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ABSTRACT

The RadioHead, long-time member, user, blog participant and listener of CBC Radio 3 (R3) describes the music service as “a place where I will find the nurturing that I need” (TheRadioHead June 2010). This “place” can be found on the website http://radio3.cbc.ca and is further located through daily live webcasts (that are also broadcast on satellite radio), weekly podcasts, music streams and on-demand tracks from thousands of Canadian artists. Through the blogs that accompany the live webcasts, R3 users interact with one another and create what they experience as “community” and “family.”

This thesis uses R3 as a case study for examining the ways in which radio and cyberspace intersect, especially in the context of a “networked public” (boyd 2011) where relationships and fandom are solidified and yet also “distributed” (Baym 2007). In order to argue for a conception of radio online that is distinct from other music services online, I put forward the concept of “radio cyberspace.” In the case of R3, this necessitates an awareness of the role of the CBC in Canada, an acknowledgement of the goals of public media, and an analysis of how radio is perceived and used. While the relationship building of sites such as R3 appear to meet the goals of public media, the commercial affiliations of social network sites puts into question how these relationships enter into the realm of marketability and privatization.
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INTRODUCTION

Although it is often remarked on as a technology of the past, radio is an intensely present medium. As Jody Berland (2009) states, “radio is mutually interdependent with the daily life for which it provides a soundtrack” (204). Alarm clocks are set to national and provincial news stations, waking sleepers to headlines, sports and weather. Cyclists bike to work with their earphones bringing them giddy morning show hosts answering calls and telling dim-witted jokes in between new pop songs. Dishes get washed and meals get prepared to the spontaneous and rough playlists of community radio, with their random collage of ads from whatever community event or business is willing to support it. Motorists roar down the highway to the pre-programmed and genre-centred stations of their satellite radio. In the middle of major protests, a pirate radio station squirms into the sketchy leftover call numbers of the radio dial to warn of police tactics. Truck drivers greet each other over shortwave radio as they pass each other on the highway. Rural radio stations broadcast wolf sightings and community bingos. New radio sets by online radio companies allow self-programming with thumbs up and thumbs down buttons to personalize streams of seemingly infinite numbers of songs. Earbuds plug into computers while the webpage for CBC Radio 3 (R3) is hidden behind spreadsheets and other documents, playing Canadian music curated into live shows and genre streams.

All of these radio experiences share elements, with perhaps the most integral being the constitution of space through the use of wireless technologies. Radio – whether broadcasting or webcasting – enables a narrative of the listener and the listeners’ surroundings that is both symbolic and material, with spatial consequences that stabilize and challenge conventional understanding of the world. Songs and voices tell us where
we are and where we might want to be. The boundaries of towns, cities, and countries are defined – or broken down – by the reach of broadcast signals or the capabilities of IP addresses to access certain websites.

Why R3?

Growing up primarily in rural Saskatchewan, radio played a significant role in my upbringing, with the CBC as the chosen accompaniment for daily drives to and from town, as Saturday night entertainment on the farm and as hourly news source. My discovery of R3 was very similar to many of the fans that I interviewed in that it seamlessly connected my second-hand experiences of the CBC from my childhood to my own musical tastes and technology uses as an adult. As my experience with the R3 website coincided with my studies of interactive media, my curiosity was piqued – what made the radio experience I was having as an adult similar or different to what I had experienced as a child?

Berland (2009) shows in North of Empire: Essays on Cultural Technologies of Space that “‘Radiophonic’ space is not one thing: it emerges from a particular conjunction of music cultures, sound recording technologies, modes of dissemination, and techniques of administrative and demographic production” (16). Although R3 does not use terrestrial broadcasting to transmit its programming, it sonically functions as a radio station through live streams that are webcast from the site radio3.cbc.ca (with a minimal, and now subsidiary, satellite radio component). In addition to the live streams, the website’s other features, such as blogs, contests and profile pages (See Appendix E, 1 Throughout this thesis, I refer to R3 as a “site,” which includes the meaning “website,” but also refers to R3 as the location of my investigation in a broader sense.
Figure 1), enable and encourage interactivity itself to become a primary method of engagement with the station. Evoking MTV’s former slogan, user Garry Benfold\(^2\) frames the centrality of this interactivity, stating that “the CBC, in the form of Radio 3, have \([sic]\) taken the listening experience and turned it around so that our input is their output” (Benfold October 2010).

Visiting CBC Radio 3 in 2011, whether from desktop computer, laptop or iPhone®, one will gain access to over 125,000 on-demand tracks from over 27,000 Canadian artists, four genre-based music streams, nine podcasts, extensive concert listings and thousands of user playlists.\(^3\) At the centre of it all are the daily live webcasts featuring dynamic hosts and music drawn from those 27,000 artists represented on the site. Increasingly central to these shows are the blog posts that accompany them, and most specifically, the user commentary on these posts. In 2010 alone, there were over 145,000 comments on the R3 blog, averaging 400 per day (Pratt 2011). Given the expanse of R3’s new media presence, the substantial social interactivity which it facilitates, and the degree of intimacy that users express in regards to their R3 experiences, the site provokes important questions about the social, political and cultural implications of cultural technologies in 2011. This thesis translates Berland’s concept of radiophonic space to one of “radio cyberspace” in the context of R3’s unique conjunction of music cultures, social

\(^2\) As can be noted on the consent form (Appendix C), users were given the option of either using their given name or their chosen R3 pseudonym for my research (the third option, “another pseudonym” was not selected by any interviewees). Throughout this thesis, names will be used in accordance with these selections. Also note that the title of this thesis draws on a quote from Benfold: “When I get there I tend to live there” (Benfold October 2010).

\(^3\) A quick note on representation of Canada’s two official languages: while there are French bands included on the site and revered by listeners (for instance, Quebec band Karkwa won the Polaris music prize in 2010), CBC Radio 3 is an English-language site. Their “sister site,” Bande à part (located at http://www.bandeapart.fm/#/), offers many of the same elements (musician uploads, podcasts, streams, etc.) in French. It would be a worthy project to investigate the relationships between the two sites as well explore how Bande à part functions (or does not function) as radio cyberspace.
networking, sound recordings, music-sharing technologies and administrative and demographic production.

The website, boasting the slogan, “The Home of Independent Canadian Music,” does not have the primary objective of creating community, but rather of disseminating the music of Canadian artists through an effective and interactive digital platform (O’Neill 2006; Paolozzi November 2010; Pratt November 2010; Sahota 2006). Although online music communities have been studied extensively (Aitken 2007; Albury 1999; Baym 2007; Hallet and Hintz 2009; Hendy 2000, Hujanen and Lowe 2003; Humphries 2004; Keith 2010; Kibby 2006), as have the effects of globalization on ideas of home (Blunt and Dowling 2006; Chapman and Hockey 1999; Heidegger 1993 [1978]; Lasch 1977), these analyses have not substantially studied how people perceive sites online as home spaces (despite playfulness with the term “home page” [eg. Kibby 2006]). Given that R3 identifies itself on the site as the “Home of Independent Canadian Music” in conjunction with users describing the site as “home” and fellow users as “family” and “friends,” it provides a provocative example of place-making and intimate connection online. The spatialization of R3 and the relationships formed in and from that space occur as a direct result of the design of the site and the music that is posted, programmed and played on the site. The question that arises, then, concerns the ways that the interactive use(s) of R3 work to produce ideas of community online. Thus, this thesis will explore

---

4 To be clear, the official slogan for CBC Radio 3 (the one that is used “on the air”) is “Breaking New Sound.” As my research is more focused on blog activity than programming, I use the website slogan rather than the audio slogan as my main point of reference. However, the “Breaking New Sound” slogan is far from innocent, highlighted by Lisa Christiansen’s invocation of the frontier myth (“breaking new ground”) in describing how R3 pioneers new music (Christiansen November 2010). For more on the frontier myth in the Canadian context, see Furness 1999. The mentality of R3 as representing a superior sensibility and charting new territories can be seen not only in the “Breaking New Sound” slogan, but also in the release of 2010 postcards that pronounce: “Proof that Darwin Had It Right – CBC Radio 3 – The Evolution of Radio.” Not insignificantly, a very large version of this poster hangs prominently in the R3 office.
the following questions: What are the ways in which “The Home of Independent Canadian Music” translates into a home for the listeners of this music? In what ways does the interactive use of R3 work to produce ideas of community online? And how does this formation of community connect R3 to the social history of radio?

Radio: In Canada, in scholarship and online

Radio as a cultural technology has been explored in depth by a wide range of scholars for decades (Baade 2006; Barlow 1988; Berland 2009; Carpini 1995; Vipond 1992). The more I think and read about it, the more it becomes clear that R3 reveals important convergences between radio scholarship and research that studies the social and cultural formations of music scenes and communities (Aitken 2007; Grenier 1990; Straw 1996), as well as work on how those scenes and communities transfer to, and are affected by, online environments (Albury 1999; Baym 2007; Kibby 2006). However, ...


6 In addition to the scholars listed, there is a significant history (and present) of radio art that addresses the same questions of how radio functions as a cultural technology. Indeed, as Diana Augaitis (1994) puts it, “radio as an artistic medium …calls art back to its social reality” (10). For a Canadian perceptive up to 1994, see Augaitis and Lander (1994). For the American perceptive on radio art from 1980-1994, see Apple and Thorton (1996). In 1993, Jacki Apple stated that radio art is “art for the next century” (309) — Anna Friz thoroughly teases this out in her 2011 dissertation, “The Radio of the Future Redux: Rethinking Transmission Through Experiments in Radio Art,” wherein she argues that “if radio to date has largely acted as an accomplice in the industrialization of communications, art radio and radio art continue to destabilize this process” (http://gradworks.umi.com/NR/80/NR80521.html). See also: Friz (2010); Kennedy (2010); Orwell (1993); Rodgers (2010, 216-234); Roos (2010); Schafer (1993).

7 Drawing most heavily on Will Straw, I define “scene” as a flexible space and sociality that involves “informal organization, implicit labor [sic] and struggles for legitimacy” (Straw 1999) in which “minor tastes and habits perpetuate, supported by networks of small-scale institutions” (Straw 2001, 255).

8 The term “community” does not refer to one thing, and takes different shapes in different circumstances. Lee Komito (1998) provides helpful descriptions of some of the key ways that communities are defined: moral (shared ethical system), normative (agreed-upon rules and behaviour), proximate (shared space) and/or fluid (constantly redefined, but acting collectively) (106). I tend towards Benedict Anderson’s (2006 [1983]) suggestion that even in situations of face-to-face contact, communities are imagined — the concept of comradery binds communities, rather than any inherent predilection towards being bonded together (6). For more discussion on the definition of community, see also: Aitken (2007), Parks (2011), Song (2009).
although publications about online music communities often refer to “online radio” or “web radio” (Albury 1999; Hallet and Hintz 2009; Hendy 2000; Hujanen and Lowe 2003; Humphries 2004; Keith 2010) there is neither consistent usage of the term nor a breakdown of how it is enacted online. Most distinctly, there seems to be no discussion of how social meanings are created through radio online. That is, if radio has been an influential cultural technology for the last century, what are the ways that people affect and are affected by radio in its forms online? R3 provides a prime case study for exploring this question, as it has evolved from a terrestrial radio show and, as part of the CBC, is intimately connected to the social history of radio in Canada.

