Article

After the end of multiculturalism: Public service media and integrationist imaginaries for the governance of difference

Gavan Titley
National University of Ireland, Maynooth, Ireland

Abstract
This article assesses the public service media (PSM) 'turn to diversity' in several European contexts and examines the ways in which this emerges from a rejection of multiculturalism that is at once politically sustained and analytically inchoate. It approaches PSM as national institutions conditioned to mediate coherent images of society. In contemporary European societies, this positions PSM in a field in which integrationist imaginaries of the nation are insistent, but under conditions of social complexity, which render homogeneous visions of the nation difficult to mediate. In this context, diversity has developed as a framework for mediating, and being held to mediate, lived multiculture. However, recent research suggests that this shift to diversity both depoliticizes the 'politics of difference' and may also further the prevalent integration politics currently in the ascendant in Western Europe.

Introduction

Over the last decade, research on media in migration societies has begun to account for the incorporation of 'diversity' thinking and discourse into the editorial and employment practices of the institutions of public service broadcasting and media (PSB and PSM, respectively). In doing so, this research has emphasized a discursive valence of diversity

Corresponding author:
Gavan Titley, Department of Media Studies, National University of Ireland, Maynooth, Ireland.
Email: gavan.titley@nuim.ie

that overlaps with, but is often held analytically distinct from, the systemic sense of diversity that is established in media and communication studies. This systemic sense addresses diversity of ownership and control of the distribution of communicative resources and power and, ultimately, the pluralism of the mediated spectrum of information, opinion, perspective and values and its salience to citizenship and democratic participation.

In the programmatic work of representative media institutions in migration societies, 'diversity' is invested with a different and more limited valence: that of a framework for mediating, and being seen to mediate, lived multiculture. More specifically, diversity describes those reflexively adapted representational practices[1] aiming to mediate lived multiculture *after the end of multiculturalism*, an end fashioned from both the exhaustion of particularist approaches to multicultural programming and the transnational and loudly proclaimed political retreat from multiculturalism as a public ideal and capacious policy framework (Fleras, 2009: 3–13).

By examining 'diversity' as an emergent response in a longer history of media institutional attempts to engage with the politics of representing 'minorities', this special issue locates the diversity policies of media institutions in a European conjuncture characterized by an apparent contradiction – of increasing institutional attention to the complexities of cultural attachment and identity formation, and of resolute political insistence on forms of integration and assimilation that proceed from a rejection of 'multiculturalism'. This article engages this tension through a comparative analysis of the PSM 'turn to diversity' in several European contexts and by assessing the ways in which this turn can be related to a rejection of multiculturalism that is at once politically sustained and analytically inchoate. The article advances its argument through a review of relevant recent literature, consideration of contextual research in different European sites and an empirical case study.

It takes its lead from the questions posed by Sara Ahmed (2012) in her study of diversity work in institutions, *On Being Included*, where she asks what diversity does when it is invoked as a value and idea, and when it is implemented in institutional frameworks (p. 1). This article engages these questions in the context of PSM in the following stages. In the next section, it situates the 'turn to diversity' in relation to the 'retreat from multiculturalism', a retreat that primarily constitutes a discursive prohibition, a hegemonic casting of multiculturalism in public discourse as the source of problems that can be undone through a determined shift to 'integration'.

On this basis, it suggests that PSM, as one of those national institutions charged with reproducing the 'sustained plausibility of bounded concepts of society' (Schinkel, 2013), must be seen to respond to insistent socio-political imaginaries at the level of representation: of the institution to the public and the state, and of society to the (national) audience. Yet, while this institutional reflexivity binds PSM to some form of reckoning with the public force of integration politics, it does so in contexts where the fragmentation and complexity of audiences renders the mediation of any overly homogenizing imaginary difficult and undesirable.

It is in this conjuncture that the emphasis on forms of diversity has become profoundly institutionalized. The processes are broadly comparable across Western European PSM systems in relation to a horizon of 'multicultural retreat', but retain important

socio-historical, institutional and contextual differences. This will be examined in relation to recent scholarship on PSM and diversity politics, and by situating these studies in their socio-political context, this article examines how key authors answer the question 'what does diversity do' in the relevant PSM institutions. In the final section, it turns to a case study of Ireland and draws on this to suggest that more attention must be paid to how diversity frameworks may also further the politics of integration they are in part designed to deflect.

