'Creative Diversity': UK Public Service Broadcasting After Multiculturalism

Sarita Malik, Brunel University

Abstract:

Through a critical review of recent literature and policy concepts, this article puts together history and analysis to consider the relationship between 'race' and UK public service broadcasting. Building on earlier work that recognises a paradigmatic shift from 'multiculturalism' to 'cultural diversity', the article identifies a third phase, 'creative diversity'. 'Creative diversity' provides a further incremental depoliticisation of 'race' in public service broadcasting contexts. Here, ideas of 'quality' and 'creativity' are foregrounded over (structural) questions of (in)equality or the positive recognition of social and cultural difference. The article situates the rise of 'creative diversity' alongside parallel developments in the 'crisis of multiculturalism', UK equality legislative frameworks and creative industries policy. It is argued that 'creative diversity' shifts the paradigm of the multicultural problem (in public service broadcasting), enables the 'marketization' of television and multiculture and ultimately continues to safeguard the interests of public service broadcasting.

Television is a key site in which 'sociological outcomes' are imagined (Born, 2000, p.420). How public service television responds to various social identities, including race and ethnicity, tells us how they are culturally organised, produced and communicated to the nation and, increasingly, beyond. The importance of such cultural meanings is that they 'organise and regulate social practices, influence our conduct and consequently have real, practical effects' (Hall, 1997a. p. 3). Through a critical review of recent literature and policy concepts, the article puts together social analysis and history to examine how notions of race and ethnicity, broadly linked here to the United Kingdom's (UK) 'visible' ethnic minorities, namely 'Black and Asian' (South Asian, African and Caribbean) Britons, are discursively formed, produced and circulated through cultural policy. Until now, these ethnic minority communities have experienced a unique relationship with UK Public Service Broadcasting (PSB), a public sphere with a key role in national culture (Kumar, 1977). The relationship has been based around patterns of marginalisation and foregrounding, access and constraint, specialist programming and mainstreaming (Author, 2002).

Policy (as an aspect of regulation) is situated as an important part of cultural practice in the circuit of culture (Du Gay et al., 1997). The article therefore points to the role of policy in cultural life and, in turn, the central place of culture in contemporary public communications and politics (Hall, 1997b). It examines how and where 'race' does and does not 'occur' within current PSB policy frames, what these frames are symptomatic of and the implications for cultural practice and representation. The recent diversity policies of the UK's two public service broadcasters, the BBC (funded by a public licence-fee) and Channel 4 (publicly-owned, commercially-funded), will be used as case studies, enriched by an understanding of how each broadcaster has historically addressed issues of race and representation in their policy and programming approaches (Born, 2006; Hobson, 2008; Author, 2002; Saha, 2012). I want to suggest that the latest diversity plans of these two

broadcasters are indicative of a discursive turn to 'creativity' in how race and racism are now officially handled and driven underground, after multiculturalism.

UK PSB has positioned 'diversity' as a core pursuit and framework through which programme-makers and executives are apparently tasked to deliver public service. The article considers the specific political, social and market expediencies that the flexibility of the term 'diversity' opens up for public service broadcasters in salient contexts. I situate the concerns of the article alongside PSB's own trajectory in the years following the UK 1990 Broadcasting Act since when the public service case for multiculturalism in broadcasting has been increasingly undermined by the emerging cultures of commercialism triggered by increasing competition, lighter touch regulation and technological developments (Author, 2008). The current circumstances in which the traditional 'welfare consensus of liberal democracy' (Lunt, 2009: 136) criteria of public service is being challenged by an aggressively competitive media market in a global economy, make it especially rich for such an analysis.

Running concurrently is the major socio-political context of the UK's sharply contested project of managing difference, marked by a critical shift against the ideological principles underpinning multiculturalism (Kundnani, 2007; Lentin, 2012). Since UK PSB has traditionally been tied to the ideal of national broadcasting, particular problems and solutions materialise when the idea of the national itself becomes complicated. I go on to suggest that the turn away from multiculturalism in broadcasting has been cosseted by a broader consensus of the perceived need for social cohesion rather than multiculturalism.

These dual industrial and socio-political backgrounds are mutually significant in helping us to map what can be identified as now three phases: 'multiculturalism', 'cultural diversity' and 'creative diversity', each indicating an incremental depoliticisation of 'race' in public service broadcasting contexts. The rise of 'creative diversity' specifically relates to this because the term 'creativity' signifies a post-multiculturalist, falsely post-racial

understanding. I argue that the particular nuance inscribed in '*creative* diversity' originates from an emergent post-racial discursive politics (not from post-racial times) and towards economic rationalism. The depoliticization of difference in public service broadcasting coincides with the creative marketization of television and multiculture accommodated by a wider shift from state to market in public provision (Garnham, 2005). Thus, media policy developments are directly linked and seen, in this analysis, to coincide with complex social issues, simultaneously altering the relationship of 'minority cultures to mainstream, national cultural traditions' (Hall, 1997b. p.227).

Research Context

This article does not seek to engage with the minutiae of (broadcasting) policy or extract it from other governing contexts. Rather, the concern is with the critical shift in policy emphasis, tone and, it is argued, intention, where policy itself becomes a mechanism for a range of functions. The analytical aim is to intervene in media policy studies and make a multifaceted argument about the varying, overlapping forces. These include the political economic, state responses to multiculturalism, neo-liberalism and discourses of creativity and innovation, that shape public service broadcasting's approach to the 'problem' of cultural difference.

The field of policy studies is helpful for how it links policy, discourse and motivation. Schön and Rein refer to the 'structures of belief, perception, and appreciation' of policy frames (1994, p.23) and to the functions of underlying policy positions. For Rein and Schön, policy frames can be used gainfully for legitimacy by policy makers who 'may hitch on to a dominant frame and its conventional metaphors (the free market, privatization, and 'community empowerment', for example), hoping thereby to purchase legitimacy for a course

of action actually inspired by different intentions' (1993, p.35). The language games in policy discourse, framing and reframing can reveal to us a strong normative impulse, often strategically shifting the 'paradigm of a problem' (van Eeten, 2007, p.255–6). Thus, policy acts as a tool to publicly manage what might be commonly understood as problematic situations (such as multiculturalism) whilst also serving alternative agendas (such as social cohesion). Multiculturalism, in the public imagination, has been popularly conceived of as one such 'problematic situation' for politicians, policy-makers and indeed for diverse publics themselves. This is apparent in the widespread European claims that multiculturalism is a politics of recognition incompatible with collective citizenship (Lentin and Titley, 2011), a tension that is now seen to be resolved by a new social cohesion directive.