In his insightful book *Radio, Morality and Culture: Britain, Canada and the United States, 1919-1945*, Robert Fortner (2005) outlines both the national identity crisis that radio provoked in Canada (“America could enter the Canadian home at will” [158]), as well as the hopefulness that it provided for creating relevance for Canada on an international scale. This dichotomy was present in debates between public and private radio in all three of the countries that Fortner covers in his book, creating tensions between modernity and civilization, materialism and tradition, past and future (17). Prior to a national radio strategy in Canada, the United Kingdom had established radio as a “public service” and the United States had invested in radio as a pursuit of “public interests” (therefore opening it up to commerce). Influenced by its colonial connection to the United Kingdom and its neighbouring relationship to the United States, Canada approached radio with a “hybrid philosophy to justify forms of state intervention (though not entirely successfully) in broadcasting” (Fortner 2005, 7). Fortner quotes a piece by J. Stuart Richardson from the *Northern News* in 1930 entitled “Radio—Its Development
and Uses,” in which Richardson stated that radio “has annihilated time and space, yet its possibilities have only just been touched. Radio, because of its power of international communication, is fast making the world one neighborhood [sic]” (quoted in Fortner 2005, 153). This comment foreshadows McLuhan’s “global village” (1995) and points out how the perception of radio use in its earliest days were associated with many of the same expectations as people have for cyberspace (Wilbur [2000] 2006).

Michele Hilmes (2002) provocatively addresses the status of radio in scholarship by claiming that, until recently, “radio lay outside the consensus of history” (6). As the study of popular culture gained ground in the academy in the 1960s, so too did television within popular culture itself. Therefore, government and corporate interests in funding research were more available for film and television studies than for radio, already considered archaic (Hilmes 2002; Lewis & Booth 1990). As Hilmes puts it, “neither radio’s aurality nor its ‘authorless,’ lowbrow, commercialized status allowed it to benefit from film’s legitimating strategy” (6). But the supposed diminished importance of radio within the context of visual culture has certain counterpoints. For instance, in many non-Western countries, radio has continued to be a dominant means of communication and therefore is a more frequently studied part of popular culture (Hendy 2000; Hilmes and Loviglio 2002; Kidd et al. 2009; Sposato and Smith 2005). Further, although radio might not be a media heavyweight in comparison to TV and the internet, Peter Lewis (2000) states that “in advanced industrial societies there is a radical disjunction: radio is everybody’s private possession, yet no one recognizes it in public” (161). What both Hilmes and Lewis outline in their work is that, although in relation to its significant social

---

9 The titles (and content) of two important radio studies books from the 1990s directly address the absence of radio studies: Radio: The Forgotten Medium (Pease & Dennis 1995) and The Invisible Medium: Public, Commercial and Community Radio (Lewis & Booth 1990).
impact radio has been largely ignored in scholarship, there has been a resurgence of work on radio in the last decade.\textsuperscript{10} Hilmes attributes this to a shift of focus that legitimatizes “low” forms of media and entertainment as well as the development of a new method of historiography that allows for multiple (media) stories to be told (8-12).

But whereas much of the recent resurgence in radio studies focuses on radio history, there is still a gap in considering contemporary uses and meanings of radio. A clear indication of the attitude toward contemporary formats of radio is the name change of the \textit{Journal of Radio Studies} to the \textit{Journal of Radio & Audio Media} in 2008. It seems to be the case that historical accounts are easily considered to be about “radio,” but once work on contemporary instances of radio are discussed, it is also about “something else.” This further encourages a separation between “radio as past” and everyday experiences. The places where radio converges with new media are certainly loaded with all of the complexity and banality of life online, but these convergences do not necessarily fundamentally change the most pervasive social element of radio – that it accompanies our daily life (sometimes to the point of banality). As Lewis suggested above, radio is not only present but ever-present. Radio cyberspace does not refute this point, especially as our offline lives more seamlessly blend with our lives online.

Simon Frith (1988) closes his chapter “The Pleasures of the Hearth – The Making of BBC Light Entertainment” with the statement that “what was (and is) enjoyable is the sense that you too can become significant by turning on the switch” (42). This implication of the listener into media production has been integral to the success of radio

\textsuperscript{10} Lewis (2000) further argues that radio has been ignored in newspaper reviews, made inaccessible in archives and suffered from other restraints for enthusiasts, interested listeners and academics alike. In his words, “…although words are what radio uses above all else, it is as if there are no words to describe what radio is about” (164).
and television and is further enhanced with the interactive capabilities of the internet. Frith states in relation to the early days of radio (particularly of the BBC) that “what was on offer was access to a community, a language, a set of radio manners. To become a BBC listener was to join a club” (42). Similarly, Grant Lawrence, host of R3’s most popular show and podcast, stated that “I’ve often said CBC Radio 3 is like a secret club” (quoted in Sahota 2006, 80). A sense of belonging has clearly functioned as stimulus for radio programming for almost one hundred years, carrying through from terrestrial to cyber formats. Alla-Fossi et al. (2008) comment that “the infiltration of radio-like services into practically every new delivery platform can be seen as an evidence of a ‘virus-like’ capability of transformation and proof of the vitality of polymorphic radio media” (7). The CBC has been energetic in adopting new delivery platforms throughout its seventy-five year history, and R3 demonstrates how these evolutions of the service have both maintained and transformed radio media use in Canada.

What is R3?

In Mary Vipond’s (1992) singularly thorough book on the earliest years of broadcasting in Canada, Listening In: The First Decade of Canadian Broadcasting 1922-1932, she argues that those beginning years involved “complex interrelationships not only between but within categories of institutions, audience, and content” (xv). In addition to applying to the organizational body that umbrellas R3, this statement also applies to R3 itself. Daniel J. Czitrom (1992) states in Media and the American Mind that new media are “a matrix of institutional development, popular responses and cultural content that ought to be understood as a product of dialectical tensions, of opposing
forces and tendencies clashing and evolving over time…” (quoted in Vipond 1992, xv).

With this in mind, R3 can be seen as a conjunction of the complex, and continually evolving, priorities of the CBC, the conflicts of public and private media, as well as the reactions of users (and non-users) to its presence in their media environment.

R3 is the outcome of two major CBC incentives in the 1990s: to reach younger audiences and to explore using new media for CBC content (O’Neill 2006; Sahota 2006). As suggested by its name, R3 was originally conceived as a third broadcasting arm of the CBC, decades after British and Australian public radio created such youth-oriented networks.¹¹ The CBC proposed the new service as a “Youth Radio Network” to the Canadian Radio-television and Telecommunications Commission (CRTC) in October 1998, also releasing it as part of their strategic plan *Our Commitment to Canadians, the CBC’s Strategic Plan* in March 1999, in advance of the CRTC license renewal hearings in that same year (Beatty 1999). In the CBC annual report of 1998-1999, this Youth Radio Network was described as a “unique niche radio service, [that] would provide music and other programming designed to appeal to a younger audience, which is not currently served by commercial or public radio in Canada” (Canadian Broadcasting Corporation 1999). With the plans for R3 to be a completely separate terrestrial radio station, this meant that shows (and their budgets) already targeted to a younger  

---

¹¹ The BBC in England grappled with appealing to youth from its inception onward. See Baade 2006 for a thorough analysis of the choices that surrounded broadcasting dance music, and what kinds of dance music, before, during and after World War II. Radio One was re-established as a distinctly youth station in 1967 in response to pirate radio insurgence, taking over the market and audience of Radio London. See Chapman 1990; Yoder 2002. Triple J in Australia had its origins as a radical Sydney radio station, expanding to a national youth network in 1989. See: Albury 1999.
demographic on Radio Two (such as Brave New Waves and RadioSonic) were engulfed by the Youth Radio Network initiative.\textsuperscript{12}

In response to CBC’s proposal for the Youth Radio Network, the CRTC expressed skepticism as to why the goals presented could not be fulfilled by the already established stations.\textsuperscript{13} At the same hearings, the CRTC exempted new media broadcasting from regulation (O’Neill 2006).\textsuperscript{14} This created both pressure to maintain the CBC brand within a new open digital media environment, as well as opportunities for exploration of online services. The lack of support from the CRTC for a new terrestrial radio station, as well as the openings provided by the deregulation of cyberspace, led to a rethinking of the Youth Radio Network. Thus, in 2000, instead of launching as a separate FM radio station from Radio One and Two, R3 was launched as web convergence project.\textsuperscript{15} On a blog post on March 19th 2006, John Paolozzi (web producer, blog editor and community manager of R3) reflected on the position of R3 as an experiment in new media for the CBC, stating that “Radio 3 is something of a lab for the rest of CBC \textit{sic}. Already the Mothercorp is

\textsuperscript{12}For more on CBC’s initial online presence, see O’Neill 2006. For the origins of R3 and The Youth Radio Network, see Sahota 2006.

\textsuperscript{13}As Sahota puts it, the CRTC concerns can be paraphrased with the question, “Why…was a separate radio service required when it was ostensibly possible to reach the same audience through a skillful redress of core Radio One programming and promotional strategies?” (Sahota 2006, 64).

\textsuperscript{14}At that time, it was believed that because online services were primarily text-based, they did not fall within the jurisdiction of Canadian “Tele-communications.” See O’Neill, 2006. It is interesting to note this attitude in contrast with the policy of the CRTC that “To hold a radio license in Canada is to hold a public trust” (quoted in Grenier 1990, 222). Whereas all airwaves in Canada are public property, the internet creates considerably more roadblocks for governmental control. As has been seen in recent years, corporate control has greatly influenced the way in which the CRTC has begun to engage with new media. CRTC 2010; the blog of Michael Geist. \textit{Michael Geist –Blog}, http://www.michaelgeist.ca. It was not until 2006 that the CRTC released it’s “Revised Digital Radio Policy” (CRTC 2006).

\textsuperscript{15}As an example of the recognition by the CBC of the importance of digital expansion (with an eye on BBC Radio One’s digitalization in 1995), Perrin Beatty, CBC CEO from 1995-1999, told the CRTC in 1999 that “as our colleagues in other countries understand very clearly, no public broadcaster can remain relevant or continue to reach and serve new audiences unless it reaches out aggressively and innovatively to explore and embrace the new digital technologies that are revolutionizing how we produce and deliver programs and services (Beatty quoted in Sahota 62).
looking into ways to distribute its content via the web” (Paolozzi 2006). This status of experimentation continues. As Steve Pratt, director of R3 and digital music at CBC, stated in November 2011, “your job is to keep experimenting in a digital space that keeps evolving and trying to figure out how to make it work” (Pratt November 2010).

Although the initial online experimentation of R3 did not carry its name, the websites that were launched as part of the R3 project provided the initial groundwork for future R3 developments. The three websites that went online in 2000 were (1) 120seconds.com, which featured user-submitted short films, animation and acoustic documentaries; (2) justconcerts.com, which streamed live concerts and CBC studio sessions with independent Canadian musicians; and (3) newmusiccanada.com, a user-submitted Canadian music library. In 2002, CBCRadio3.com was launched as a full-screen online magazine featuring Canadian music, literature and visual arts. This site also functioned as a portal to the other websites in the project. In 2003, CBCRadio3.com gained international recognition, including winning several Webby awards. The same year, the Radio Two show RadioSonic, which had been referencing the web content since its inception, was renamed CBC Radio 3 in order to reflect a full convergence of the broadcast with the online material.

Lawrence stated in 2010 that “Radio 3 has gone through all sorts of different changes but it has remained fairly consistent ever since Steve Pratt came along” (Lawrence August 2010). The major changes that Lawrence refers to took R3 from

---

16 Interesting to note that the R3 studios and workspace literally feel like a dungeon laboratory: florescent lights turned off, conspicuously separates them from the other CBC programs that share the CBC Vancouver basement (eg. The Debaters). Heads are quietly bent over desks; eyes focused on computer screens. They are not so much separated by the physical cubicles, but more so by the headphones that top every worker’s head.

17 In 2003, a fourth site was added called rootsmusiccanada.com.


19 RadioSonic was already a convergence itself, having merged RealTime and Nightlines in 1997.
existing as a terrestrial\textsuperscript{20} radio show on CBC Radio Two to an online music magazine with a group of linked websites to the current (that is, the Steve Pratt era) interactive website with auxiliary satellite service. Between 2005 and 2007 (the beginning of Pratt’s role at R3), five major changes occurred that established the influence and form of R3: the launch of the podcast, the inauguration of the blog, the development of a satellite radio channel, a shift from weekly playlist to continuous music stream as part of website amalgamation, and a departure from terrestrial radio to the integration of live hosted shows on the online music stream.