The ambivalent resolve of the 'retreat from multiculturalism'

As Cottle (2000) has argued, 'political ideas of assimilation, integration, pluralism, multiculturalism and/or anti-racism can all variously inform the regulatory frameworks and cultural climates in which mainstream and minority productions can either flourish or founder' (p. 14). As the contemporary European research discussed subsequently demonstrates, accounting for this influence does not depend on establishing a causal relation between shifts in dominant political paradigms for the governance of difference and changes in the institutional frameworks and guiding imaginaries of media institutions. The question, then, is not so much whether and how the PSM 'retreat from multiculturalism' can be definitively related to broader shifts in public policy and political discourse. Rather, it is to account for how 'diversity' emerges and what it *does* in a political conjuncture that fuses a valorization of certain forms of difference under certain conditions, with a pronounced insistence on forms of cohesion, integration and assimilation as the necessary condition of cohesive social futures.

Multiculturalism has come, in this conjuncture, to stand for and symbolize the problematic excess of difference that must be disciplined by the turn to 'integration'. However, understanding this retreat is complicated by the need to understand that, for all the seductiveness of this dominant narrative, there is no stable point from which retreat proceeds. This is in part because of the widely noted polysemy of the term across different levels of meaning as an empirical fact, porous ideology and policy, programme and practice (Fleras, 2009: 4–5). As Ivison (2010) argues, 'however inelegant a word, the concept of multiculturalism now occupies a central place in the public culture of Western liberal democracies and increasingly in global political discourse too' (p. 10).

The cumulative, transnational narrative of multiculturalism's retreat (Lentin and Titley, 2011; Vertovec and Wessendorf, 2009) is in large part shaped by the productivity of this polysemy in public culture. 'Backlash' against the idea of multiculturalism has gathered synthesizing political force at different historical moments since the 1970s (Brahm Levy, 2009; Hewitt, 2005). Over and beyond specific contentions, this is because, as Pitcher (2009) usefully summarizes, 'multiculturalism is a way of thinking and talking about identity and belonging in relation to a conception of social order' (p. 23). Furthermore, it is a way of thinking and talking about belonging and legitimacy that, as Pitcher (2009) argues, always implicates the state, regardless of what states actually do with respect to programmatic multiculturalism. As a consequence, multiculturalism's polysemy is purposively mobilized politically to refract a cluster of anxieties focused on social and political futures.

After the latest intensive transnational round of high-profile political repudiation of this capaciously projected multiculturalism – featuring Angela Merkel in October 2010 and, then in quick succession in February 2011, David Cameron, Nicolas Sarkozy and Maxime Verhagen – John Bowen (2011) captured the character of this polysemic mobilization:

> But while it is hard to know what exactly the politicians of Europe mean when they talk about multiculturalism, one thing we do know is that the issues they raise – real or imagined – have complex historical roots that have little to do with ideologies of cultural difference. Blaming multiculturalism may be politically useful because of its populist appeal, but it is also politically dangerous because it attacks 'an enemy within': Islam and Muslims. Moreover, it misreads history. An intellectual corrective may help to diminish its malign impact.

An important element of this corrective is an attention to what Ghassan Hage (1998) has termed the 'policy fetishism' that grants policy frameworks inflated and 'unrealistic powers of shaping society'. In the case of multiculturalism, this involves recognizing two corollaries of this fetishism. The first is the piecemeal, disjointed and enormously modest histories, and non-histories, of the state-led multicultural programmes invested with such fractious power. As Anne Philips and Sawitri Saharso (2008) summarize,

> It was never adopted as official policy in any part of Europe … in France, however, multiculturalism was rejected pretty much out of hand as at odds with republican principles; in Germany, as at odds with a predominantly ethnicized conception of citizenship …. In those countries most commonly cited as exemplars of multicultural policy – the UK, the Netherlands, Sweden – practices varied and were rarely codified in any explicit way. (pp. 291–292)

The second is the mixed evidence as to the impact a loudly declared retreat from multiculturalism has had on those varied practices. Derek McGhee (2008) has argued in the context of the United Kingdom, for example, that the term 'multiculturalism' has been 'driven underground' through an 'authoritarian anti-multiculturalism' at the level of national debate, while multicultural logics and structures continue to shape policy and programme practices at local levels (pp. 145–147).

McGhee's focus on national debates is crucial, for it is at this level that the politics of multicultural crisis have arguably been most potent. As Bowen suggests, the problem of multiculturalism has come to facilitate the projection of an over-determining culturalism to ethnic and racial minorities. Long contested in academic research (for an overview, see Philips, 2007), the post 11 September 2001 (9/11) political context has 'strengthened the existing categorical thinking' whereby 'the dominant discourse in most European countries … has become increasingly culturalist, in which a migrant's culture is considered to deviate from the European norm' (Ghorashi et al., 2009: 4).