Van Ewijk (2011), from a policy studies viewpoint, recognises the growing prevalence of 'diversity policy good practices' (p.683) within both public and private sectors. Of particular value in understanding the critical politics involved in *public* organisational strategies, is the recent primarily sociology-based literature on diversity policy. Much of this emerging body of work is from US scholars who have observed a shift from affirmative action to diversity in higher education, work and racial attitudes, in which questions of inequality have been erased from organisational responsibility (Collins, 2011). 'Diversity' has been exposed here as an 'ideological counter-point to the race-based policy and practice of affirmative action' (Collins, 2011, p.517) that came before. Moore and Bell, for example, focus on the 'maneuvers of whiteness' in elite law schools, proposing that diversity in supposedly post-racial times operates through a retrenchment of white racial framing (Moore and Bell, 2011). From their Critical Sociology standpoint, a deliberate politics is at play because diversity talk decontextualises race and racial inequality, consciously negates a critical multicultural politics grounded in anti-racism and most of all, holds whiteness in place. Sara Ahmed's critical race analysis of the function of diversity in liberal institutional

practice (higher education) positions embedded diversity as an 'institutional speech act' that serves both to obscure racism and reify the dominance of institutional whiteness (Ahmed, 2012). 'Institutionalised diversity' enables ethnic minorities to be administered and consequently a range of other (for example, legal, economic) agendas to be met. For Ahmed, 'doing diversity' fails to speak to the range of issues that are involved in achieving a more equitable politics of cultural representation and consequently has limited potential to destabilise dominant power structures in institutional life.

Across these critiques, the current diversity frame is recognised as immensely powerful and as constructed in response to, and inflected by, earlier (policy) moments; thus it is understood as an ideological discursive formation. Within the UK, one such dominant earlier policy moment in the British public consciousness is 'institutional racism', a claim which has been levelled by Sir William Macpherson at public organisations in his 1999 report following an enquiry into the institutional handling of the racist murder of a Black teenager, Stephen Lawrence. 'Institutional racism' is also a 'contested policy' (Murji, 2011, p.595), which adapts itself or is negated according to different contexts. The article draws on these dynamic contentions around policy functions, motivations and predicaments.

Turning to the matter of public service television, recent literature has discussed policy as a deeply political phenomenon (Born, 2006; Freedman, 2008; O'Loughlin, 2006) with a focus on diversity of supply, digital strategies and its implications for democracy, pluralism and cultural diversity (Born, 2006; Flew, 2011). Although issues of race and ethnicity are only obliquely addressed in this work, the core question of media citizenship relates seriously to questions of race and representation. A closer focus on cultural diversity policy can be found in research from a wider European perspective (Horsti, 2009; Horsti and Hultén, 2011; Leurdijk, 2006). Also relevant is the scholarly work examining other *loci* of cultural practices, beyond regulation, such as identity, production and consumption (Du Gay

et al., 1997) that foregrounds questions of media, globalisation and cultural identities (Rigoni and Saitta, 2012; Siapera, 2010). The role of Diasporic media and cultural politics (Bailey and Harindranath, 2006) and the transnational broadcasting marketplace as critical sites for the proliferation of difference (see Karim, 2003) are especially useful in how we evaluate what is happening to the national. Understanding processes of cultural production (Cottle, 2000), from a radical cultural industries perspective (Saha, 2012), has also helped situate conditions of production within the dominant neoliberal agenda since the 1990s. There is considerable value to be found within and across these studies, but a focus on race and representation in a UK PSB context that takes into account the overlapping terrains of cultural production, representations and regulation (Frith, 2000), set against the broader socio-political contexts in which cultural meanings are made, still remains limited. As yet, the new language of *creative* diversity in how 'race' is being publicly managed has not been addressed.

Mediations of Multiculture: Mapping the Changes in PSB

This is not the place to review in any detail the now well-rehearsed debates around the 'crisis of multiculturalism'. However, a summative account of mediations of multiculture is necessary because of its connections with the shift from cultural to creative that I am mapping here. If 'multiculture' describes the lived realities of a society's cultural heterogeneity, 'multicultural*ism*' refers to strategies designed to govern or manage 'the problems of diversity and multiplicity which multi-cultural societies throw up' (Hall, 2000, p.210). Whilst there are various interpretations of multiculturalism (or multicultural*isms*) (Hall, 2000), state-sponsored multiculturalism had itself publicly redirected the attention away from the evolving anti-racist movement of the 1970s and 1980s (Gilroy, 1987). Multiculturalist principles employed an

overt group-based approach in which certain ethnic communities were targeted for inclusion and access. Although not without its own politics of limitation and ghettoisation (Cottle, 2000), this version of state multiculturalism should be noted for being written into media policy and commissioning structures and for being grounded in a particular (albeit soft) version of anti-racism.

It is this version of multiculturalism that has, since the turn of the millennium, been actively undermined as a normative principle within wider political and public discourse. For Lentin and Titley (2011) this crisis of multiculturalism has become *the* contemporary articulation of racism, mediated and managed by the strategizing and neoliberalizing of 'good diversity' and citizenship (Horsti, 2009; Lentin and Titley, 2011). State-led social cohesion provides a space in which more assimilation can be pressed for, in which a proliferation of social anxieties can converge (particularly acute since the 'war on terror', Kundnani, 2007) and where we can relegate racism to the past.