On June 2, 2005, R3 launched its weekly podcast hosted by Lawrence. Podcasting was a new mode of musical distribution at the time, and the remarkably early release of the R3 podcast meant that it very quickly became known as the main source for Canadian independent music.\textsuperscript{21} This step, then, significantly affected the scope of R3’s influence in the Canadian music industry in general by successfully reaching outside the CBC audience. Furthermore, as the R3 podcast was the first CBC content to be podcast, it solidified R3 as the source for new media experimentation and development.\textsuperscript{22}

On October 21\textsuperscript{st}, 2005, Paolozzi posted the first entry to the R3 blog, a tribute piece to former R3 host Alexis Mazurin.\textsuperscript{23} From 2005 until 2007, Paolozzi was the main blog contributor, with most posts centring on socio-political content such as racism.

\textsuperscript{20} Terrestrial radio refers to radio signals, including community, commercial, public and pirate stations, that broadcast over radio waves (as opposed to content that is transmitted via satellite or digital connection services). See: Keith 2010; McCauley 2002.


\textsuperscript{22} In 2006, the R3 podcast was the most downloaded in Canada. The success of the podcast increased demand for other CBC shows to start podcasts. In 2011 the CBC now boasts 53 available podcasts in the “Arts & Music” category alone, clearly indicating the influence of R3’s inauguration of the format.

\textsuperscript{23} Alexis Mazurin was a comedian and radio host who died of a heart attack at the Burning Man festival in 2005. He was one of the original hosts of Radio 3 and the main Vancouver R3 recording studio is named after him.
homophobia, musicians’ rights issues, and election coverage. There was very little commenting on the blog at this time, save for a few questions about website features. The maximum amount of comments for any single month was nine. This was in November 2005, with seven of those comments accounted for on the post that announced the coming of the satellite radio channel.

Soon after the podcast was launched, on June 18th, 2005, the CRTC approved satellite radio in Canada. In the following months, R3 developed its satellite station, launching the channel on December 3rd of that year. The continuing Radio Two show on Saturday nights became a simulcast of the satellite feed. The blog took on the role of supplementary content to the satellite feed, with contests and posts that encouraged users, readers, and listeners to acquire the equipment necessary to tune in to a Sirius station.

Along with the satellite channel, in early December of 2005, the online portal CBCRadio3.com moved away from a magazine format and integrated all of its sites to become what it termed as “the definitive voice of independent music and culture at the CBC” (CBC Radio 3 2005). This new website fostered a new format for listening, and by March 19th, 2006, the weekly playlist was converted into a continuous music stream. The blog that day received an unprecedented sixty-one comments, inaugurating a trend on the site for significant user feedback whenever changes were made. For instance, after March, the next spike in user comments came in May, when user playlists became shareable on other social media sites such as Facebook.

On January 17th, 2007, R3 was removed from its position on terrestrial airwaves, significantly pushing R3 in the direction of web radio. It was specifically on September 16th, 2007, however, that R3 pronounced itself to be a “web radio station,” posting a blog
entry that day entitled “CBC Radio 3 Launches Brand New Web Radio Station.” The music stream up until this point had included few interruptions, except for an occasional station identifier or advertisement for their satellite channel. With the inauguration of the web radio station, however, the music stream became similar to the satellite feed, with live hosts and featured content.

The change from web stream to web radio station was met with considerable feedback (108 comments), both positive and negative. For instance, tb3 described the new format as capturing what he had been missing about the Radio Two broadcasts, stating in a blog that day that,

> the R3 people talk at me like we're hanging out at some gathering of cool-in-the-know-folk talking about things, as opposed to slugging away in the dreary world of greige and fluorescent lighting...The R3 Bot that changed the songs, never said anything in between songs. (Paolozzi 2007)

But others, like hool, expressed reactions such as, “i [sic] liked the radio mode better without grant [sic] talking all the time. i [sic] think a host makes sense for a podcast of related music, especially because you can skip the talking if you want” (Paolozzi 2006).

The comments made on that day, whether expressing appreciation or despondence for live hosts as part of R3 programming, exposed these users as listeners of the web stream only. That is, none of the commenters were satellite listeners, otherwise they would have already been engaged with this style of programming from R3. As such, this blog discussion actively created a space for web users/listeners, in particular, to establish communication with one another through the live webcasts. As hosts began posting live blogs to accompany their shows, blog commentary evolved into active, daily participation. By November 2007, the R3 Facebook group had 4,000 members, and by
February 2008, the R3 website boasted over 50,000 members. Therefore, when the web radio and satellite feeds were merged in June 2009 (having been programmed separately up until that point), the community on the website, and the networked public (boyd 2011) to which it belonged, had solidified itself to such a degree that the satellite feed answered to the website and not the other way around (Paolozzi July 2011).

In Anu Sahota’s (2006) two-part thesis “Sermon and Surprise: The Meaning of Scheduling in Broadcast Radio History” and “CBC Radio 3: A Disquieting Radio Revolution,” she concluded that “the hub of Radio 3 has decidedly shifted from the magazine to twenty-four hour, subscription satellite radio. Rather than signaling the clarion call of radio’s re-invention, Radio 3’s current model is rather more indicative of the CBC’s willingness to confer legitimacy on market-based solutions to its funding shortfalls” (94). The year after her thesis was published, it would seem that R3’s shift away from a focus on subscription-based satellite radio to freely-accessed web radio enacted Sahota’s hope for R3 to “discharge universal, national access” and attempt “a new kind of public sphere” for a new kind of audience to the CBC” (95). However, the “new kind of public sphere” that R3 is a part of is directly facilitated by the use of social network sites (SNS) where, as Tiziana Terranova (2000) points out, “free participation is redoubled as a form of productive labor [sic] captured by capital” (36). Although the R3 site pursues the public media goals of the CBC, fans explicitly connect through for-profit

24 Drawing on danah boyd (2011), “networked public” refers to a public that is facilitated through the technologically-mediated interactions of social networking sites. Although the networked public is similar to other publics, it has distinct characteristics due to the ways that technology frames participation.

25 A separate analysis might ponder what the “old kind of public sphere” was. As Jürgen Habermas (1989) proposed, the public sphere was a space of “rational discourse” between state and commerce. Lynn Spigel (2001) expresses, however, that “in the liberal welfare state [the] utopian possibilities [of Habermas’ ideal] are shattered and the public sphere becomes a place where competing groups express their own private interests” (6). The “new kind of audience” that Sahota identifies is perfectly enabled for the public sphere of neo-liberalism, wherein discourse is enabled only through the division of the public into niche audiences.
websites. While the use of social media is obviously not unique to the R3 community, nor is it wholly disagreeable, this situation reveals specific tensions between public media goals and the profitability of community creation through SNS. Thus, my thesis picks up where Sahota left off, applying her critique of the intersection between public radio and commercial delivery to the so-called “free” access of SNS-supported radio cyberspace.

**Area of Research**

My own relationship with the R3 website has greatly informed the methods through which I approached this research. Having been an avid *Brave New Waves* fan since the late 1990s, I heard about the R3 online magazine while listening to *BNW* in 2002. As a music fan and a musician, I was intrigued by the ability of artists to upload their own music to the site. Although in university, I used the site to listen to music, I became a much more avid listener and participant when I got a desk job (like most of the participants I spoke to). My relationship solidified when I wrote an email in disgust about a segment on Lawrence’s podcast. My letter was read on the following podcast and personally responded to by Lawrence. Despite a steady decline in my own R3 participation over the next years, the friendly argument with Lawrence created a connection that would end up as invaluable for this research.

---

26 Little did I know that my favourite show would leave the airwaves in favour of the amalgamated R3.
27 My disgust was in reaction to a particular edition of a podcast segment called “The School of Rock” wherein bands describe details of their music, their lyrics, or, in the case of the show I was calling about, their band name. The band that was highlighted on that podcast was Saint Alvia Cartel, who discussed that they had named themselves after a Canadian war “hero.” I felt that their patriotic description was heavily reliant on a reverence for the military that I believed (and believe) provides justification for present-day military interventions. Lawrence disagreed with me on the grounds of a need to respect Canadian war veterans. See CBC Radio 3 Podcast #103 – Pedal Power, [http://radio3.cbc.ca/#/podcasts/CBC-Radio-3-Podcast-with-Grant-Lawrence/103](http://radio3.cbc.ca/#/podcasts/CBC-Radio-3-Podcast-with-Grant-Lawrence/103) and CBC Radio 3 Podcast #104 – Yacht Rock, [http://radio3.cbc.ca/#/podcasts/CBC-Radio-3-Podcast-with-Grant-Lawrence/104---Yacht-Rock](http://radio3.cbc.ca/#/podcasts/CBC-Radio-3-Podcast-with-Grant-Lawrence/104---Yacht-Rock).
Selection of Research Participants

In order to centre my research on the blog activity of R3, primary ethnographic research was carried out through interviews with R3 members who appear as regular commenters on R3’s daily blog posts. Although these members vary in their geographic locations and I was careful to not draw from one city’s participants only, I did not concentrate on reflecting “all of Canada” or representing all of R3’s membership. My intention was to capture the experiences of regular users of the blog space rather than attempt to create a statistical or demographical summary of the space. I deliberately chose not to create a definitive description of the R3 community – an endeavour that would not only be unwieldy, but also naïve – but rather to interrogate the practices and reactions that the site has incited in some participants. Furthermore, while quantitative and representational data analysis is de rigeur in research about social networking sites due to the ease with which it is collected, I have avoided this in principle, situating myself in opposition to viewing online sociality as a scene for data-mining.

Due to my personal interaction with the blog prior to this work, I used connections that I already had with the site. In allegiance to the “networked public” (boyd 2011) that I argue R3 exists within, I asked people who I knew were more involved in the site than I was to send my participant request to their networks. For instance, Jenelle Jakobsen is an R3 user from Regina whom I know personally off of the site. While I had drifted away from using R3, she had developed some even stronger relationships through the site. She helped me in identifying who were primary users as well as sharing my interview request (See Appendix B) with her R3 contact list, asking them to share it further. I used this networked approach for finding R3 users that I had not been aware of.
in the past, but I also used this method to find contact information for particular members that I could see for myself had high levels of interaction on the blog. Through my past email interactions with Lawrence, I gained contact with other R3 staff members. In particular, after sending my interview request to Paolozzi, he offered to post it on the blog for me. This led to responses from people whom I may not have otherwise connected to, but who were evidently present on the R3 site.

Primarily my interviews were conducted on Skype. Some interviews that were held at a distance were conducted by phone or by Gmail chat. I was able to conduct in-person interviews with users from Winnipeg, Swift Current, Regina and Vancouver. I held interviews with R3 staff at their studios in Vancouver, which allowed for a contextualization of the site’s production, programming and moderation. All interviews were recorded, transcribed and analyzed by me.

Methods

In addition to ethnographic research, this work includes a media discourse analysis through which I evaluated the institutional characteristics of the CBC through policy documents, CBC transcripts of shows, annual reports as well as documentation on decisions, guidelines and policies released by the CRTC. Further, I reviewed news releases, historical documents, academic papers, articles, and books pertaining to the

---

28 Notable for me on this visit was the degree of difference between my experience living in Regina and the experiences of the R3 staff living in Vancouver. I navigated to busy downtown Vancouver using their heavily used public transit system and entered the spectacle of a building that is CBC Vancouver. Although I was there at a particularly cold time in late November of 2010, the outdoor coffee shop (JJ Bean) on the CBC plaza was teeming with smiling hipster baristas, some of whom were wearing R3 merchandise. As I waited at the security desk to be met by Lana Gay for the first interview, I watched Lisa Christiansen (recognizing her from her R3 profile) meet up with a CBC colleague to go out for lunch. I was struck by the cosmopolitan appearance of this host, who I knew as the resident metal head. While this juxtaposition is most definitely connected to my own bias, this points out the contrast between the day-to-day experiences of the hosts and the way in which the audience reads them. These first-hand experiences heightened my awareness of the unavoidable Vancouver-centredness of the site, despite the many efforts that they make to avoid this.
foundation of CBC Radio, CBC.ca and, primarily, the development of R3 over the last fifteen years.