Kofman (2005) locates this culturalism in the context of an emergent political calculus around migration, residence and citizenship regimes, which involves the state '… asserting its role as protector of national identity and social cohesion. One of the ways it seeks to achieve these objectives is through demonstrating its ability to control and manage migration and diversity' (pp. 454–455). Kofman's (2005) dual emphasis on managing migration and diversity is critical, for it captures how the 'shift to neo-assimilationism

and civic integration' involves both the construction of increasingly stratified migration regimes and increased surveillance of and demands on populations implacably positioned as 'migrants'.

The imaginary of 'integration' is of course fundamental to historical thinking on, and of, the nation-state. Thus, the idea that integration regimes are predicated on categorization, division and stratification runs contrary to the assumption that a meaningful integration project must be based on tackling forms of inequality and exclusion between populations. However, the turn to integration is better understood as a border practice, extending beyond and contracting within the territory, merging an instrumental demand for economic utility with political concerns regarding cultural compatibility and socio-economic costs.

The turn to integration further involves a deliberately structured gap between the discursive and the material: *integration politics* involves extensive, formal and symbolic demands for loyalty and elective homogeneity in public space, while *integration regimes* organize presence and access to socio-economic rights through stratified systems of entry, status, residence and legitimacy (Back and Sinha, 2012). Social cohesion and 'security', in other words, are to be demanded and managed on the terrain of the symbolic, whether through assimilation to freshly insistent national cultures or identitarian 'ways of life' or through the 'liberal nativism' of forms of civic integrationism (De Genova, 2010: 411).

A brief summary of such political and ideological dynamics is inevitably, at best, limited, but necessary to understand the context in which 'diversity' is increasingly deployed, while also holding on to how 'diversity' is not over-determined by these developments. While the PSM 'retreat from multiculturalism' must also always be understood in terms of editorial and programmatic logics in relation to complex and fragmented (transnational) audience demand (Leurdijk, 2006; Malik, 2010) and the interplay of market pressures and institutional responses (Malik, 2013), it is also clear that powerful political discourses organized around questions of national cohesion will exert pressure on institutions with a representational mandate.

It is well established that public service broadcasters' mandate, historically, has involved a 'cultural vocation' to address and foster national identity and community, while concomitantly 'catering for minorities' (Humphreys, 1996: 117–119). In practice, however, this latter aim, at least in the form of multicultural[2] programming, has involved limited representational strategies bolted on to the central mission of the cultural reproduction of the 'national family' and its boundaries. Given this role, the turn to assertive forms of integration politics presents a field on which PSM, as national institutions, are inevitably implicated and uneasily positioned.

In his discussion of guiding images of society in the institutional monitoring of 'integration', Schinkel (2013) describes the importance of 'ocular centres', professionalized monitoring agencies that 'function as sites of observation that produce the images that feed larger social imaginaries such as a national society' and that are critical to the 'sustained plausibility of bounded concepts of "society"' (p. 1143). PSM, as national institutions, are similarly charged with reproducing this sustained plausibility and through the production of images of society on a far greater scale than the agencies Schinkel discusses. At the same time, as Gilbert (2013) has argued, understanding the

crisis of representative democracy, and of modern institutions with a representative or representational mandate, involves a reckoning with the cultural fragmentation of postmodernity, the 'world of multiple, fragmented sets of demands and values' and the difficulty in representing or projecting coherent collectivities (p. 11).

This reckoning has long been recognized in assessments of PSM, from the specific recognition of how transnational mediascapes undermined the limited and often essentializing approaches of multicultural programming (Malik, 2013) to the broader analysis of the dissolution of the regulatory, political-economic and socio-cultural conditions of PSM's national centrality (Papathanassopoulos and Negrine, 2011: 25). In general terms, then, the shift to diversity can be understood as what Håkon Larsen (2010) terms a 'legitimation strategy', which emerges in public service broadcasters' reflexive attempts to negotiate their mandate in shifting socio-economic circumstances. The next section examines these general structural and political pressures in specific media contexts.

Diversity logics in PSM institutions in Europe

According to Sarita Malik (2010), '… it is apparent that most European countries have, at some stage, had some form of multicultural programming' (p. 124). The literature of the last years indicates a concerted turn to the framework of 'diversity' in broadcast policy and initiatives, notably in the United Kingdom and Netherlands (discussed below), but also in Sweden, Finland and elsewhere in North and Western Europe (for an overview, see Horsti et al., 2014). Horsti and Hultén (2011), for example, have traced the adoption of 'vague cultural diversity' policies in YLE (Finland) and SVT (Sweden), where 'multicultural services' remained associated with the responsibilities of PSB, but where explicit references to multiculturalism had given way to ideas of 'mainstreamed diversity'.