The expansive scholarly work on the crisis of multiculturalism has highlighted its connection with 'post-racial' discourse. The idea of post-race (Gallagher, 2008) is predicated on a theory of racelessness (Goldberg, 2006) rather than on support for a post-racial state in which racial equality has been achieved. For Lentin, post-race orthodoxy is not just post-multiculturalist, but specifically anti-multiculturalist, 'because the backlash against multiculturalism does not express a problem with culture, but rather with its *excess',* always to be found 'in an-Other's culture' (Lentin, 2012, p.10). We can recognise these contemporary articulations of racism in a new modality of 'tolerant liberal multiculturalism' which for Žižek, is 'an experience of the Other deprived of its Otherness – the decaffeinated Other' (Žižek, 2010). The 'decaffeinated other' is a mythic, holistic 'good other', not too potent or different or indeed authentic – so as to pose a real threat to other individuals or to a socially cohesive society.

We can relate these wider social trends (in which a new preferred assimilationist model of managing social and cultural difference exists) to the rise of creative diversity. The collective language of citizenship within a liberal polity, aspires towards an 'absolute citizen' subject based around shared values and common citizenship. Significantly for us here, the new 'racial neoliberal' (Lentin and Titley, 2011) discourse that Žižek alludes to, has popular appeal because it values what we all value (flexibility, creativity and imagination), as does 'creative diversity'. We are all invited, and indeed expected, to be included in its broad 'diversity' frame. Nicholas Garnham suggests that creative diversity policy is centred on four key themes, 'access', 'excellence', 'education' and 'economic value' (Garnham, 2005) and versions of these are apparent in the creative diversity vision. It is a policy frame that involves a pro-creative, not pro-cultural vision in line with a broader 'creative industries turn' that led in UK broadcasting to 'the need to open British broadcasting to international competition, consolidation and inward investment in order to compete in the global programme market' (Garnham, 2005, p. 26).

The timing of the crisis of multiculturalism has also been noted for its significant impact on European public service broadcasting systems and representations (Horsti, 2009; Horsti and Hultén, 2011; Leurdijk 2006). It has coincided with a contrasting PSB drive strategized as an institutionalized and redemptive (from the old order of multiculturalism) mainstreaming of diversity (Author, 2008, Author 2012). In order to acknowledge the intensity of change, it is helpful to briefly consider the historical situatedness of the relationship between race and public service representation, most obviously the formative models of national televisual address such as multicultural programming (Cottle, 2000). This emerged out of an evolving context of cultural hegemony reinforced by Reithian philosophy of PSB provision based on what the public needs or what the nation constitutes (see Creeber, 2004); a unifying project dependent on a national public culture and identification. During the

course of public service development, recognising diversity within universality became a method of celebrating difference and challenging inequality elsewhere. Multicultural broadcasting policies (most notably between the 1970s following the UK Race Relations Acts and up until the 1990 Broadcasting Act) included recruitment measures, targets and specialist slots and multicultural departments (or in the case of the BBC, separate 'African-Caribbean' and 'Asian' Programme Units for a period in the 1990s), designed to explicitly position Black and Asian representation on the media agenda (Author, 2002).

As part of a broader regime of cultural governance, Channel 4 also positively acknowledged UK multiculture in both representation and structure. Its true innovation was as the only UK terrestrial channel established (in 1982) with multicultural programming embedded as part of its core practice and infrastructure, becoming what might be regarded a 'multicultural public sphere' (Author, 2008). The impetus, as Sue Woodford, the first Multicultural Commissioning Editor said at the time, was that 'blacks and Asians in this country are never shown on television, or if they are shown, they are shown in their standard stereotypical roles' (Woodford quoted in Hobson, 2008, p.68). This direct engagement with questions of representation and racial stereotyping implied an interventionist politics predicated on anti-racism within an early idea of state multiculturalism.

As delocalization developed, the role of national broadcasting as a kind of 'social glue' that produces the ideological pursuits of national unity and 'common culture' became problematic (Karim, 2003). The rise of Diasporic television, facilitated by cable and satellite systems, shed light on the critical relationship between two related trajectories: one, the threat to traditional public service delivery as it too struggled for audience-share; and two, the claims of ethnic minority groups for better representation (Ofcom, 2008). Traditional ways of conceptualizing, regulating and running television along national lines was now being

challenged as unique affiliations and points of identification beyond national broadcasting (Creeber, 2004) were provided by a transnational broadcasting marketplace (Karim, 2003).

We can identify the early 2000s as a critical moment in the history of the ambivalent ethnic minority/PSB relationship. The BBC and Channel 4 reformulated their multicultural departments and promoted (through programming, policy and address) a more mainstream definition of 'cultural diversity' (see O' Loughlin, 2006) that was, in turn, to pave the way for 'creative diversity'. This historical juncture can also be noted for William Macpherson's report on 'institutional racism', the 2000 Race Relations Amendment Act and the Runnymede Trust's report on the 'Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain', each of which highlighted continuing racial and ethnic social divisions. The BBC's then Director General, Greg Dyke, alluding to Macpherson's critique of 'institutional racism', described the iconic public service broadcaster's 'hideous Whiteness' (Creeber, 2004). The significance of these important acknowledgements of structural inequalities, discrimination and cultural representation is that they are all trumped by a bigger emphasis on a socially broad conception of 'cultural diversity' and apparently inclusive way of managing diversity. A central tenet of cultural diversity, and later creative diversity policy, was the concept of widening access. Chris Smith's, then Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport, overview of culture and the arts in contemporary Britain presented in *Creative Britain* (1998) stated that, 'access will be the corner stone of our cultural policy. Experience of the highest quality must be available to the widest possible audience'.