Initially my intent for this research, as well as the description that interviewees received (See Appendices C and D), centred on the complex location of R3 as both online and Canadian, specifically figuring the research within the context of nationhood and notions of borders on a website run by a national public institution. Although these themes continue to play an important role in the final direction of this work, the interviews clarified more distinct experiences for users of R3. Namely, it became clear that listeners and users were grappling with important changes in how they interacted with radio, and how these changes informed and are informed by the intimacy of connections fostered on the R3 site.

I have approached all of my research from a participant/observer perspective, with key insights drawn from my own history with and current interaction on the R3 site. My participation on the site and relationships with both members and staff have informed much of my dedication to this exploration and are present in the perspectives that have manifested themselves in my writing. This approach to the work reflects an adherence to, drawing on Eve Sedgwick (1993), a methodology that is anti-separatist, anti-assimilationist, relational, and above all perhaps, strange (xii). As opposed to either maintaining a distance from or claiming an “insider’s” knowledge of the subject matter of my thesis, I connect with a methodology that works “through” and “across,” countering the “betweens” and “withins” and explicitly seeking “rich junctures” where everything does not necessarily mean the same thing (6). That is, while my thesis explores how elements of radio cyberspace intersect through the experiences of users of R3, the
complexity of these intersections necessitates an awareness of multiple meanings for my findings.

*The Thesis*

This thesis is divided into three chapters, each of which is broken into three or four sub-sections. The first chapter, “R3 as Radio Cyberspace” will further the discussion from this intro of R3’s relationship to radio in Canada. The chapter has three sections: “Public Radio in Canada” which will acknowledge both the relationship that participants in this study have with the CBC as well the implications of the CBC on public space in Canada. The second section, “Web Radio and the Networked Public: Radio Cyberspace as Distinct from Radio Broadcasting” argues for a new formulation of online radio formats with R3 as reference point. The final section of the first chapter, “R3 Listening Habits and Live Radio Programming,” looks specifically at how R3 users listen to R3 as radio and what the implications of this are in radio cyberspace.

The second chapter, “R3 as Online Music Community,” looks at how R3 users perceive R3 as “community.” The first section, “’The Community Here’: R3 as a Distributed Community” will describe how the R3 community is formed and defined by its members, drawing on work by Wilbur ([2000] 2006), Komito (1998 & 2001) and Baym (2007) to assist this description in light of other work that has been done on online music communities. The second section, “’Facebook is magic’: R3 in the networked public,” delves into the complexities of community formation through a “networked public,” specifically drawing on the work of boyd (2011) and Andrejevic (2011) to provide a thorough critique of SNS-facilitated relationships. Section three of chapter two, “Perceptions of R3 as Community: Music, Live Shows, Blog Discussion, and the CBC
Ideology,” looks at the specific components that lead to R3 users defining and experiencing “community” through R3.

The final chapter, “R3 as Home,” is divided into four sections, showing how articulations of home by users of R3 expose intimate attachments cultivated by radio cyberspace, as well as the contradictions found within this exposure. The first section of this chapter, “Location: The Placing of R3,” examines how R3 is produced as a specific location through both its focus on independent Canadian music, through comparisons made to other sites and radio stations, as well as through the methods of participation of its users. The second section, “Relationships and Fandom” discusses how the concept of R3 as a “home” is connected to relationships fostered by fandom, and what some of the limits of these relationships are. Thirdly, in the section entitled “Who Knows About Your Affair With Radio 3?': Perceptions of Others,” I will examine how users articulate the location and relationships of R3 to non-users in a way that solidifies the “home” space for themselves. The final section will consider how users express being a part of a “Collective Cultural Experience” through identification with values associated with “Canadianism” and with independent music.
1. R3 AS RADIO CYBERSPACE

The connections that are made on and through R3 as radio cyberspace are facilitated through the access to music that R3 offers. According to R3 director Steve Pratt,

the big goals for Radio 3 [are]…to support new and emerging Canadian music…to raise awareness of it, to make it easier to be a Canadian musician…to help more people discover that there’s a lot of great Canadian music out there as music fans…so the bulk of it is around that…dual accountability to musicians and music fans.” (Pratt November 2010)

The relationship between radio and music in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries is so thoroughly interwoven that neither history can be told without the other. The technologies of radio production and reception have mutually reinforced each other, particularly due to changes in the scale of audiences and the continually increasing ability to reproduce sounds (Berland 2009; Douglas 2001; Grenier 1990; Taylor 2005).

The meeting of radio and music as mass media have met with significant interrogation by critical theorists, such as the concern indicated by Theodor Adorno’s (1945) question: “Are the changes [that “good” music] undergoes by wireless transmission merely slight and negligible modifications or do those changes affect the very essence of the music?” (209) Among many others, Simon Frith (1987) critiques Adorno’s elitist approach by examining the agency involved in consumption practices of music, stating that “music ‘machines’ have not…been as dehumanizing as mass media critics…have suggested” (72). However, Frith (1996) also points out that complete rejections of the taste values on which Adorno’s arguments hinge “reduce people to a faceless mass or market every bit as effectively” (16). Berland (2009) provides key insights into these critical tensions, stating that, “Just as listening to a song mediates our feelings with our social surroundings, so reproductive technologies add diverse levels of mediation to the bonds between musical experience and social space” (196). Music does
not only maintain meaning in the context of radio transmission, nor are meanings merely
circulated to the point of bland repetition, but meanings are actively, and complexly,
produced through these reproductions and transmissions.

Jocelyne Guilbault (2006) explains that, “music…not only reflects people’s reality
but also ‘constructs’ or shapes that reality” (188). Through music, the identities of
individuals and communities are dynamically produced and reproduced through lyrics,
styles, production and consumption. In the context of R3, these processes are further
mediated through the complexities of the site’s construction and use. In order to examine
the practices of music that occur on and through the R3 site, I draw on Christopher
Small’s (1998) conception of “musicking,” in which he explains that “the fundamental
nature and meaning of music lie not in the objects, not in the musical works at all, but in
action, in what people do” (8). Small developed the idea of musicking out of a discomfort
in the ways that music is most commonly treated and analyzed through its objects rather
than as an activity. Thus, he defines musicking as such: “…to take part, in any capacity,
in a musical performance, whether by performing, by listening, by rehearsing or by
practicing, by providing material for performance (what is called composing), or by
dancing” (9). This definition provides a way to discuss “music’s primary meanings” as
“not indivual at all but social” (8). While Pratt describes the goals of the site, user
Cameron Bode describes the practices:

Some only use it primarily for listening to the radio, some will use it to check up
on other people’s opinions on there…and it’s mostly people who have the luxury
of working a computer job and therefore are able to sit in front of a computer
screen all day while they’re still paying the bills…but for them it’s like a water
cooler kind of thing, or a town hall meeting, all sorts of things. (Bode November
2010)

These conventions outline the ways in which musicking on the site intersects with the
daily lives of users through R3’s technologies of production and reception.
Henry Jenkins (1992) argues that “fans actively assert their mastery over the mass-produced texts which provide the raw materials for their own cultural productions and the basis for their social interactions” (23-24). More recently, Jenkins (2009) has expanded on this to suggest that producers and consumers are not so separated within “convergence culture” where old and new media, as well as corporate and grassroots (and governmental) media, collide (2). The unanticipated consequences of this collision are not merely in the shifting of what technologies are being used but are, as Marshall McLuhan (1962 [2003]) intones, “the psychic and social consequences of the designs or patterns as they amplify or accelerate existing processes” (203). How, then, does the convergence of old and new media in the radio cyberspace of R3 affect the musicking practices that surround what is posted and streamed on the site? Further, according to the users, what are the ways that the particular radio format of R3 informs their social interactions?

This chapter considers how R3 operates as radio cyberspace, particularly in relation to the creation and maintenance of public space. First I discuss in more detail the relationship between the radio space of the CBC and the public space of Canada. Secondly, I break down concepts of “web radio” and how, in the context of Radio 3, these concepts contribute to a “networked public” (boyd 2011). Finally, I will look at how the users of R3 enact notions of public space through their listening habits and interactions, particularly in accordance with the scheduling of live shows on the site.
1.1. Public Radio in Canada

While environments as such have a strange power to elude perception, the preceding ones acquire an almost nostalgic fascination when surrounded by the new. – Marshall McLuhan (1995, 287)

Most participants in this research acknowledged that the CBC has been a consistent presence in their media environment.29 As Bode puts it, “love or hate the CBC, in Canada you know what it is” (Bode November 2010). Many comments were made about the integral part that CBC has played in listeners’ lives prior to R3, such as “CBC’s kind of my go to, from growing up,”30 “I was a CBC kid”31 and “I kind of grew up on it.”32 This was reflected by both those who were raised in Canada, as well as those in Detroit who received CBC television and radio stations due to their close proximity to the border.33

The relationships to the CBC that R3 users express are tied explicitly to the embeddedness of CBC within the history of Canadian cultural technologies. User rmelvin expressed that “I feel like I know exactly what being Canadian means and CBC is a huge part of that,” illustrating the precise motive of the national public broadcasting project in Canada (rmelvin June 2010).

Over the last century, public broadcasting in Canada has had the consistent motivation of creating and maintaining a cohesive identity for the Canadian nation. In 1931, the Canadian Radio League described radio as “an instrument of national unity”

29 Significantly, Brenda Lee, who immigrated to Canada from China at nine years old, explained that “so many of the people that listen to CBC Radio 3…are listening to Radio 3 because they grew up with CBC in their homes and stuff like that. I just never had that association” (Lee November 2010).
30 From interview with rmelvin, June 2010.
31 From interview with Cameron Bode, 2010.
32 From interview with MikeV, October 2010.
33 As noted in the intro, Canada’s relationship with radio has developed similarly but distinctly from both the British and American systems. These differences are underlined by geographical and political differences, but are also due to Canada’s national broadcasting policies being set into place later than in the other two radio nations. Whereas the BBC operated strictly as a public service and the American commercial radio system professed to serve public interest, the CBC was developed as a “hybrid philosophy to justify forms of state intervention in broadcasting” (Fortner 7). See: Fortner 2005, Sahota 2006 and Vipond 1992.
and a “tremendous factor in developing a strong Canadian consciousness in new settlers” (Fortner 154). In 1974, this idea was again articulated at the CBC’s license renewal submission to the CRTC, as they stated, “…the national service can build unity…It is there, as a part of the common experience of being Canadian, to be participated in by all” (McKay 1976, 132). In 2011, the CBC released its newest strategic plan, *Everyone, Every Way*, stating a commitment to producing “programming that enlightens Canadians and contributes to a shared national identity by facilitating a dialogue amongst Canadians in a public space. CBC/Radio-Canada remains singularly positioned to fulfil [sic] a nation-building role” (CBC 2011a, 3).