The following survey of research, and subsequent empirical case study, is guided by the questions posed by Sara Ahmed (2012) in *On Being Included*, where she asks, '[W]hat does diversity do? What are we doing when we use the language of diversity?' (p. 1). Ahmed's genealogical question emerges, as she notes, from a body of sustained critique of 'diversity' as a depoliticizing term, a term that fulfils the political requirement to *recognize* difference while lifting difference from contextual and historical relations of racism, power and inequality, and re-arranging it as a given state of current pluralism and future promise of mutual enrichment. Yet, diversity as a brand, as a 'mission', as a set of practices, must be understood in and through institutional processes – 'the story of diversity thus becomes a story of diversity's inclusion into the terms of an institution' (Ahmed, 2012: 3).

The United Kingdom

Significant sociological differences notwithstanding, British PSB has long been regarded in Europe as influential when it 'comes to managing the cultural diversity of its various diasporic communities' and has had an impact on the formulation of European policies (Malik, 2010: 124; see also Horsti, 2009). As Malik documents, multicultural broadcasting policies between the 1970s and 1990s explicitly addressed questions of Black and

Asian representation, as well as recruitment measures aimed at shifting representations through shifting the culture of production. Following the 1990 Broadcasting Act, and in the context of intensifying multichannel competition and deregulation, the case for dedicated multicultural programming and policies was undermined. Concomitantly, the increased availability of diasporic and transnational media possibilities relativized and undermined multicultural modes of representation (Malik, 2010).

This dissatisfaction was borne out in several empirical studies. Annabelle Sreberny's (1999) *Include Me In* explored the opinions of minority ethnic media audiences who presented themselves as 'multiculturally aware', actively seeking representations of their experiences and milieu, but critical of how 'even the standard descriptions of minority ethnic audiences do not do justice to the cultural mixes in which people live their lives' (p. 3; see also Millwood Hargrave, 2002). Ben O'Loughlin's (2006) account of the development and operationalization of cultural diversity policies suggests that addressing this tendency towards 'recognizing and managing different – essentialized – identities and voices' (p. 3) was key to shifts in the mid-1990s towards a 'flowing' concept of cultural diversity. This flowing concept, however, was also shaped by policy regimes responsive to agendas other than the political demands of audiences for complex and de-essentialized portrayals.

Diversity, as an 'added value' and competitive resource in the knowledge economy, was framed as a form of social capital to be cultivated through 'plural and overlapping conversations within and across the differing political, social, cultural and economic spaces within which people in Britain are located and locate themselves' (O'Loughlin, 2006: 3). The additional goal of 'social cohesion' – through diversity as a cohering form of capital – maps onto important political developments in this period. In the aftermath of the riots in Northern England in 2001 and the political attention to 'parallel communities' (Finney and Simpson, 2008), and in the subsequent context of the 'war on terror', Britishness was elaborated as a rubric for integration to a form of civic nationalism, while recasting diversity and multiculture as *constituent features* of Britishness. While attempts to cast diversity as a threat to Britishness endured in this period (cf. Goodhart, 2004), in governmental terms, diversity was recast as a rationality of integration, a social fact and social resource when imbued with the 'bridging capital' of shared values (McGhee, 2008: 131–134; see also Fortier, 2010).

Sarita Malik's (2013) recent work has developed these themes to suggest that this imaginary of 'cultural diversity' has been replaced by a '… discursive turn to creativity in how race and racism are officially handled and driven underground, after multiculturalism' (p. 228). The elasticity of the idea of diversity is extended to mean the forms of openness that support and benefit from innovation and imagination beyond a restrictive emphasis on identities, culture or race. Reframing cultural diversity as creative diversity, Malik (2013) argues, has a 'market imperative' that advances the 'business case' for diversity and that foregrounds criteria of 'excellence' and 'quality' over representational concerns – a regulatory imperative that positions diversity-as-creativity as an important form of public value, and a social value that projects a post-racial valorization of diversity as the basis for a turn away from the 'contested ideological terrain of cultural representation':

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 all included in this intentionally culturally unspecific (and socially cohesive) creative frame. (p. 236)

Malik's critique draws out dimensions of salience also to other contexts. At a first glance, diversity seems to transcend the essentialist trap of cultural representation by foregrounding intersectionality and social complexity. Yet, addressing inadequate portrayals has been taken as a licence to erase the very conditions under which this critique of the politics of multicultural representation became necessary and to disengage from questions of representation that persist, as Malik (2013) concludes, in 'ongoing demands for fairer representation from the regularly marginalized' (p. 238). Thus, following multiculturalism and cultural diversity, creative diversity represents a new phase in the 'incremental depoliticization of race in public service broadcaster contexts' (Malik, 2013: 235). Second, as Sara Ahmed (2012) observes, 'diversity in the policy world still tends to be associated with race. The association is sticky, which means the tendency is reproduced by not being made explicit' (p. 24). Diversity policies are implemented in recognition of this 'stickiness', but by expanding the remit of diversity to all vectors of social identity and forms of creativity, they risk furthering this depoliticization.