Whilst there is a strong idea of diversity and access apparent here, for public service broadcasters there seemed some uncertainty at the time about how to interpret diversity. Thus for the then BBC Deputy Director General, Mark Byford, 'If we chase every group with the aim of converting them as an audience, then we could run the risk of losing the core audience we already hold. There will always be some unreachables' (quoted in *The Guardian*, 24

January 2007). For Channel 4, equality had now, we were told, been achieved. In an early evocation of the post-race idea, the Channel's then Chief Executive, Michael Jackson, stated, 'In 2001 the 'minorities' of those times [1982, when Channel 4 began] have been assimilated into the mainstream of society' (Jackson, 2001; my addition). The situation for Jackson was apparently prophesised by Kumar's earlier work on the BBC, which still encapsulates the sociological tension at the heart of PSB. As audiences actually become increasingly multicultural, public service broadcasters are 'trying to hold the "middle ground" on a terrain that is treacherous and unstable' and in which they 'cannot afford identification with any organized section of the community however large' (Kumar, 1977, p.245-246).

In mapping this journey from cultural diversity to creative diversity and the tricky negotiation of economic and social goals (see Hesmondhalgh, 2008) by the public service broadcasters, we can therefore identify considerable anxiety about how to most expediently manage and apply diversity. Thus after the closure of its Multicultural Programmes Department in 2002, Channel 4 announced in 2008 that as part of a major review of its public service role, it sought to re-establish its original connection with minority audiences through a new Diversity department with a broad, inclusive remit in which 'diversity' was devolved across the departments in order to 'embed' diversity more even-handedly. We can understand this policy U-turn as an indication of the extreme vulnerability of the Channel in the broadcasting value-chain, making its public-service drive strategically entwined with 'diversity', which arguably sits at the heart of a public service ethos in which public value is determined (Author, 2008). For the broadcasters, there was considerable economic significance in retaining a public version of social diversity, whilst not losing 'majority' audiences.

'Creative Diversity' in Public Communication

Before I go on to pinpoint instances where 'creative diversity' (as a discourse of public value) has become central to this public-service drive, I want to signal an important link with the broader equality legislative setting. The UK has recently seen a restructuring of the 'equality architecture' (Walby et al., 2012) during the formation of the Equality and Human Rights Commission (EHRC) and under New Labour in 2007. This was cemented by the 2010 Equality Act (Government Equalities Office, 2011a) which adopts a single legal framework (covering nine 'protected characteristics' of which race is one), thus merging together different areas of discrimination law including the Race Relations Act 1976. One aspect of the Act is the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED), making the public service broadcasters' current diversity strategies the mechanism for their response to the new duty (Government Equalities Office, 2011b). This legislative background is one against which we can start to understand the rise of 'creative diversity'.

The creative diversity agenda formulates ideas of 'quality' and 'creativity' over (structural) questions of (in)equality. In periodising the shift from 'multiculturalism' and 'cultural diversity' to 'creative diversity', we see how each incarnation becomes increasingly all-encompassing; including and containing all possible forms of diversity in society (van Ejiwk, 2011) and claiming to broaden access 'to the widest possible range of cultural experiences' (Garnham, 2005, p.27). In fact, each element of the newest policy paradigm suggests a departure from the welfare and structural concerns identifiable in earlier (multiculturalist) media policy and an orientation towards market and industrial priorities, dealt with by 'creativity'. On the question of why 'creative' (diversity) rather than 'cultural' (diversity) we can identify a parallel with arts and media policy debates about the terms 'creative industries' and 'cultural industries' linked to the competitive global economy (Garnham, 2005). The rise of creative industries policy, as I will go on to discuss, becomes a

key backdrop against which this shift from cultural to creative occurs and highlights how PSB is also implicated in the overarching shift towards neo-liberal market models.

So where do we find discourses of 'creative diversity' in PSB and what are the connections with its antecedents, 'cultural diversity' and, prior to that, 'multiculturalism'? Notable in identifying the shift from 'cultural' to 'creative' is the industry-wide Cultural Diversity Network (CDN) of which the BBC and Channel 4 are both members (and which the BBC currently chairs). The CDN was originally set up in 2000 to promote cultural diversity and was therefore an organisation founded specifically to deal with issues of diversity in the industry. In 2011, it merged with the Broadcasting and Creative Industries Disability Network (BCIDN) announcing 'a new name to reflect the network's remit' (CDN, 2011), the *Creative* Diversity Network. The significance of the literal replacing of 'Cultural' with 'Creative' in this instance is that the Network members include all the major UK public service and commercial broadcasters, demonstrating both the current expansiveness of 'creative diversity' and its triumph over cultural diversity within media policy. The rebranded Creative Diversity Network declares its Priority 1 as 'Making the business case for diversity' (CDN, 2011). With regards to ethnicity within this broader schema, it seeks to 'put a greater focus on BAME [Black and Minority Ethnic]-led initiatives aimed at senior level recruitment' and collate data to help members understand 'diversity within diversity' (CDN, 2011).

Although it goes much wider, the new principles of 'creative diversity' are also evident within the BBC and Channel 4; public service broadcasters that are more or less considered together in what follows because of their manifest derivative politics in how they attempt to 'out public service the other' in their responses to ethnic minorities (see Author, 2002).

Of specific note, is the BBC's current diversity strategy, 'Everyone Has a Story: BBC's Diversity Strategy 2011-15', unveiled in 2011 and approved by the BBC Trust, the

governing body of the BBC. According to the BBC's Head of Diversity, Amanda Rice, the strategy is influenced by two things: 'our desire to connect with all audiences to ensure licence fee-payers' feedback helped shape the strategy, and the recently introduced Equality Act 2010' (Rice, 'Everyone has a story – the BBC's new diversity strategy, 24 May 2011). Diversity policy at the BBC is now organised into three main pillars: this new Diversity Strategy, the equality information report ('Telling Our Story', 2011) in line with the specific duties under the PSED and finally its Divisional Diversity Action Plans, required by each BBC division. Close analysis of these BBC documents reveals two key messages: first, the idea of an all-encompassing 'One BBC' (Rice, op.cit) aligned with the new single equality legislative framework; and second, a business-oriented case for 'creative diversity'. The 'context for a new diversity strategy' is that 'the challenges of diversity in the UK offer a genuinely creative opportunity' (BBC, 2011). Thus the 'challenges' produced by cultural diversity can be resolved by creativity.