Just as radio broadcasting would provide a public space of articulation for an imagined community (Anderson [1983] 2006) of the nation in 1931, so too does the CBC continue to view this as their goal within convergent forms of media of 2011. In the Canadian context, the importance of a representational space for the common bond of national identity was, and is, heightened due to the diffuseness of geographical spaces, multicultural citizens and experiences (Bhabha 1990; 1994). In her extensive study of the cultural and technological productions of space in Canada, *North of Empire: Essays on the Cultural Technologies of Space*, Berland (2009) affirms that “the technologies of valorizing and overcoming distance, and the ways these technologies produce spaces they simultaneously represent, are a central part of the Canadian topos” (18). Further, how the CBC has staked its claim on public space in Canada raises important questions as to what

---

34 Although these national goals were attached to radio in 1931, this was not always the case. Broadcasting in the early 1920s in Canada can be described as “ad-hoc” programming, with a focus on experimenting with the technical aspects of broadcasting. See: Vipond 1992.
35 For a captivating look at the context of Canadian communications systems in the 1970s, see Hindley, et al., 1977.
36 Canada is not alone in taking this type of tone in developing new media strategies for public radio. For example, the Danish 2003 strategic public broadcasting plan was entitled *Unique Radio for Everyone*. See: Jauert, 2003.
this public space is, and what the continual need to articulate it through radio broadcasting and radio cyberspace might mean.

The idea of public space as connected to a “commons” of collective discussion and action (Habermas 2006; Kidd, Rodriguez and Stein 2009) becomes problematic when given representational responsibilities in media forms (DeLuca 2002; Herman and Chomsky 2006). Patricia Phillips (2004) describes the “public” as “the sphere we share in common; wherever it occurs, it begins in the decidedly ‘somewhere’ of individual consciousness and perception” (192). In the absence of geographical commonality, CBC radio has had the role of introducing shared and distinct experiences and of creating the perceived “somewhere” of Canada as a nation. Thus, radio has not only remarked on space, but has actively produced it (Berland 2009).

In order to argue that radio cyberspace both reaffirms and accentuates this spatial production, it is important to tease out the relationship between radio broadcasting and public space. As Sahota (2006) details, in Canada “the enshrinement of the electromagnetic spectrum as a public resource in 1932 enabled the management of broadcasting in the public interest” (46). Broadcasting by definition connotes simultaneous communication with widely-spread audiences and, as Taisto Hujanen and Gregory Lowe (2003) put it in “Broadcasting and Convergence: Rearticulating the Future Past,” “the character of being ‘broad’…emphasizes the ability of broadcasting to connect people across geographic, social and cultural borders in a public life that can be shared as a result” (13). In order to stand for a public that is spread out by population, geography and cultural distinctions, representational organizations such as the CBC must

---

37 Anne F. MacLennan offers a perceptive analysis of both the central place that CBC played in constructing Canadian reality as well as the contestations that occurred through alternative broadcasting initiatives and rejections of public media in general. See: MacLennan, 2010.
congeal public interests into content that may serve an imagined “all,” or in other words, draw on “public opinion.” In Jean Baudrillard’s (1985) essay “The Masses: The Implosion of the Social in the Media,” he argues that public opinion as exposed in opinion polls actually works to eliminate the public sphere altogether. He states that what is exhibited then, is a “redundancy of the social, [a] sort of continual voyeurism of the group in relation to itself: it must at all times know what it wants, know what it thinks, be told about its least needs…in a sort of hypochondriacal madness” (580). In the case of public radio in Canada, although it has appeared to represent Canadian society as a whole, it has in fact largely only broadcast its description.

In seeming contrast, the “digital programming strategy” of the Everyone, Every Way plan emphasizes the desire to “give Canadians the tools they need to tailor CBC/Radio-Canada programming to their specific interests and requirements” (CBC 2011a, 4). As such, the plan re-orients the idea of “broad’casting to one of “narrow”casting, or what is often referred to as “demassification” (Scheiter 2003; Toffler 1989; Webster and Blom 2006; Wu 2010). R3 director Steve Pratt echoes this concept and connects the idea of providing niche content to the dedication of the R3 listenership:

"broadcasting is declining in relevance…If you are a successful broadcaster, you need to create a product that applies to almost everybody and when you do something that has that broad of appeal, generally speaking less people will love it and die for it…Niches don’t make sense in a broadcasting world because you can’t reach enough people to make enough money to keep doing it…When you do things that are more niche oriented, people love it because it is really catered more to them rather than the big giant audience. And I think…what we’ve done is said that our niche is Canadian music. (Pratt November 2010)"

While catering to niche audiences appears to create a solution to the public as a congealed mass, intense individualization can also be an indication of an erosion of public space.  

38 For an examination of how the creation of format radio (genre-specific station programming) in Canada seemed to suit the goals of the CRTC and yet had more to do with commercial processes, see Grenier 1990.
Herbert Marcuse (1964), writing against abstractions of equality and freedom, explains that liberty itself can operate as a means for domination. Echoing Baudrillard’s skepticism about “hyperinformation which claims to enlighten,” Marcuse states that “the range of choice open to the individual is not the decisive factor in deciding the degree of human freedom, but what can be chosen and what is chosen by the individual” (21). That is to say, freedom is an illusion when public discourse is attenuated by our choices being recycled back to us.

In the case of R3, users feel a great amount of agency in making their own playlists, voting in contests, interacting with hosts and an abundance of other individually chosen activities, but how are these choices accomplished by the position of R3 within the discourse of the CBC’s strategy to “offer public space for citizens to tell each other their singularly Canadian stories?” (CBC 2011a, 2) Shared listening experiences, which were foundational to the CBC’s production of public space for most of its history, become less of a priority with a move away from the ideologies of broadcasting. What can be said, then, of R3 users’ attachment to each other and their dedication to forming and maintaining community on and through the R3 site?

1.2 Web Radio and the “Networked Public”: Radio Cyberspace as Distinct from Radio Broadcasting

…radio could be the most wonderful public communication system imaginable, a gigantic system of channels – could be, that is, if it were capable not only of transmitting but of receiving, of making the listener not only hear but also speak, not of isolating him but of connecting him.
A 2010 study conducted by the CRTC entitled “Navigating Convergence: Charting Canadian Communications Change and Regulatory Implications” stated that “with the growing popularity of the Internet, radio has evolved to become a medium compatible with and complementary to the Internet. It draws audiences by way of podcasts, extending its reach to radio audiences on its website and engaging their views and comments” (CRTC 2010). This description indicates one form of what is often referred to as “web radio,” but does not address the complexities of radio delivery online or evolutions of radio as a cultural technology in cyberspace. In fact, although according to the study there were over 600 Canadian radio stations streaming live on the internet by February 2010, R3 is not included among them. In order to account for this absence, the following outlines four distinct forms of “web radio” and how they intersect to structure “radio cyberspace.” I further look to how this construction of radio cyberspace indicates a significant change in the relationship between radio and the public.

Radio cyberspace, as defined in the introduction to this thesis, indicates a conjunction of music cultures, social networks, sound recordings, music sharing technologies, consumption practices and administrative and demographic production. The intersection of these elements occurs in many different ways and is often linked with what is called “web radio.” This term is used to describe four different types of online radio presence: value-added, self-curated, music streaming, and live. The value-added
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39 See the list at http://www.canadianwebradio.com/index.html.
40 These distinctions have been reviewed and encouraged to be used by, among others, the following: John Paolozzi, web manager for R3, Michael Geist, Canada Research Chair of Internet and E-commerce Law at the University of Ottawa, and Jody Turner, founder of San Francisco-based Culture of Future. Steve Pratt, director of R3, agrees with the distinctions and with the ways in which I describe R3, but does not agree that R3 is “radio.” Instead, he uses the term “music service.” This discrepancy is indicative of the
model is demonstrated by the online content of CBC Radio One and Two, which includes the web-casting of shows already available on terrestrial or digital broadcasts, supplementary podcasts, websites for shows, and the Twitter feed and Facebook accounts of hosts (Humphries 2004; O’Neill 2006). Self-curated web radio is exhibited by sites such as last.fm, Grooveshark, and Pandora, where streams are often un-hosted and formed by individual user selections (Healey 2009; Mason 2010). Examples of music streaming web radio are the mostly pre-recorded and minimally hosted radio streams of iTunes. Live web radio is best exemplified by R3’s daily live hosted programs, which feature music drawn from the site’s extensive library of Canadian music, curated primarily by R3’s music programmers.

The R3 site itself is a unique convergence of all four of these forms of web radio, making it a consummate manifestation of radio cyberspace. The music cultures on R3 range from the scenes represented by genre delineations (Straw 1996; Holt 2007) to the various music consumption practices of listeners to the relationships of listeners, hosts and artists to live performances and festivals. Social networks function to connect differential between the use of “radio” to describe the technological infrastructure rather than the cultural form, the latter of which informs the work I am presenting here.

41 A “digital radio station” is defined by the CRTC as “a station that broadcasts in the frequency band of 1452 to 1492 MHz (L-band) using a digital transmission system, but does not include a transmitter that only rebroadcasts the radiocommunications of a licensee; (station de radio numérique)” (CRTC 2010). For a thorough analysis of the implications of digital radio, see Alla-Fossi et al. 2008; Hallet and Hintz 2009; and McCauley 2002.

42 Usually in the form of station or show identification tags.

43 A comparable site is that of the station “triple j” in Australia, with a similar identity as a national youth media entity. However, this site differs significantly from R3 in its interactive qualities. For instance, interactions take place on a forum where as a user you are told that you can “even chat with presenters (if you’re lucky!” (see http://www2b.abc.net.au/tmb/Client/Board.aspx?b=3). The context of forum discussion contrasts significantly with the R3 blogs that are associated temporally with live shows. Furthermore, the lack of guarantee of host presence on triple j drastically changes the types of connection and community that are made (and what they are formed around). For more discussion on triple j, see Albury 1999.

44 For instance, some listeners discuss downloading music as their primary form of music consumption, whereas others focus on purchasing LPs of R3 artists at live shows.
listeners, hosts and artists and enhance the blog community experience of the site. A variety of sound recording practices are utilized on the site ranging from the live recording of hosts to the high production value of studio recordings by artists such as Feist and Peaches to the lo-fi basement recordings of experimental musicians. The use of live streams, downloadable podcasts and links to downloadable music from artists or distribution networks (such as iTunes and Zunior) all underline the importance of music sharing to the site. Administrative and demographic production takes place in accordance with the CBC’s objectives and is intertwined with the workings of music programming and site production, such as ensuring representation of musicians from each province and territory (Grenier 1990).

Myra Draisin, executive director of the International Academy of Digital Arts and Sciences, described R3 at the time of its online convergence in 2006 as “a seamless site…the next generation of broadband…Awesome from a content perspective, awesome from a visual design perspective, from an interactivity perspective; they’re just doing it right” (Toronto Star quoted in Sahota 2006, 83). In the same vein, Pratt explained that “it’s been this really cool thing where you’ve got a broadcasting arm with the radio piece on Sirius [satellite radio], you’ve got a whole internet area that kind of fuels all the radio programming and then opens up this huge community and pool of on-demand music” (Pratt November 2010). These descriptions reveal the interconnectedness of the elements of R3, but also point to how the website can be perceived differently depending on a user’s interactions with it. For a satellite R3 listener, the website becomes value-added. For a listener that is primarily accessing the library of music for individual song consumption, the site provides self-curated listening. Listening to a genre stream on the
site provides un-hosted music streaming. The users that describe the site in the most intimate of terms, however, are those that listen and interact with the daily live webcasts.