The Netherlands

The Netherlands, like the United Kingdom, is also regarded as an influential player in shaping European approaches to cultural diversity through institutions such as the European Broadcasting Union (EBU) (Horsti, 2009). In her research on strategies of multicultural television programming, Andra Leurdijk (2006) positions the United Kingdom and the Netherlands as influential in shifting the focus from the production of discrete multicultural 'magazine' programmes to institutional missions of integrating 'diversity' across genres and formats.

Her interviews with programme-makers in the Netherlands, Finland and Sweden display a striking congruence in logics of shifting away from first-generation 'windows on their world' and 'explaining minorities to majorities' programmes to approaches that, as with the 'multiple conversations' model discussed by O'Loughlin, seek to integrate 'cross-cultural' perspectives into financially sustainable mainstream, popular programming. Her summary of the rationale for these changes also recalls the shift to 'flowing cultural diversity' at the expense of a political recognition of social conditions and racialized experiences discerned by Malik:

(Previous practices of multicultural programming) dealt increasingly with social and political issues concerning inequality, injustice, racism … the programmes functioned as a sort of compensation for the under-representation or mis-representation of minority perspectives in mainstream programming. In trying to gain larger audiences, stressing the universality of human emotions and experiences became the next important strand in multicultural programming … in this interaction of media logic and conceptualizations of multiculturalism the favoured model of multiculturalism is a cosmopolitan one, a version in which cultural and

ethnic identities are not seen as fixed characteristics of people but as flexible constructions that can be explored in a self-reflexive and playful way. (Leurdijk, 2006: 41–42)

However, as Isabel Awad (2012) documents in her analysis of research on minority audiences in the Netherlands, this idea of the flexible individual co-exists and is instrumentalized in a political context where their cultural and ethnic identities are seen as fixed and where 'assimilationist policies treat culture as something that is lost or gained in a zero-sum game' (p. 170). Awad and Engelbert (2014) suggest that the combination of a concerted public discourse attacking multiculturalism and pushing assimilative integration, combined with populist attacks on Netherlands Public Broadcasting (NPO), the Dutch public service broadcaster, have contributed to the elucidation of a 'new style' that organizes diversity in terms of problematic differences (associated with 'non-autochthonous' differences) and acceptable 'autochthonous' differences that in fact comprise and stimulate national culture. However, in the context of challenges to PSB's market position and political legitimacy, 'it would be unwarranted to argue that it is the public broadcaster's aim to defend a dominant notion of Dutch culture or … to support the agenda of right-wing political parties. What is apparent in the broadcaster's changing approach to diversity … is the system's own struggle to legitimize and thus secure its own place in Dutch society' (Awad and Engelbert, 2014: 99).

Ireland: Accelerating to diversity

Imaginaries for the governance of difference were intensively produced and mediated by institutions in Ireland in a period of rapid and unsustainable economic growth loosely termed the 'Celtic Tiger', from the late 1990s to 2007–2008. This 'boom' attracted the significant inward movement of both diasporic Irish and variegated and stratified migration from outside of the European Union (EU) as well as the 2004 EU accession states. According to the Central Statistics Office, 224,000 citizens from other countries were living in Ireland in 2002, rising to 557,000 (12% of the population) in 2011. In contrast to the markedly comparable 'retreat from multiculturalism' narrative and anti-immigrant populism found elsewhere in Western Europe, public discourse in Ireland was shaped by a highly contextual form of celebratory multiculturalism. Discussions of 'new' multiculture were routinely narrated as a historical shift from a site of emigration to immigration, with 'migrants' positioned as evidence of economic, but also cultural, transformation (Mac Éinrí, 2009: 50).

In terms of media representation, research in the late 1990s mapped out a concerted attempt to racialize asylum-seeking in ways congruent with European dynamics. However, by the mid-2000s post-EU accession – and after the concerted invisibilisation of asylum-seekers (Lentin and McVeigh, 2006) – it was far more prevalent to encounter versions of what Browne and Onyejelem (2007) described as the 'multiculturalist persuasion of white Irish audiences' to 'patronizingly ascribe cultural vibrancy to every African woman who buys a yam on Parnell Street'[3] (p. 191). While many migrants experienced everyday forms of harassment, and the state racism of direct provision/deportation, and stratified and highly restrictive forms of work and residence permits and socio-economic rights endured (Loyal, 2011), these experiences and issues were

under-reported in a context wedded to the projection of a national state of progressive diversity so central to semiotic labour in a globalized, late capitalist economy.