A major facet within these scripts is 'quality', led by the BBC's 'Delivering Quality First' (DQF) (2010) editorial strategy that coincided with the approval of its new six-year licence-fee settlement. DQF for the BBC is about the '*best* journalism, *outstanding* children's content, *inspiring* knowledge, music and culture, *ambitious* UK drama and comedy…' (BBC, 2011; my emphasis). Also clear is the weight given to 'strategy', 'procurement' and 'people'. Therefore, 'Equality analysis of non-content related activity will become increasingly important' (BBC performance return on the public sector equality duty: Quarter 1 2011-12). Specifically, equality concerns are configured around the diversity profile of the workforce, for example in strategic and senior posts, employment policy, divisional restructuring, Board procurement and 'Delivering Quality First'' (BBC, 2012). The shift in these guiding principles is not just towards questions of recruitment practice and human resources (talent, training, mentoring and development), but away from the more contested, ideological terrain

of cultural representation. Implicit is that more diverse recruitment and 'creative workers' (see Garnham, 2005) will make the difference for the equality agenda which, one presumes, also has to include questions of content. This turn away from questions of representation and identity politics is the critical dimension of this story of the rise of creative industries policy (and the shift away from 'multiculturalism' and 'cultural industries' policy).

Over at Channel 4, 2010 saw the unveiling of a new 'fully converged content and commissioning structure' (Channel 4, 2010, http://www.channel4sales.com/news/print/148) in which the Cultural Diversity team now reports (along with Indie relations, the Disability executives and the Paralympics (coverage) team) into a new position, the Director of Creative Diversity (headed by Stuart Cosgrove). The primary concern of Channel 4's conceptualisation of Creative Diversity is based on diversity of supply and regional diversity, helping drive the commission of multiplatform content from newer companies through to the regions (Channel 4, 2010). The absorption of Cultural Diversity under the rubric of Creative Diversity is a significant development for this fascinating public service broadcaster and suggests a further attempt to remove race or outdated identity politics from 'diversity' matters. Indeed, Channel 4 in its Diversity Strategy 2011 openly welcomes the new single Equality Act because it sees it as being 'entirely consistent with Channel 4's own objectives' (Channel 4, 2012). For Channel 4 now, 'Diversity is not about the colour of someone's skin; it goes way beyond that. Diversity is about being all-inclusive, regardless of culture…race' and so on because, 'Diversity of thought and opinion helps us to innovate, be distinctive and encourage people to think in different ways' (Channel 4, 2012, p.1). Thus the openness of the term 'diversity' is utilised by Channel 4 here and overlaid with an emphasis on innovation and creativity, which draws parallels with how it tends to operate within creative industries policy at large. It is possible for cultural diversity to be subsumed into the rhetoric of creativity because of the wider creative industries turn that now guides arts and media policy making.

Meanings of 'Creative Diversity' After Multiculturalism

I want to pull together these various sets of concerns to suggest that through 'creative diversity', the major contemporary dilemma of multiculturalism in social and cultural life is reconfigured as a 'post-racialised' modality of public service. Creative diversity policies are underpinned by market, regulatory and social motivations, meeting marketplace requirements, safeguarding PSB interests and ultimately shifting the paradigm of the multicultural problem (in public service broadcasting and beyond). Basically, by renaming and reframing cultural diversity as 'creative diversity', three major, overlapping market, regulatory and social predicaments are dealt with.

First, it attends to the *market* predicament by mobilising an innovation imperative for particular kinds of (ethnic) creativity or excellence (with an emphasis on popular formats and styles of programming, Lunt 2009; Author, 2012) rather than fixate on social concerns. Importantly, this serves the logic of the contemporary broadcasting marketplace very well and, in turn, a neo-liberal register of cultural governance. Second, it settles *regulatory* and remit predicaments by both promoting itself as a source of 'diversity' (and hence public value) and enabling compliance with wider legislative and policy frameworks; namely the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) component of the single Equality Act 2010. And finally, it deals with *social* predicaments, by attaching itself to strategic 'creative' objectives that are already present in the cultural sector, such as innovation, quality and excellence (see McMaster, 2008). In so doing, a depoliticized, raceless 'diversity' consensus is achieved, taking the heat out of 'the multicultural problem', smoothing over difference, and deflecting

claims of special treatment and rights because we are now *all* included in this intentionally culturally unspecific (and socially cohesive) 'creative' frame.

Market: 'Creative diversity' and creative enterprise in the cultural industries

What these 'creative diversity' scripts start to tell us about updated principles of 'public service', branding and accountability is that 'quality' and 'creativity' are now foregrounded over (structural) questions of (in)equality. Human resources becomes more important than content, and a broad sense of diversity is promoted rather than the naming of specific communities. Furthermore, the ubiquitous creative diversity paradigm is shaped by a pro-creative agenda and openly *not* by a politics of recognition of social or cultural difference. Where for the BBC, there is a clear emphasis on delivering 'quality' first, Channel 4 places additional value to other competencies such as innovation, imagination, flexibility and excellence (Channel 4, 2012). In this post-traditional logic, diverse people can produce innovation, individuals can make a difference and change is offered through these competencies, not bound by political, social or economic determinants.

This is a narrative that takes us to the ideology of freedom, liberalism and individualism (Žižek, 2001); an approach in which all publics and producers are apparently treated equally within a presumed meritocracy. This is what Saha in his analysis of British Asian programme-makers and executives calls, an 'imagined autonomy of commissioning practices' (Saha, 2012, p.433) in spite of the ongoing systemic racialised hierarchies of decision-making roles and regimes of representation. The risk of the 'individual agency' approach, as Saha goes on to suggest, is that it 'can underplay the influence of larger forces' (p.434), including organisational culture. Perhaps further still, we can start to identify the role of the asocial innovation impetus as a method for (ethnic minority) cultural workers to deracialise their own position or relationship to the industry. Saha's analysis suggests that

minority producers are themselves implicated in industry shifts towards deregulation and neoliberal market models (Saha, 2012). The idea of 'creatification' (Florida, 2012, p.viii) highlights the requirement for cultural workers, or indeed 'creative workers' (Garnham, 2005), to demonstrate 'creativity', in the quest for job stability in this new economy (Florida, 2012).