The live web radio of R3 is where the most interaction from and between listeners happens, indicating a temporal relationship to their feelings of shared space. David Hendy (2000) speaks to the role of time in radio programming in Radio in the Global Age, commenting that

> the familiarity engendered over time is one of the foundations upon which radio’s intimacy is built (...) we rarely tape a radio program in the way we might record a favourite television program. And if we are listening at the same time, that means we have something in common: our lives stand in the same temporal relationship to the programs we hear. (184)

In Canada in particular, this stands out as a distinctive aspect of the radio listening experience, as time zones vary so considerably across the country. For instance, the announcement of “and half an hour later in Newfoundland” is inseparable from listening to national news broadcasts on the CBC and is a sonic cue that one is sharing the listening experience with Newfoundlanders (and everyone in between). R3 listeners have comparable experiences due to the liveness of the daily shows. MikeV from Fredericton expressed that Vish Khanna’s show out of Toronto “has in many ways become the unofficial maritimes show because it comes on at 8 or 8:30 [am] in Newfoundland so often we are the ones that tune in” (MikeV October 2010). Emphasizing this, Mackenzie Campbell from Winnipeg commented that “I know that people are listening to Vish’s show. To me Vish’s show is way too early. It’s ending pretty much as soon as I get to work” (Campbell June 2010). While Campbell’s comment indicates that separation occurs due to time zone differences, the overall impact of this scheduling brings a marked acknowledgement of a cross-country shared space. The interaction between live shows and time zone variation notably affects the listening practices of users, namely in
connection with a broader Canadian radio listening experience (Sahota 2006; Vipond 1992).45

On September 16th, 2007, when R3 switched from music streaming web radio to live web radio during the day, listeners took note. Although the commenting feature on the blog had existed since late 2005, rarely did posts have comments and when they did, they were noticeably lacking in conversational tone and limited to one or two in number. The blog post attached to R3’s first day of live web radio, however, received 107 comments, including opinions on the change, questions about use and conversation between listeners about the shows. rdicke commented, “I don’t know what’s more exciting, the fact that you guys put out a web radio station or the fact that you guys actually listen to viewers [sic],” signifying listeners’ interpretation of the webcasts of R3 as, indeed, radio (Paolozzi 2007). In fact, this correlation between “live” and “radio” is further emphasized by those who were not in favour of the change – for instance, aRTie stated “my vote is for the old talk free stream. It was prefect [sic]: perfect for work, perfect for parties, perfect for listening” (Paolozzi 2007). Opinions like aRTie’s consistently do not refer to their preferred streaming as “radio.”

Since that first live web radio day in 2007, the interactions of users on the site itself are consistently demonstrated most through comments on blog posts that are attached to the live programs, often exceeding 200 comments per show. But as many of the members that I spoke to stress, once they make contact through these blogs, they quickly begin communicating with each other through SNS such as Facebook and Twitter. This applies to the hosts as well, who maintain ongoing dialogue through SNS, particularly during

---

45 For an in-depth study of how online communication is affected by time zone variation, see Cao et al. 2010.
their live show. The type of public that functions in this circumstance, then, is markedly
different from that of terrestrial radio and, drawing on boyd, can be described as a
“networked public.” As boyd (2011) elucidates,

while networked publics share much in common with other types of publics, the
ways in which technology structures them introduces distinct affordances that
shape how people engage with these environments. The properties of bits – as
distinct from atoms – introduce new possibilities for interaction. As a result, new
dynamics emerge that shape participation. (39)\textsuperscript{46}

Where terrestrial radio enables participation through a unified public (or publics)
represented by “public opinion,” radio cyberspace answers to a network of interactivity
that requires attention to systems of identification and communication.

This reshaping of participation does not fundamentally change the structures of
power that inform how public space operates and is controlled. As Gilbert B. Rodman
(2003) states in “The Net Effect: The Public’s Fear and the Public Sphere,” “the extent to
which this power actually makes the Net a democratic space is questionable, and we need
to be cautious about conflating the power that individual users have to ‘speak’ online
with actual power over the networks that comprise the Net” (30). But these types of
warnings are not unique to cyberspace. In boyd’s (2011) words, “unfortunately,
networked publics appear to reproduce many of the biases that exist in other publics –
social inequalities, including social stratification around race, gender, sexuality, and age,
are reproduced online” (54). At the same time, as Darin Barney (2007) remarks in his
compelling lecture “One Nation Under Google,” “it would be equally misleading to
suggest that inhabiting the world with the internet and mobile telephony is the same as
inhabiting the world without them. Things happen when new technologies arrive on the
scene, or when practices surrounding old technologies change” (7).

\textsuperscript{46} Chapter two will expand on how R3 functions within a “networked public.”
While R3 is most certainly “radio,” it is not because this term means the same thing as it did prior to the forms of radio cyberspace. Whether value-added, self-curated, music streaming and/or live, “web radio” has not only provided an additional method of consuming music, it has fundamentally changed the ways in which radio, as a cultural technology, affects the lives of the (networked) public. As Paul Théberge (1997) incites, “Specific activities related to making or consuming music result in differently structured listening habits…Listening [is] both context and effect” (276). What do the listening habits of R3 listeners reveal about both the context and effects of radio cyberspace?

1.3. R3 Listening Habits and Live Radio Programming

Where, how, and to whom listeners connect is the complex subject of the cultural technologies of sound. - Jody Berland (2009, 187)

On June 21, 2011, R3 host Grant Lawrence asked “Where exactly do you listen? In the office/home/car/kitchen/cubicle?” Of the forty-seven comments that answered this question (there were a total of 368 comments as part of the conversation that surrounded this blog), forty stated that the primary place that they listen to R3 is at work. Many of these comments, as well as much of the ensuing conversation, echo what Nathan Jones explained in an interview, that R3 is “something that gets me through my day at work” (Jones October 2010). R3’s live programming is webcast from 5am-10pm CST, with the largest amount of listeners “tuning in” during daytime work hours in their respective time zones. Lawrence’s program, which is the only show that falls within the general work hours of 9-6 across all time zones, is the most popular show, gaining the most
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47 In addition, the amount that Lawrence goes over the 5pm mark in the Maritimes is a disputed aspect for listeners. For instance on his Jan. 28th, 2011 blog in which he asked “What can we do better?” gruvn’s suggestion was to “move Grant's time earlier so that us East Coasters get his whole show” (Lawrence
commentary and “on air” participation. As Berland (2009) writes of radio communication,

One result of this teletopographic mode of address is that music, indeed any mode of address in sound, seems to articulate time, but not space, whose overcoming nonetheless provides the occasion for the listening event. Nowhere is this more evident than in radio, which organizes our sense of morning, of daily activity, of the discipline of time. (187)

The scheduling of shows on R3 is related directly to how users’ daily lives are organized. The changes that have occurred in the technology of R3 from a terrestrial radio program to a web magazine and currently as radio cyberspace have all correlated with how listeners tune in and participate, further informing the way in which R3 functions as a networked public. This section examines the daytime listening habits of R3 listeners, as well as investigating Lawrence’s show in particular as a site of cross-country convergence.

Users, especially those who joined after R3 converted to web radio in 2007, tend to describe their discovery of R3 as decidedly connected to their workday. For instance, Jones, who signed on as a member on June 25th, 2010, states that

I work at an office, so I’m sitting at a computer all day so I have access to sit there and listen to radio. I need something in the background playing. And I have…my own office…so I can listen to music without having to worry about my neighbours next to me…so I’m able to listen to more music.” (Jones October 2010)

rmelvin also outlined how her relationship to R3 has been defined by her work:

I’ve been listening since 2006, intermittently, depending on what work project I was working on…in 2006 I was listening all the time, and then for…a year and a half I barely listened because I had a crazy insane job. And then…when I chose a less involved, less stressful, less responsibility [sic] type position I started listening on a daily basis, and I just kept expanding [sic]. (rmelvin June 2010)

As a clear indication of how the conventionality of certain types of workdays creates a demographic concentration on the site, TheRadioHead remarked that “people who sit at

2011). The issue here isn’t that his show is inaccessible after a certain time, but that it falls outside of the workday.
desks and can listen and comment and blog all day...have no idea how difficult it is for some people that are not white collar workers to gain access to Radio 3” (TheRadioHead June 2010).

TheRadioHead, who describes herself as an “early adapter to Radio 3,” recalls her initial listening experiences as her “Saturday night thing.” As a “big CBC listener,” she heard about the R3 online magazine, then discovered that she could listen on Saturday nights, and henceforth spent those hours glued to both her computer and her radio. She would expand the Toronto three-hour broadcast to four hours in Winnipeg by tuning in online for the first hour and then switching to the Radio Two broadcast when it kicked in. She won a Sirius satellite radio from R3 in 2004 which she describes as “shit, they are shit” and so although she has it in her car, listens to CDs when she drives. Since R3 was taken off of terrestrial airwaves, TheRadioHead now listens to R3 from her laptop plugged into speakers when she gets home from work. The time she gets home from work is decided by when Grant Lawrence’s afternoon show is on. As she says, “I have to go to great lengths to be able to listen...It means being out the door...really early...so that I can be home to listen online by 2:00 or 2:30” (TheRadioHead June 2010). In TheRadioHead’s case, although she cannot listen at work,48 her relationship to R3 is still greatly defined by her workday and, indeed, her workday is defined by her relationship to R3. This is a significant transition between her beginnings with R3, when listening to R3 supplanted all other Saturday night recreation but had no significant impact on her workday. The transition of technologies outlined by TheRadioHead’s experiences, and particularly that she has had to “go to great lengths” to maintain her listenership through
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48 This recently changed when TheRadioHead picked up an iPhone on Aug. 2nd, 2011.
the technology shifts at R3 clarify an important positionality of radio cyberspace to her everyday life.

In addition to users’ accessing R3 differently according to work environments and schedules, these work situations often also dictate which elements of radio cyberspace are accessed. As Campbell described, “I started off as a podcast user and switched to listening to the radio…Now basically I just blog because I can’t listen at work” (Campbell June 2010). Similarly, Monica Skorupski explained that she started off by listening to Grant’s podcasts “because I was at work and I had an mp3 player at work and I was really bored…I wasn’t really near my computer that often, so that’s why the podcasts were something that was perfect for me at the time” (Skorupski November 2010). Her transition to listening and participating online was when she went to a new college and “I was just…at my computer and lonely and…I didn’t know what to do” (Skorupski November 2010).

The blurring of the lines between labour, entertainment and socialization that these workplace (and school-as-workplace) affiliations suggest are symptomatic of a situation wherein workers (and students) are already, to invoke Marx (1844), estranged from the products of their labour. As Mark Andrejevic (2011) states, “One of the pre-conditions for the promotion of Web 2.0 is…the invocation of the forms of estrangement associated with the exploitation of waged labour” (92). Radio was already reacting to this form of alienation with interactive forms of music in the earliest days of broadcasting. As Baade (2006) has shown, in WWII, some BBC producers had “an interest in workers interacting with the music they heard…” and “dance music played a crucial role in the BBC’s programming for the Forces and in its broadcasts to factory workers…” (356). In the case

49 The nature of SNS and labour will be further elaborated on in Chapter Two.
of the BBC’s programming for workers in WWII, not only was the type of music programmed important, but so was the scheduling. Anderson and Curtin (2002) maintain, “broadcast networks…helped to organize popular perceptions of space through daily, weekly, and seasonal broadcast schedules” (26). For R3, like the early BBC, this space is organized around the standard workday. At the centre of this daytime organization on R3 is Grant Lawrence. In fact, this temporal organization is necessary for the constitution of R3 as a perceived space because, as Berland (2009) remarks, “The experience of time is defined by the practices of producing space” and “through radio, music mediates our interactions with space and our contradictory senses of belonging” (189-191). While listening from work, R3 users are drawn into an apprehension of their physical space that is directly related to the temporal and “abstract technoregion” (Luke 1999 quoted in Berland 2009) created by R3’s programming.