From the mid-2000s, state integration strategy framed diversity as a resource, reflecting an instrumentalist economic reductionism central to a 'national interest' discourse (Loyal, 2011) and also as a basis of governmentality explicitly positioned as having been reflexively conditioned by European mistakes with state multiculturalism. Integration policy – such as it existed in anything other than piecemeal, discursive form (Boucher, 2008) – was not framed as an insistence on conformity with or adoption of shared values, as elsewhere in Western Europe, but positioned cohesion as a product of overtly neoliberal modes of responsibilizing 'self-sufficient and autonomous migrants' (Gray, 2006: 130).

During this period, the national public service broadcaster, Raidió Teilifís Éireaan (RTÉ, 2008), was acutely reflexive as an 'ocular centre', extending its responsibilities to pluralism under the 2005 Public Service Charter to incorporate interculturalism as an indicator of its corporate social responsibility:

> RTÉ will be inclusive and respectful of the cultural difference and richness that exist within the population of Ireland. It will provide the diversity of output necessary to present an understanding of the cultural and ethnic backgrounds of the country's inhabitants, foster an understanding and appropriate valuing of different cultures and create a sense of cultural cohesion within our society. (p. 26)

Explicitly drawing on the narrative of emigrant-to-immigrant society, RTÉ (2007) positioned its commitment to interculturalism as a legitimation strategy whereby media have the power to play 'both a decisive and responsible role in determining attitudes and levels of understanding between communities and cultures' (p. 52). This focus on interculturalism emerged from an internal process focused on constructing the 'correct' discourse to capture new social realities and the assumed, integrative role of PSB in shaping attitudes, fostering understanding and cultivating an 'appropriate valuing' of other cultures. Yet, it cannot be solely coincidental that the broadcaster ceased including updates on intercultural strategy in its annual reports from 2009 on, a year that saw the intensification of political-economic crisis in Ireland, the close association of recession with the 'return of emigration' (Lentin, 2012: 9–13), a low-level but insistent causal association of immigrant presence with recession (Goodwin-White, 2013: 216–217) and a governmental insistence that integration had ceased to be a priority as 'migrants' ceased to be made visible (Moreo, 2012).

The downgrading of interculturalism in policy documents is both congruent with and disjointed from the rapid progress through guiding editorial discourses for programme-making. RTÉ's programmes accelerated through approaches accumulated in the United Kingdom and the Netherlands over a far longer period of time, making multicultural magazine programmes in both radio and television in the early 2000s and jettisoning them for the mixture of documentary, reality formats and transversal editorial options described by Leurdijk (2006).

Their accelerated progress through institutional discourses that have evolved in other European PSBs over a far longer period of time is mirrored in the programme provision

during this period. A significant dimension of this in both radio and television involved jettisoning multicultural magazine formats – or the so-called niche programmes – for a transversal emphasis on *diversity* and the integration of relevant perspectives, issues and voices into hybrid formats and mainstream programmes. In the early 2000s, 'multicultural programming' was added to the programme department, Cláracha Gaeilge (programming in the Irish language), Multiculture and Education. After 2005, much of this programming was broadcast under the 'super-strand' – or programme category – of *Diversity*. Reality formats examining different aspects of social experience sought to foreground their engagement with 'diversity' – understood in practice as anyone of a foreign background – and could be subject to the critiques accumulated from the contexts previously examined – of dissipating the experience accumulated in 'multicultural programming' and of depoliticizing the experience of racialized and minority difference, while diversity is nevertheless deployed in recognition of the 'stickiness' of race.

Conclusion

The case studies considered here testify to the insistent force of a 'retreat from multiculturalism', while concomitantly illustrating that the adoption of diversity frameworks in PSB is not determined simply by political shifts – no matter how stark – in national public spheres. The shift to 'flowing' imaginaries of diversity works in and through strategies of competitive repositioning and audience competition in fragmented markets and where diversity as a resource and value represents the valorizing modality in which difference is evaluated in late capitalist societies.

Nevertheless, diversity, suspended between a banal all-inclusivity and the 'stickiness' of race, is also deployed by institutions seeking to position themselves in political contexts fraught with demands for cohesion, often understood in terms of homogeneity. For this reason, it is necessary to recognize that the generic codes, narrative structures and dominant frameworks of diversity approaches may work to further integrationist logics.