The major conclusion arising from an evaluation of the implementation of the Equality Act, commissioned by the DCMS,[1] is that equality is good for business (DCMS, 2012), conveying a wider business-case driven equality agenda. An investment in diverse creativity (however defined) and diverse personnel (more distinct in the BBC's Diversity strategy) are positively identified in these narratives as producing quantifiable business benefits. Thus a discursive shift is evident from diversity as a social regulatory discourse to diversity as an economic regulatory discourse (Born, 2006). The reframing indicates an updated attempt to achieve a form of consensus by settling on the universalist and sufficiently loose concept of 'creativity' (Hesmondhalgh, 2008) in place of the contested social values within the antecedent models of 'multiculturalism' and even 'cultural diversity'. The overarching agenda however, is that 'creative diversity' dovetails nicely with the wider narrative of creative enterprise in the cultural industries.

Broadly, recent ideas of diversity have been imbued with so-called 'innovation' in wider policy orientations (European Commission, 2007) and some Creative Industries academic literature. For example, Florida's work on the rise of creativity links human capital, diversity and creativity in how innovation is produced, hence a 'creative class' (Florida, 2012). Whilst there is a tangential connection with more inclusive ways of thinking, cultural diversity functions primarily to steer creativity in the global communication of the twenty-first century and within various environments of economic crisis, increasing demand for diversity from 'clients', and creativity from workers. More critical accounts of the rise of

creative industries policy (and theory) point to its 'refusal of the forms of critical analysis associated with the cultural industries approach' (Hesmondhalgh, 2008) and its tendency to support 'inequality and exploitation associated with contemporary neoliberalisms' (Hesmondhalgh, 2008, p. 567). Kate Oakley's work on the role of the creative industries in UK economic development highlights the lack of 'evidence-based policy' that the creative industries actually foster a sense of social inclusion. Moreover, she draws attention to examples that suggest that they can, in the case of creative industries labour, actually contribute to social polarization and inequality (Oakley, 2004).

Regulatory: Diversity policies, institutional requirements and Public Service Broadcasting

In these ways, diversity – 'vis-à-vis' creativity – becomes just another means for public organisations to promote themselves and allow the 'accumulation of organisational value' (Ahmed, 2012, p.110). Taken together, new diversity in media policy cements the value of public service when PSB is most in need of public justification. The idea that even public service broadcasters operate in the context of capitalism has long been put forward in political economy approaches (Murdock and Golding, 1977). The current tension is exemplified in, and arguably arises from, a concurrent drive towards market liberalisation and diversity agendas within public service communication (Freedman, 2004). It is based on a PSB progressively more tasked with being entirely inclusive and grappling with the nuances of difference (cultural, racial or otherwise) in a multicultural, if not multicultural*ist,* society. This is an environment in which the market dominates and, of course, regulates (Hall, 1997b).

Whilst we might agree that market forces are the prevailing agenda, there are other mechanisms at work providing the shifting contexts of these articulations. Therefore, these complex struggles cannot neatly be reduced to an aspect of political economy that limits dilemmas for PSB to a spotlight on market forces. I attribute the role of social change, the

single legislative settling and the state in rejecting principles of multiculturalism, to the ways in which an environment has been provided for PSB to *be able to* transfer its priorities to an increasingly culturally unspecific trope of 'diversity' through a unifying diversity frame. Whilst these operate in relation to the market, not from a politics of equality, it is also necessary to bring to light the particular (less market-focused) ethical (social, political and cultural) dilemmas involved in public communication (Born, 2006).

Walby et al. (2012) in their social analysis of the implications of the new 'single' legislative setting for the theory and practice of intersectionality, note that it was race/ethnicity (rather than gender, for example) that was first addressed by discrimination laws in the UK.[2] The 'moves to even out the differences between strands' (Walby et al., 2012, p.13) has particular historic connotations for the way in which race is now publicly positioned as a general equality issue amongst many others. Or in another way, the single Equality Act 'sets out a new approach to delivering equality, moving away from the identity politics of the past and to an approach that recognises people's individuality' (Government Equalities Office, 2011a). The point here is less about the potential losses and gains of the single Equality Act, than about the rejection of 'identity politics' and earlier anti-racist movements (Gilroy, 1987), now relegated to the past. The 'new architecture' accommodates such a discursive orientation for PSB away from discrimination, inequality and social justice concerns towards a broad conception of 'individuality' through social cohesion licensed by the new politics of post-multiculturalism (Kundnani, 2007).

Social: Policy and post 'crisis of multiculturalism' thinking

Current predicaments are seemingly resolved through 'creative diversity' 'speech acts', rendered so because whilst they pertain to public value and interest, they produce an ambivalent response to a thriving lived multiculture. A politics of racelessness, which forms

part of the critique presented in this article, is retrenched by blurring the moral, social and economic case for diversity. The conventional metaphors of community, access and inclusion are implied, but it is the arguments of the market state (that have traditionally worked against such ideas) which are declared through the new economy of 'creativity'. Fairclough in his analysis of contemporary political texts suggests that they often contain a 'hybridization of discourses', specifically the 'strategy of legitimizing the discourse of social cohesion in terms of the neo-liberal discourse' (Fairclough, 2003, p.127)

Creative diversity speaks to the project of nation-building, but limits itself as an abstract and symbolic, rather than political frame.[3] The present struggles are, however, of deep political consequence. The socio-political basis of 'race' remains 'real' and persists as a salient factor in identity claims and ongoing demands for 'fairer representation' from the regularly marginalised that are still structured by ongoing unequal power relationships within broadcasting and beyond. Thus the power of policy frames to suppress, limit and divert attention from the actuality of 'race' is an instance of racism being buried, but 'buried alive' (Goldberg, 2006, p.338).

