitigate what are presumed to be its harmful moral effects, it is likely [...] to be [...] counter-productive.<sup>39</sup>

What the pioneers of media education missed at the time, was the essential plurality of the media they tended to identify as television. Audiences tend to consume a *mix* of different media, rather than just one medium.

In conclusion, in the interests of transparency, an intention – whatever the motive – to concentrate the apparently pluralistic “media studies” curriculum on one medium or another ought to come out and declare itself. “Film studies,” “television studies” or “press studies” could (and often do) each lay perfectly legitimate claim to a place in the curriculum in their own right. Something calling itself “media studies,” though, ought to fairly reflect the relative importance of the various elements which collectively make up what we understand to be “the media.” If media educators, from those who write the *syllabi* to those who deliver the programmes, have difficulty coming to terms with one or more media, that should be recognised as a deficiency which should be addressed with haste, rather than being rationalised using logical *non-sequiturs*. If there are doubts about the transferability of core concepts between media, then that just means there is work still to be done. If radio is to be accorded its rightful place in media education, then it is incumbent on those of us whose interest lies in the still-emergent field of radio studies to do that work.

Meanwhile, in the wider context of Europe, the obvious *fora* for collaboration in such advocacy include the Radio Studies Network, which joined with other media educators in the Media, Communication and Cultural Studies Association (MeCCSA) in January 2010, and parallel national networks, such as Radio Research Ireland (RRI). It is widely agreed that the Radio Studies Network resulted largely from the drive towards establishing radio studies on a firmer, more easily recognisable footing than had previously been the case, led by Peter Lewis, then at Middlesex Polytechnic. Meanwhile, a pan-European

---

<sup>38</sup> E. Buscombe, *Television Studies in Schools and Colleges*, in: *Media Education: An Introduction*, p. 44.

<sup>39</sup> D. Buckingham, *Practical Work*, in: *Media Education: An Introduction*, p. 106.

approach has been developing in the European Communication Research and Education Association (ECREA) Radio Research Section, of which one of the first Vice-Chairs was Professor Stanislaw Jedrzejewski, and other groups focused on geographical or linguistic commonalities have a significant role to play, too. One such association is GRER, the Groupe de Recherches et d'Etudes sur la Radio, begun by Professor Jean-Jacques Cheval of the University of Bordeaux.

She may once have worn rags and been left at home, but now Cinderella has finally arrived at the ball, it is important she stays well beyond midnight, gets down and parties.

### Bibliography

- Alvarado, M., Gutch, R., and Wollen, T., *Learning the Media: An Introduction to Media Teaching*, London 1987.
- Buckingham, D., *Practical Work*, in: *Media Education: An Introduction*, eds. M. Alvarado, and O. Boyd-Barrett, London 1992.
- Buscombe, E., *Television Studies in Schools and Colleges*, in: *Media Education: An Introduction*, eds. M. Alvarado, and O. Boyd-Barrett, London 1992.
- Collins, R., *Television News*, London 1976.
- Crisell, A., *Understanding Radio*, London 1986.
- Halesworth, B., *Radio – The Cinderella Medium*, “Educational Broadcasting International” 1971, vol. 5, No. 3, pp. 189–991.
- Higgins, A.P., *Talking about Television*, London 1966.
- Kitses, J., and Mercer, A., *Talking about the Cinema*, London 1966.
- Leavis, F.R., and Thompson, D., *Culture and Environment: The Training of Critical Awareness*, London 1933.
- Lovell, A., *The BFI and Film Education*, “Screen” 1971, vol. 12, No. 3, pp. 13–26.
- Masterman, L., *Teaching about Television*, London 1980.
- Masterman, L., *Teaching the Media*, London 1985.
- Media Education: An Introduction*, eds. M. Alvarado, and O. Boyd-Barrett, London 1992.
- National Council for Vocational Qualifications (NCVQ), *GNVQ: Media and Communication, Unit Specifications*, London 1994.
- Newsom, J., *Half Our Future: A Report of the Central Advisory Council for Education (England)*, London 1963.
- Skues, K., *Pop Went the Pirates*, Horning 1994.
- Starkey, G., *Balance and Bias in Journalism: Representation, Regulation and Democracy*, London 2007.
- University of Cambridge Local Examinations Syndicate, *1994/5 “A” Syllabus*, Cambridge 1994.
- Watson, J., and Hill, A., *Dictionary of Media and Communication Studies*, London 2000.

### Related links

- European Communication Research and Education Association (ECREA), [online] <<http://ecrea-radio-research.eu/>>, accessed 23 September 2016.
- Groupe de Recherches et d'Etudes sur la Radio (GRER), [online] <[www.grer.fr/](http://www.grer.fr/)>, accessed 23 September 2016.
- Radio Academy, [online] <[www.radioacademy.org/](http://www.radioacademy.org/)>, accessed 23 September 2016.
- Radio Studies Network (RSN), [online] <<http://www.meccsa.org.uk/networks/radio-studies-network/>>, accessed 23 September 2016.

## **Dlaczego Kopciuszek spóźnił się na bal. Rozwój badań nad radiem w Wielkiej Brytanii i w Europie**

### Streszczenie

W artykule omówiono powody, dla których edukacja radiowo stosunkowo późno rozwinęła się jako gałąź nauki w Wielkiej Brytanii i w innych krajach, głównie europejskich. Zwrócono uwagę na kontrast między długowiecznością tego medium, jego stuletnią historią, skutecznością w reagowaniu na wyzwania generowane przez rozwój innych mediów i stosunkowo niewielkimi kosztami kształcenia a dalekimi od imponujących osiągnięciami w dziedzinie przyciągania uwagi naukowców i studentów studiów wyższych i w procesie dalszego kształcenia. Odwołując się w zakresie edukacji medialnej do ustaleń Franka Raymonda Leavisa i innych badaczy, autor przywołuje także tradycyjne ujęcie Johna Reitha, aby wyjaśnić niedostateczną obecność radia w badaniach medioznawczych w drugiej połowie XX wieku. Porównuje i kontrastuje to medium z innymi, które przyciągnęły większą uwagę, i argumentuje, że tendencja środowisk medialnych do ignorowania radia pozostawia znaczną lukę w dziedzinie edukacji dziennikarskiej i medioznawczej. W artykule omówiono również pozytywne przykłady aktualnych badań nad radiem w Wielkiej Brytanii i Europie, łączących nauczanie i badania nad radiem w ramach sieci krajowych i międzynarodowych, oraz kilka inicjatyw mających na celu promowanie zaangażowania akademickiego w dziedzinie radioznawstwa.

### Summary

This paper examines the reasons for radio studies being relatively slow to develop as a field of academic study in the UK and in other contexts, mainly European. It contrasts the longevity of the medium, its hundred-year history, its durability in response to numerous challenges from other media and its relative cheapness to resource in educational contexts, with a far from impressive record in attracting the attention of academics and students in higher and further education. Tracing media education back to Frank Raymond Leavis and other influences, the paper invokes Reithian traditions to explain the absence of radio from a nascent subject so maligned in the second half of the twentieth century. It compares and contrasts the medium with others which have attracted far greater attention and argues that the tendency of media academics to ignore radio leaves a significant hole in the media studies curriculum. On a more positive note, the paper discusses the current state of radio studies in the UK and Europe, reconciling teaching and research with national and international networks and a number of initiatives intended to promote understanding and academic engagement with radio.