In 2011, for example, RTÉ's main diversity-related format was called *Now It's Personal*,[4] an observational contact-hypothesis format that invited 'controversial' media columnists and commentators to live with those they insistently problematize. In the second programme, the 'Muslim community' hosted the *Irish Independent* journalist, Ian O'Doherty. At least formally, this programme built on the key shifts towards 'plural overlapping conversations' and drawing on and building up diversity as a form of cohesive social capital. And, as Nikunen (2013) argues, the bundling of diversity issues into reality formats need not involve downplaying the significance of being included in the 'popular narratives of mainstream television' (p. 315). Yet, the mode of inclusion proffered in *Now It's Personal* through these stable diversity elements is a familiar one – an invitation to account for every transnational ill that can be associated with Islam. The very first frame of the programme shows planes slamming into the twin towers, with a voiceover sample from (presumably) a preacher exhorting that 'Islam is coming to Europe!', followed immediately by a shot of O'Doherty at his journalist's work desk, watching an 'Islamic' protest somewhere in the 'Islamic world', and providing the voiceover: 'Islam, the religion of peace. And if you disagree, we'll kill you'. It then further cuts to preview snippets of O'Doherty's interactions with Muslims in Ireland, where

he asks one man if he condemns Osama Bin Laden, tells another that he finds halal meat disgusting and so forth.

Thus, while the formal conventions of the programme promise the journey of mutual discovery central to the observational 'swapping' genre, the narrative immediately centres the 'contrarian' O'Doherty as empowered to conduct a 'trial by presumption', asking questions from a position that assumes 'this is our world, you're just living in it' (Younge, 2004). By immediately indexing the participants to such events as the 9/11 attacks, the programme replicates the dynamics of 'integration debates' discerned in research by the Institute of Race Relations (Fekete, 2008), which showed how international events are used not only to frame domestic discussions but to seek a 'reaction' from 'local Muslims' in a loop that, whatever their response, confirms that what happens abroad must be of significance for what happens here and related to their presence here.

Further critique along these lines is important, for the institutional shifts discussed suggest that diversity frameworks have intensified not only as a declaration of the end of the problem of multiculturalism but also as a declaration of the end of the problem of representation. Yet, a brief example such as this one suggests just how readily integrationist imaginaries can be furthered through the practices of diversity in part constructed to evade them. Diversity frameworks have become part of the story of PSM as a widespread response to conjunctural tensions between the political insistence on cohesion and the social realities of complexity. It remains to be examined whether diversity initiatives in PSM constitute not just a post-multicultural depoliticization of difference and equality but also come to represent an institutional re-formation of integration politics.

Funding

Notes

1. Given the length of this article, it focuses on diversity as a dimension of editorial practices and institutional mission and not of the evidently related areas of employment.
2. A broader consideration of cultural diversity in relation to minority language provision is not included here.
3. Parnell Street, in Dublin's north inner city, is historically an area of trading markets and, in recent years, an area of high density for migrant-run businesses.
4. The episode can be viewed at https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ew7IoMl6Nzw (accessed 13 February 2014).

References

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

Awad I (2012) Desperately constructing ethnic audiences: Anti-immigration discourses and minority audience research in the Netherlands. *European Journal of Communication* 28(2): 168–182.

Awad I and Engelbert J (2014) Between diversity and pluriformity: The 'new style' of Dutch broadcasting. In: Horsti K, Hultén G and Titley G (eds) *National Conversations: Cultural Diversity and Public Service Media in Europe*. London: Intellect Ltd, pp.85–104.

Back L and Sinha S (2012) New hierarchies of belonging. *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 15(2): 139–154.

Boucher G (2008) Ireland's lack of a coherent integration policy. *Translocations* 3(1): 5–28.

Bowen JR (2011) Europeans against multiculturalism. *Boston Review*, 1 July.

Brahm Levy G (2009) What is living and what is dead in multiculturalism. *Ethnicities* 9(1): 75–93.

Browne H and Onyejelem C (2007) Textualising radio practice: sounding out a changing Ireland. In: Grossman A and O'Brien A (ed) *Projecting Migration: Transcultural Documentary Practice*. London: Wallflower Press, pp. 183–198.

Cottle S (ed.) (2000) *Ethnic Minorities and the Media*. Basingstoke: Open University Press.

De Genova N (2010) Migration and race in Europe: The transatlantic metastases of a post-colonial cancer. *European Journal of Social Theory* 13(3): 405–419.

Fekete L (2008) *Integration, Islamophobia and Civil Rights in Europe*. London: Institute for Race Relations.

Finney N and Simpson L (2008) *Sleepwalking to Segregation? Challenging Myths about Race and Migration*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Fleras A (2009) *The Politics of Multiculturalism: Multicultural Governance in Comparative Perspective*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Fortier AM (2010) Proximity by design? Affective citizenship and the management of unease. *Citizenship Studies* 14(1): 17–30.

Ghorashi HT, Hylland Eriksen T and Alghasi S (2009) *Paradoxes of Cultural Recognition*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Gilbert J (2013) *Common Ground: Democracy and Collectivity in an Age of Individualism*. London: Pluto Press.

Goodhart D (2004) Too diverse? *Prospect Magazine*, 20 February.