Although beyond the aims of this article to consider the textual representations that have materialized under the ruse of 'creative diversity', recent studies point to an increased visibility of Black and Asian Britons on-screen in popular formats (Author, 2012) alongside a persistent current of racialised regimes of representation (see Georgiou, 2010; Author, 2002; Saha 2012). Whilst a critical multicultural politics can occur within popular entertainment formats (Author, 2012), a broad span of programming with a cultural politics grounded in both moral philosophical commitments and experiment and autonomy (identifiable in early Channel 4) are now rarely to be found in the schedules. How we excavate other racisms in PSB can be done in several ways; in terms of social form (with the still unresolved 'hideous Whiteness' of organisational culture, Creeber, 2004), the creative environments in which

programme-makers and executives handle race in programming decisions (Saha, 2012) and, indeed, in terms of the policy structures that seek to obliterate race (and therefore racisms)[4] from their frame.

Conclusion

This article has identified the emergence of 'creative diversity' and set this within parallel 'crisis of multiculturalism' contexts in order to contribute to debates on PSB, multiculturalism and citizenship. I have discussed the implications and currency of 'diversity' in these evolving policy settings, what it really represents and how it is *acted out.* I have explicated the 'racelessness' of creative diversity rhetoric, through its lack of engagement with inequalities and racisms. The crux of my argument is that quality/creativity have been foregrounded over structural inequality in recent policy developments and that 'creative diversity' is essentially founded upon the denial of social and cultural difference. Creative diversity demonstrates the depoliticisation of race in PSB contexts.

As the UK prepares for its next Communications Bill, there are questions of whether PSB will be a likely vehicle for diversity issues except in so far as ensuring 'creative content' unlikely to be provided by other parts of the market. The fallout is that PSB as a truly unifying space continues to be undermined, in spite of its potential as one of 'the primary 'theatres' for contemporary pluralism' (Born, 2006, p.114) or, indeed, as a progressive multicultural public sphere. This would require a repoliticisation and reframing of race and ethnicity in PSB in order to mobilise a new version of multiculturalism that is grounded in anti-racism with real effects.

References

Ahmed, S. (2012). *On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Appignanesi, R. (ed.) (2010). Beyond Cultural Diversity: the case for creativity, *Third Text, 2010*.

Arts Council England. (2010). What is the Creative case for diversity? Retrieved from www.artscouncil.org.uk/.../What_is_the_Creative_Case_for_Diversity.pdf

Author (2002)

Author (2008)

Author (2012)

Bailey, O., & Harindranath, R. (2006). Ethnic minorities, cultural difference and the cultural politics of communication. *International Journal of Media and Cultural Politics, 2 (3),* 299-316.

BBC. (2011). Diversity Strategy 2011-15. Retrieved from www.bbc.co.uk/diversity/pdf/Diversity_strategy_110523.pdf

Born, G. (2000). Inside television: television studies and the sociology of culture, *Screen 41 (4),* 404-424.

Born, G. (2006). Digitising democracy. in (eds.) J. Lloyd., & J. Seaton, *What Can Be Done? Making the Media and Politics Better*, 102-23. Special book issue of *Political Quarterly*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Channel 4. (2012). Equality Objectives. Retrieved from www.channel4.com/media/documents/.../C4_Equality_Objectives_2012.pdf

Collins, S. (2011). From Affirmative Action to Diversity: Erasing Inequality from Organizational Responsibility. *Critical Sociology, 37 (5),* 517–520.

Cottle, S. (2000). *Ethnic Minorities and the Media: Changing Cultural Boundaries.* Open University Press.

Creeber, G. (2004). ''Hideously White'': British Television, Glocalisation, and National Identity.' *Television & New Media. 5 (27),* 27-39.

Creative Diversity Network (CDN) (2011) http://www.creativediversitynetwork.org/index.php

Department for Culture Media and Sport (DCMS) (2012) http://www.culture.gov.uk/publications/9552.aspx

Du Gay, P., S. Hall, K. Negus, H. Mackay, L. Janes. (1997). *Doing Cultural Studies: The Story of the Sony Walkman:* London and New Delhi: Sage (Culture, Media and Identities series)

European Commission (2007) Diversity and Innovation: A Business Opportunity for all www.iegd.org/pdf/Task%203%20-%20Innovation.pdf

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*. New York: Routledge.

Flew, T. (2011). Rethinking Public Service Media and Citizenship: Digital Strategies for News and Current Affairs at Australia's Special Broadcasting Service. *International Journal of Communications, 5,* 215-232.

Florida, R. (2012). The Rise of the Creative Class -- Revisited. Basic Books.

Freedman, D. (2005). Promoting Diversity and Pluralism in Contemporary Communication Policies in the United States and the United Kingdom. *The International Journal on Media Management,* 7 (1, 2), pp. 16-23.

Frith, S. (2000). The black box: the value of television and the future of television research, *Screen 41 (1),* 33-50.

Gallagher, C. A. (2008). Racism in Post-Race America: New Theories, New Directions. Social Forces Publishing.

Garnham, N. (2005) `From Cultural to Creative Industries: An Analysis of the Implications of the Creative Industries' Approach to Arts and Media Policy Making in the United Kingdom', *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, Vol. 11, No. 1, 15-29.

Georgiou, M. (2010).Media Representations of Diversity: The Power of the Mediated Image. in Bloch, Alice and Solomos, John (eds.) *Race and Ethnicity in the 21st Century.* Palgrave.

Gilroy, P. (1987). *There Ain't No Black in the Union Jack. The Cultural Politics of Race and Nation*, London: Unwin Hyman.

Goldberg, D. T. (2006). "Racial Europeanization". *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Vol. 29, No. 2, 331-364.

Government Equalities Office [GEO]. 2011a. *Equality Act 2010*. Retrieved from http://www.equalities.gov.uk/equality_bill.aspx

Government Equalities Office [GEO]. 2011b. *Equality Act 2010*. Public Sector Equality Duty. Retrieved from http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/equalities/equality-act/equality-duty/

Hall, S. (1997a). *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*, London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi, Sage Publications in association with the Open University.

Hall, S. (1997b). 'The Centrality of Culture: Notes on the Cultural Revolutions of our time', in Thompson, Kenneth (ed.) *Media and Cultural Regulation*, London, Thousand Oaks, Sage.