Producing engaging daytime programming is not unprecedented for the CBC. In the years following WWII, just as commercial broadcasters learned they could take advantage of the daytime listening of “housewives”50 to market domestic products (hence, “soap operas”), so too did public broadcasters see the benefit of programming for the daytime attention, domestic or otherwise.51 The show that truly established CBC’s daytime presence was Peter Gzowski’s Morningside, which aired from 9am-12pm on weekdays from 1982 to 1997. Sahota (2006) describes a definitive correlation between

51 By the 1940s, the BBC had clarified through “scientific principles” that music was valuable for monotonous work, but “would be detrimental to productivity in concentration-intensive tasks” (Korczynski and Jones 2006, 152). The subsequently developed program Music While You Work was especially designed for factory work. See Korczynski and Jones for more on this.
Morningside and R3 as she explains that in May of 2004 Harold Redekopp (President of CBC Television from the mid-nineties until Fall 2004) stated that R3 “would achieve for a younger audience what Peter Gzowski had achieved for an older audience…bringing together Canadians from coast to coast – a younger demographic very much like we had an older demographic in Morningside” (64). The younger demographic to which he refers is the “under-served” audience of 15-24 year olds. But given what I have found in the workday listening habits of R3 listeners and users, it seems that this is hardly the main age demographic of R3. Live programming during the day immediately marginalizes high school students, and even many university students. Jenelle Jakobsen describes transitioning from listener to “heavy, heavy user” after leaving university and getting a job where she was at a desk all day (Jakobsen February 2011). As Brenda Lee, an undergraduate university student at the time of our interview, told me, “the live show has never been a primary way for me to consume R3…because mainly the shows are…during the day when I have class” (Lee November 2010). At best, it seems that the “youth” focus of R3 has slid to the older range of 25-34, an age group that is already served as a “secondary target” for Radio One with shows like Q and Definitely Not the Opera and Radio Two with shows like Drive and Spark.

While R3 has clearly failed to reach the particular “youth” that Redekopp was hoping it would, Sahota (2006) states that “R3 quickly developed appreciably more
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52 One theory is that R3 has merely “grown up” with its listeners – that is, if listeners who started listening to R3 when it was on terrestrial radio were teenagers at the time, they would now be in their mid-twenties. From my admittedly limited group of interviewees, however, the two longest-term R3 fans would have been over 30 when they started listening in the late 90s and therefore were already older than the intended demographic. For more on this topic, see Ken Garner’s (1990) analysis of the shifts in age demographics on morning radio in Britain.

53 As yet another example of R3 as an experimental sector of the CBC, the immensely popular host of Drive, Rich Terfry, started his CBC radio hosting career as a fill-in host on R3. Furthermore, Terfry holds celebrity status within Canada’s independent hip-hop scene as rapper Buck 65, demonstrating the same reverence for authenticity of experience as informs Lawrence’s hosting career.
elastic conceptions of its audiences” and quotes Lawrence: “the target audience is whoever is interested” (74). Interested, that is, in the connectivity of Canadian content produced by artists, musicians, programmers and listeners that the site affords. But this was and is still grounded in a similar ideal to envelope a “youth” bracket: that is, drawing in audiences who are not already connected to the CBC. While accomplishing this to some degree, as demonstrated in the first section of this chapter, the R3 audience are largely grown-up CBC kids and CBC ex-pats. Therefore, the site’s accomplishment in this regard is mainly in upholding or re-patriating audiences to the CBC rather than creating new ones. Furthermore, the link between the style and achievements of Gzowski and Lawrence discloses a clear relationship between R3 programming and the ongoing expectations of CBC radio.

Berland (2009) attributes Morningside’s extreme popularity to the unpredictability of the format – that is, Gzowski would ask the questions and the audience (and the plethora of “ordinary citizen” guests) would answer (201-202). In this regard, the live shows of R3 continue this daytime tradition, with Lawrence’s show providing a noteworthy manifestation of the connective abilities of Morningside. Lawrence’s history as a member of the Vancouver-based independent punk band The Smugglers gives him capital among independent Canadian music listeners and musicians, for whom status is given to those with perceived genuine experiences within a music scene. Despite obvious institutionalization, Lawrence’s professional involvement with the CBC since 1998 does not put his expertise into question for R3 fans, but rather reinforces his position of authority. TheRadioHead assigns Lawrence with the credit of her long-term R3
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54 Berland establishes that this is a flip of American style radio wherein the audience asks the questions and the host answers.
relationship, stating that “I just knew right away that he and I had a lot in common and so… I just really connected with him. I really liked his voice.” (TheRadioHead June 2010). The sonic qualities of Lawrence’s medium-range voice— which could be described as casual, enthusiastic, and somewhat sardonic— are clearly part of the reasons for listeners’ dedication to him. The pleasures instilled from his voice may be explained by Roland Barthes’ (1990 [1977]) concept of “the grain of the voice,” or rather, “the very precise space of the encounter between a language and a voice” (294). While Barthes applies this to the singing voice, the voice of the radio DJ transmits the same combination of language structures and communicative meaning with messages that are void of intellectual meaning, forming “a signifying play having nothing to do with communication, representation (of feelings), [or] expression” (295). The DJ’s voice itself provides, as Berland (2009) states, “an index of radio’s authenticity as a live and local medium, and to offer evidence of the efficacy of its listeners’ desires. It is through his or her voice that the community hears itself constituted” (199-200).

In addition to (and in consort with) connections to his voice in particular, users consistently remarked on Lawrence as the facilitator of both their social and musical experience—from facilitating blog connections in order for people to find “gig-going buddies” to show content that demands interaction (such as Trivia shows and Movie Clubs). As TheRadioHead put it in remarking on her discovery of Lawrence, “I liked that he had so much trivia. He had so much to teach me” (TheRadioHead June 2010). The type of “persuasive influence” that occurs with a DJ who is considered an expert, as Lawrence invariably is, can be said to be a form of what Weber terms as “domination by
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55 TheRadioHead did make a caveat to this comment, stating that she didn’t want to stroke his “already-large” ego.
virtue of authority” (quoted in Scott 2007). That is, as John Scott (2007) describes, “the advice of technical experts is regarded as providing compelling reasons for its acceptance because of a prior acceptance of the validity of the specialist knowledge on which the expert advice is offered” (27). Further, he argues that this type of domination involves “institutionalised relations of commitment, loyalty and trust” (27). Lawrence’s show, at the centre of R3 scheduling, acts as a central point of congregation for R3 listeners in part because of the distinct relations of power associated with him.

The scheduling of live shows on the R3 site facilitates a convergence of listeners during a standard workday, when the majority of interactivity happens on the site. Furthermore, a vital element of this formation is the presence of an elite – most notably, Grant Lawrence. These factors underline the ways in which R3 is enacted as radio, while its place online and the types of interactions that are unique to online transmission enable it to be discussed as radio cyberspace. What are the ways, then, that R3’s radio-style programming intersects with its location in cyberspace to make R3 listeners understand themselves as a “community?”
2. R3 AS ONLINE MUSIC COMMUNITY

Communities are to be distinguished, not by their falsity/genuineness, but by the style in which they are imagined. – Benedict Anderson ([1983] 2006, 6)

On the November 19th, 2009 blog attached to the R3 program “The Craig Norris Hour,” mcfflyer commented that

seriously, the community here is nothing short of amazing. Finding Radio3 was one of the luckiest things that’s happened to me – meeting all of you music fans – and we are all friends...Its [sic] almost hard to comprehend the friendships that we [sic] make here – knowing that many/most of us will never meet. But we’re friends nevertheless. (Norris 2009)

This comment exemplifies the attitude that many R3 users have about the connections to other people that they have made through the R3 site. The formation of community on R3 is imbedded in a conjunction of features facilitated by radio cyberspace: shared listening (as addressed in the previous chapter), interactivity, shared interests (independent Canadian music), shared ideology (highlighted by relationships to the CBC and to independent music) and finally, the ability to articulate one’s identity and experience in a shared space. The following chapter considers the ways in which these elements have formed what users describe as “community.” The first section examines how the term is used, both on R3 as well as in wider scholarship. Secondly, I expand on boyd’s concept of the “networked public” by exploring the relationship of R3 to social network sites. Finally, I consider the elements that users identify as contributing to their sense of community, namely the music on the site, blog discussions, and the association of offline gig attendance and socialization.
2.1. “The Community Here”: R3 as a “distributed community”

The “R3 community” is a multi-faceted entity. First of all, given the member-based nature of the site, it could be said that all members and artists have signed on to be part of the R3 community. Certainly this is the meaning that the Toronto Star was using when, in 2004, they evoked the word “community” in reference to R3, deeming it the “virtual community centre for the nation’s independent culture” (quoted in Sahota 2006, 81). This is also how Robert Ouimet, former manager of the R3, was using the term when he spoke about R3 in 2006, stating that “I think Radio 3 was always aggressive about being on top of technology but it’s not about technology, it’s about relationships in community…[the fact that] there are 30 or 40 thousand songs at newmusiccanada that aren’t played on radio anywhere else is a huge huge thing – it’s what culture is” (quoted in Sahota 2006, 69). While these invocations suggest that the “community” of R3 is as large as the nation or as large as culture itself, my concern is with “the community here” that mcfflyer commented about – that is, the “R3 community” as experienced and perceived by the users themselves.

The term “community” is most often used to reflect an idealized notion of space and social grouping based on a shared understanding of, for example, ideology, geography or experience. As Iris Marion Young ([1990] 2011) puts it, “the ideal of community expresses a desire for social wholeness, symmetry, a security and solid identity which is objectified because [it is] affirmed by others unambiguously” (232). Young clarifies that the premise for community rhetoric – a shared understanding – is faulty from the start, because “I cannot understand others as they understand themselves,
because they do not completely understand themselves” (232). Although due to its perpetuation of misunderstandings about solidarity and affinity, Young (1990) calls for an abandonment of the term “community” altogether, others suggest an alternative in the idea of a “community of difference” in which “a group of people from diverse backgrounds, with differing beliefs, values, goals, and assumptions, [come] together to achieve cohesion through new understandings, positive relationships, and the negotiation of shared purposes and norms of behaviour” (Shields 2001, 71). While this definition still treads into the territory of what Young describes, drawing on Derrida (1976, 137-39), as the “copresence of subjects” (231), it does demonstrate that the term “community” is used, defined, and contested for a variety of political as well as subversive reasons. To this end, the clearest exposure of what “community” means in the context of R3 requires an examination, drawing on Paul Aitken (2007, 4), of the roles that R3 plays in the lives of the individuals that comprise this social space, and in turn, the roles that these individuals have in shaping R3 as a space of “community.”

R3 members who described their practices on the site as exclusively listening balked at the use of the word “community” to describe their R3 experiences. However, those who were active on the blog (whether they were heavy commenters or not) were quick to identify their relationship(s) in terms of community. The word seems to be employed by users and staff to indicate two types of groupings: the broader cross-Canada blog participants (who, as indicated in the first chapter, do not always interact at the same time) and the local factions of R3ers who have formed offline R3 “clubs,” usually for attending shows and festivals together. The local groups interact with each other, other local factions, and with other users on the R3 blog and are therefore part of a broader R3
community. For the following analysis, I will be concentrating on examining the
intertextual relationships of this broader blog community, with the acknowledgement that
these R3 local clubs are both included within, and important features of, the general R3
community. In order to argue that R3 can be referred to as a “distributed community,” I
will briefly outline some conceptions of community, particularly in reference to
cyberspace.