Goodwin-White J (2013) Context, scale and generation: The construction of belonging. In: Gilmartin M and White A (eds) *Migrations: Ireland in a Global World*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, pp.213–227.

Gray B (2006) "Migrant integration policy: a nationalist fantasy of management and control?" *Translocations*.

Hage G (1998) *White Nation: Fantasies of White Supremacy in a Multicultural Society*. London: Pluto Press.

Hewitt R (2005) *White Backlash and the Politics of Multiculturalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Horsti K (2009) Antiracist and multicultural discourses in European Public Service Broadcasting. *Communication, Culture & Critique* 2(3): 339–360.

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

Horsti K, Hultén G and Titley G (eds) (2014) *National Conversations: Cultural Diversity and Public Service Media in Europe*. London: Intellect Ltd.

Humphreys PJ (1996) *Mass Media and Media Policy in Western Europe*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Ivison D (2010) Introduction: Multiculturalism as a public ideal. In: Ivison D (ed.) *The Ashgate Research Companion to Multiculturalism*. Farnham: Ashgate, pp.1–18.

Kofman E (2005) Citizenship, migration and the reassertion of national identity. *Citizenship Studies* 9(5): 453–467.

Larsen H (2010) Legitimation strategies of public service broadcasters: The divergent rhetoric in Norway and Sweden. *Media, Culture & Society* 32(2): 267–283.

Lentin A and Titley G (2011) *The Crises of Multiculturalism: Racism in a Neoliberal Age*. London: Zed Books.

Lentin R (2012) Immigration in Ireland and migrant-led activism. In: Lentin R and Moreo E (eds) *Migrant Activism and Integration from Below*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp.42–71.

Lentin R and McVeigh R (2006) *After Optimism? Ireland, Racism and Globalisation*. Dublin: Metro Éireann.

Leurdijk A (2006) In search of common ground: Strategies of multicultural producers in Europe. *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 9(1): 25–46.

Loyal S (2011) *Understanding Immigration in Ireland*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

McGhee D (2008) *The End of Multiculturalism? Terrorism, Integration and Human Rights*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.

Malik S (2010) From multicultural programming to diasporic television: Situating the UK in a European context. *Media History* 16(1): 123–128.

Malik S (2013) 'Creative Diversity': UK public service broadcasting after multiculturalism. *Popular Communication: The International Journal of Media and Culture* 11: 227–241.

Millwood Hargrave A (2002) *Multicultural Broadcasting; Concept and Reality*. London: Broadcasting Standards Commission.

Moreo E (2012) On visibility and invisibility: Migrant practices between regimes of representation and self-determination. In: Lentin R and Moreo E (eds) *Migrant Activism and Integration from Below*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, pp.72–94.

McÉinrí P (2009) If I wanted to go there I wouldn't start from here: re-imagining a multi-ethnic nation. In: Ging D, Cronin M and Kirby P (ed) *Transforming Ireland: Challenges, critiques, resources*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, pp. 38–51.

Nikunen K (2013) Difference in reality: Ethnic minorities and the boundaries of the nation in reality TV in Finland. *Popular Communication* 11: 303–317.

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

Papathanassopoulos S and Negrine RM (2011) *European Media*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Philips A (2007) Multiculturalism without Culture. Princeton N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Philips A and Saharso S (2008) The rights of women and the crisis of multiculturalism. *Ethnicities* 8(3): 2–12.

Pitcher B (2009) *The Politics of Multiculturalism: Race and Racism in Contemporary Britain*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Raidió Teilifís Éireann (RTÉ) (2007) RTE Annual Report. Available at: http://www.rte.ie/about/en/policies-and-reports/annual-reports/

Raidió Teilifís Éireann (RTÉ) (2008) RTE Annual Report. Available at: http://www.rte.ie/about/en/policies-and-reports/annual-reports/

Schinkel W (2013) The imagination of 'society' in measurements of immigrant integration. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 36(7): 1142–1161.

Sreberny A (1999) *Include me in: Rethinking Ethnicity on Television*. London: Broadcasting Standards Commission.

Vertovec S and Wessendorf S (2009) *Assessing the backlash against multiculturalism in Europe*. MMG Working Paper 09-04. Munich: Max Planck Institute.

Younge G (2004) No offence, but why are white men so aggressive? *The Guardian*, 1 December. Available at: http://www.theguardian.com/world/2004/dec/01/race.islamandbritain (accessed 27 September 2014)

Author biography

Gavan Titley's research focuses on racism, discourse and politics in Europe. He is the author (with Alana Lentin) of *The Crises of Multiculturalism: Racism in a Neoliberal Age* (Zed Books, 2011) and is currently writing *Racism and Media* for Sage Publications.