Hall, S. (2000). Conclusion: the Multi-cultural Question. in: B. Hesse (Ed.) Un/Settled Multiculturalisms: Diasporas, Entanglements, Transruptions. London, New York: Zed Books.

Hesmondhalgh, D. (2008). Cultural and Creative Industries. In *The Sage Handbook of Cultural Analysis*, Sage Publications, pp. 553-569.

Hobson, D. (2008). *Channel 4: The Early Years and the Jeremy Isaacs Legacy*, London and New York: IB Tauris.

Horsti, K. (2009). 'Antiracist and Multicultural Discourses in European Public Service Broadcasting: Celebrating Consumable Differences in the Prix Europa Iris Media Prize', *Communication, Culture & Critique,* 2 (3): 339–360.

Horsti, K., & and G. Hultén (2011). Directing diversity: Managing cultural diversity media policies in Finnish and Swedish public service broadcasting, *Journal of Cultural Studies, 14 (2)*: 209-227.

Jackson, M. (2001). The fourth way. *The Observer*, July 29.

Karim, H. K (ed.) (2003). *The Media of Diaspora: Mapping the Globe,* Routledge.

Kumar, K (1977). 'Holding the Middle Ground: The BBC, the Public and the Professional Broadcaster' in Curran, J, Gurevitch, M and Woollacott, J (eds) (1977) Mass Communication and Society, Edward Arnold (Publishers) Ltd. London pp. 231- 248.

Kundnani, A. (2007). The End of Tolerance: Racism in Twenty-First Century Britain. London: Pluto Press.

Lentin, A. (2012). Post-race, post politics: the paradoxical rise of culture after multiculturalism, *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, pp. 1_19, iFirst Article

Lentin, A., & Titley, G. (2011). The Crises of Multiculturalism: Racism in a Neoliberal Age. London & New York: Zed Books

Leurdijk, A. (2006). In Search of Common Ground: Strategies of Multicultural Producers in Europe. *European Journal of Cultural Studies 9.1*: 25-46.

Lunt, P. (2009). Television, Public Participation and Public Service: From Value Consensus to the Politics of Identity. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science 625*: 128-138.

McMaster, B., (2008). *Supporting Excellence in the Arts: from measurement to judgement*, Department of Culture, Media and Sport. Retrieved from

http://www.artscouncil.org.uk/publication_archive/mcmaster-review-supporting-excellence-in-the-arts-from measurement-to-judgement/

Murdock, G., & P. Golding (1977). Capitalism, communication and class relations. In James Curran, M. Gurevitch & J. Woollacott (eds.): *Mass Communication and Society.* London: Arnold.

Murji, K. (2011). Race policy and politics: two case studies from Britain. *Policy Studies,* 32 (6): 585-598.

Oakley, K. (2004). Not so cool Britannia: The role of the creative industries in economic development. *International Journal of Cultural Studies*. 7 (1): 67-77.

Ofcom. (2008). Second Public Service Broadcasting Review Phase One: the Digital Opportunity. Retrieved from http://www.ofcom.org.uk/consult/ condocs/psb2_1/

O'Loughlin, B. (2006). The operationalization of the concept 'cultural diversity' in British television policy and governance. CRESC Working Paper Series, Working Paper No.27, Open University, November.

Rein, M., & Schön DA. (1993). Reframing policy discourse. In: Fischer F and Forester J (eds) *The Argumentative Turn in Policy Analysis and Planning*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Rigoni, I., & E. Saitta (eds.). (2012). *Mediating Cultural Diversity in a Globalised Public Sphere*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Saha, A. (2012). 'Beard, scarves, halal meat, terrosrists, forced marriage': television industries and the production of 'race'. *Media, Culture and Society* 34 (4): 424-438.

Schön, D. A., & Rein, M. (1994). *Frame Reflection: Toward the Resolution of Intractable Policy Controversies* (New York: Basic Books.

Siapera, E. (2010). *Cultural Diversity and Global Media: The Mediation of Difference*, Wiley-Blackwell.

Smith, C. (1998) *Creative Britain*, Faber and Faber, London.

Van Eeten MJG. (2007). Narrative policy analysis. In: Fischer F, Miller G and Sidney MS (eds) *Handbook of Public Policy Analysis: Theory, Politics, and Methods*. Boca Raton: CRC/Taylor and Francis.

Van Ewijk, A.R. (2011). Diversity and Diversity policy: diving into fundamental differences. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 24 (5):* 680-694.

Walby, S., Armstrong, J., & Strid, S. (2012). Intersectionality and the Quality of the Gender Equality Architecture. *Social Politics 0 (0):* 1-36 (First published online October 31, 2012).

Žižek, S. (2001). *On Belief*, London, Routledge.

Žižek, S. (2010). Liberal multiculturalism masks an old barbarism with a human face. *The Guardian, Comment is Free*, 3 October.

Notes

---

1 In a Government reshuffle in late 2012, responsibility for administering the Equality Act moved from the Home Office to the Department for Culture Media and Sport (DCMS), suggesting a limit to its powers and also a rather significant placing of it in a 'softer', lower profile government department. This repositioning of equality administration as a Home Office (political, social) concern to a cultural one coincides

with the UK government's current marginalisation of equality issues, for example, its severe budget cuts on the EHRC (which upholds the Equality Act) in 2012.

2 The Race Relations (Amendment) Act 2000 placed a statutory duty on public authorities to promote racial equality, not merely to avoid discrimination.

3 We can find an analogous turn to creative diversity in the UK arts sector, highlighted in Arts Council England's 'creative diversity' report (Arts Council England, 2010) followed by its commissioning of Richard Appignanesi's 'The Creative Case for Diversity in Britain' (2011). The latter investigates the failings of 'state-sponsored cultural diversity policy in Britain' around which it mobilises a critique of cultural ghettoisation and offers new proposals for a 'culturally whole Britain' (Appignanesi, 2011).

4 Goldberg argues that the persistence of racisms are what themselves give race meaning and therefore 'post-race' is rendered impossible (Goldberg, 2006).