When Howard Rheingold (1993) made his now-famous declaration that “virtual communities are social aggregations that emerge from the Net when enough people carry
on…public discussions long enough, with sufficient human feeling, to form webs of
personal relationships in cyberspace” (5), the ways in which people interacted online
were very different from the current SNS-dominated cyberscape. Rheingold’s feature
eexample of a “virtual community” was The WELL,\textsuperscript{56} which was (and is) centred around
an internet-based forum and mailing list. Despite a disassociation from shared geography,
which Rheingold controversially argued was not necessary for the formation of
community, his original conception of community was still markedly attached to the idea
of the “proximate community” (Komito 1998 & 2001), with The WELL as a central
“watering hole.” Significantly, R3 user tb3 commented on a February 4\textsuperscript{th}, 2011 blog that,
“There are VERY FEW [sic] experiences, socially on this planet that parallel what I get
here with CBC Radio3 [sic]. And that includes real life, [sic] watering holes” (Pratt
2011). And while the next chapter will deal with how R3 acts as (or is perceived as) a
home for the interactions of users, the community that tb3 describes does not cement
their relationships exclusively through the blog. In fact, this is an important but minimal
component of how users describe the community. Just as Rheingold (2000) has more

\textsuperscript{56} The “Whole Earth ‘Lectronic Link,” found at http://www.well.com.
recently articulated online communities to be “networks of personal relationships,” so too have other scholars unlocked the term “online community” in order to capture the types of relationships that are built through the wide dispersal of tactics available in the technologically-mediated world of 2011 (boyd 2011; boyd & Ellison 2007; Goodings, Lock & Brown 2007; Ito et al. 2010; Liu Jenkins 2006; Papacharissi 2011). The following briefly outlines some of the debates surrounding uses of the term “community” in association with online socialization in order to frame the activities of R3 fans as composing a “distributed community” (Baym 2007).

Shawn Wilbur ([2000] 2006) asks of the virtual community, “what kinds of non-virtual community does it presuppose? What ideological fragments cluster in the way the term ‘community’ is reinvested with meaning in cyberspace?” (26). Debates about the efficacy of online communities ironically dwell on the level of “realness” of these communities despite there being little expression of how offline communities exhibit such “realness.” As Anderson ([1983] 2006) articulates, “all communities larger than primordial villages of face-to-face contact (and perhaps even these) are imagined” (6). In other words, offline communities are as virtual as online ones. Put another way, Goodings et al. (2007) suggest that “mediation – whether electronic or not – is a structural feature of both off-line and on-line communities” (475). Furthermore, divides between online and offline life create a false binary: each does not exist in isolation of the other (Barney 2007). Encapsulating the changes that have occurred since Rheingold’s famous articulations, Norah Young (2011) states that, “it used to be that our online lives tended to be separate from our regular lives, but increasingly, online life is just another seamless part of who we are in daily life” (Young 2011). This has strong implications for
evaluating “online communities,” as interactions in cyberspace cannot be studied merely in relation to the technological interfaces that facilitate them, but must also examine general conceptions and experiences of community.

Lee Komito (1998 & 2000) divides perceptions of communities into four types: moral (shared ethical system), normative (agreed-upon rules of behaviour), proximate (shared space), and fluid (“temporary aggregations of individuals”). The first three of these types of communities emphasize some form of sharing – of ideology, experience, identity, space, citizenship, kinship, etc. However, the last category on which Komito’s (1998) main argument hinges describes community to have “little sense of collective identity…Membership in a community is voluntary and temporary, and individuals move and groups are redefined” (103). Komito (1998) sees this nomadic style of community as an alternative to “an ethnocentric and restrictive view of community based on limited comparative examples from industrial and agrarian societies” (103).

Komito’s suggestion of the “fluid community” within a “foraging society” aligns well with Nancy Baym’s (2007) conception of the “distributed community.” Baym raises the important question: “What are the consequences for social coherence if groups are spread through multiple sites, only some of which are explicitly linked to one another?” I would add to these “multiple sites,” in the case of R3, the offline sites of live concerts and festivals. R3 fans can be seen as very similar to the Swedish indie fans that Baym studies in a number of ways: allegiance to a nation-specific form of independent music; concern with “monitoring and promoting multiple bands on multiple labels [rather] than with supporting any particular band or bands;” and the use of multiple online (and offline) platforms to “avail themselves of many mediated opportunities to share different
sorts of materials including text, music, video, and photographs in real time and asynchronously” (Baym 2007). However, for the Swedish indie fans that Baym studies, there is no “home base,” effectively creating challenges such as lack of coordination, coherence and efficiency. R3 fans (and the musicians whom they support) benefit from the position of the R3 site as a catalyst site within the distributed community. How, then, does this distributed community work within the assemblage of social networking practices that make up the “networked public?”

2.2 “Facebook is magic”: R3 in the networked public

In order to explain the increase in connections that she has made to other R3 fans in recent years, TheRadioHead stated succinctly that “Facebook is magic” (TheRadioHead June 2010). As mentioned in chapter one, once R3 fans make contact on the R3 site (primarily through blogs attached to the live webcasts), they quickly begin also communicating through SNS such as Facebook and Twitter. Some users and staff also claim that R3 itself is a SNS. If, as boyd (2011) argues, networked publics are “simultaneously (1) the space constructed through networked technologies and (2) the imagined collective that emerges as a result of the intersection of people, technology and practice,” (39) what role do networked publics play in articulating the representations and experiences of the R3 community? Furthermore, what are the complications that arise when public media, in this case R3, is supported by a community enhanced and sustained through for-profit enterprises such as Facebook and Twitter?

Pratt and Paolozzi had different reactions to the question of whether R3 is a SNS, although in both of their responses, they stressed the lack of actual SNS infrastructure on
the site. Whereas Pratt implies that it cannot be truly classified as an SNS because “there’s 8 zillion tools that we don’t really have the resources to build here” (Pratt November 2010), Paolozzi maintains that “it’s a social networking site despite itself, without the proper tools” (Paolozzi November 2010). The rationale that Paolozzi gives for his positive response to R3 as an SNS is that “our users hang out with each other, they have creative relationships that exist outside of the blog and outside of the limited function that we have on the blog” (Paolozzi November 2010). Whether or not R3 can be classified as a SNS itself, the tools it does make available help it function alongside SNS, like Facebook, that do provide those “8 zillion tools.”

danah boyd (2011) describes SNS as having three key features: profiles, tools for public communication, and friends lists. TheRadioHead captures what many users expressed about what they choose to put on their profile page: “Not much…I have a little bit, drop a hint about my work…I do have a lot of photos up there” (TheRadioHead June 2010). While R3 users tend not to focus much on their R3 profile page, saving deeper levels of self-construction for their accompanying Facebook and Twitter accounts (boyd 2011; Parks 2011), the formation of a profile is itself significant to users’ existence on the site. As boyd maintains, “profile generation is an explicit act of writing oneself into being in a digital environment” (43). It is no surprise then, that R3 profiles have had clear effects on the level of interaction on the site. Tellingly, tb3 stated that “the first thing I do when I check out people, if I see someone new commenting and I’ve caught their comments and they kind of interest me…and I want to see what they’re about, I’ll go to their profile and I’ll look at it” (tb3 September 2010).
Furthermore, as TheRadioHead alluded to, the one thing most users do pay attention to on their profiles are the pictures. As rmelvin stated, “I think the pictures are…really really important. And I think the people who don’t put pictures up don’t get as much attention…” (rmelvin June 2010). This feature, obviously important to users, was added to the site because of requests from users who wanted to see one another. As Pratt states, “since the pictures went up, the commenting has gone up a lot more too” (Pratt November 2010). In fact, the content of these pictures can be seen as a considerable source of cohesion in the community. As Mendelson and Papacharissi (2011) state in their engaging study, “Look at Us: Collective Narcissism in Facebook Photos,” “proof of the closeness of one’s peer group is confirmed by both the quantity and nature of pictures displayed” (268). A quick overview of the profiles of primary blog commenters frequently reveals pictures of themselves (in order of frequency) in R3 merch (See Appendix E, Figure 2), with R3-supported artists (See Appendix E, Figure 3), with R3 hosts (See Appendix E, Figure 4), and with other R3 users (See Appendix E, Figure 5). These extend into pictures of specialized R3 license plates (See Appendix E, Figure 6), the CBC logo formed out of perogies (See Appendix E, Figure 7), ham and other food, and even a tattoo of a line from Lawrence’s book57 (See Appendix E, Figure 8). Clearly, this is one major way that the community articulates itself.

57 Grant Lawrence released his book Adventures in Solitude: What Not to Wear to a Nudist Potluck and Other Stories from Desolation Sound in October of 2010. Although the book is not about Lawrence’s job or R3, many aspects of the book are geared towards R3 fandom, including the title of the book, which is drawn from a song by one of R3’s most played bands, The New Pornographers. Although there is a noticeable avoidance of advertising the book on the R3 site, fans consistently refer to it (with the tattoo example being the most extreme that I have seen). See the blog on July 12th, 2011 for indications of the reactions of R3 users to this book. Along with much excitement from the R3 community, the book received accolades from the literary community, including gaining the number one spot on the on the BC Bestsellers List, number two on the Canadian National Nonfiction Bestsellers List, being listed among the top ten best books of 2010 in the Vancouver Sun, Calgary Herald, and Montreal Gazette, and winning the BC Book Prize for the 2010 Book of the Year. As of October 18th, 2011, the book was added to CBC’s “Canada
The blog comments area provides the space for public interaction that boyd maintains is a feature of SNS. The live shows that garner the largest reactions usually provide a theme which instigates the discussion. As previously indicated, Lawrence’s shows receive the most comments, with themes that range from music (eg. Friday’s theme is always “The Top Five Gigs This Weekend”) to the banal. In fact, it is often the latter that receive the most comments. In a review of the blog for the last two years, other than special features such as the “Searchlight” contest (more on this in the next section), the shows that consistently get the most comments are Lawrence’s weekly “Fashion Fight Club.” This theme has sub-themes such as whether it is ok for men to wear shorts at work, whether parkas are sexy, and what style of sunglasses are “hip.” While the high level of activity on these particular blog posts may seem trivial, as boyd (2011) states, even “the ritual of checking in is a form of social grooming” (45). In fact, she maintains that “comments are not simply a dialogue between two interlocutors, but a performance of social connection before a broader audience…participants get the sense of the public constructed by those with whom they connect” (45). Like the photos on their profile pages, R3 users who comment, with depth or without, are making themselves known as part of the community.

While boyd states that the third feature of a SNS is that of friends’ lists, and Pratt explicitly stated that “where we haven’t gone is friending” (Pratt November 2010), I would argue that this is a key area that the R3 community diverges from simply being a (distributed) “online community” to a (distributed) online music community. That is, while R3 users cannot post a list of their R3 “friends” (once again, they save this for

Reads” contest. Lawrence relayed that his publisher attributes much of his national success to the loyalty of the R3 community (Lawrence October 2011c). Lawrence has effectively broadened his own fan base to outside of the CBC and has therefore enhanced his celebritism within the R3 community.
Facebook), they can display a list of their favourite artists and post playlists. If, as boyd (2011) states, “one way of interpreting the public articulation of connections on social networks is to see it as the articulation of a public,” and that the “friends” who are listed “are the people with whom the participants see themselves connecting en masse” (44), then it is clear that the act of posting lists of favourite artists and self-created playlists enables the network of artists and fans on R3 to view themselves. In continuation of tb3’s description of the act of “looking at” a new commenter’s profile, he stated that,

one of the first things I’ll check for is playlists…and see…what if anything [in] common do we have…in terms of musical tastes. Also it’s a way to…get a sense of someone on the blog, of them being someone you respect or like or think are cool. Then usually I’ll go through their playlist and see what they’ve got in there, and if it’s something I haven’t heard of, go check it out. So I think that was part of the reason I set up my playlist…because that’s how I looked at other people’s playlists. (tb3 September 2010)

The interface that R3 has with Facebook has also encouraged more use of features on the profile pages. MikeV outlined this for me, stating that,

I used to actually ignore those two parts but now that they have the built in facebook app [which posts what songs you add to your playlists or what artists you have selected as a favourite]…I use them a lot…I think its [sic] just to show off what I am listening to [sic] others who maybe are not on the site, so I guess that is for of [sic] communicating. (MikeV October 2010)

As boyd (2011) remarks, “networked publics’ affordances do not dictate participants’ behavior [sic], but they do configure the environment in a way that shapes participants’ engagement” (39). The way in which R3’s profile pages, communicative tactics, playlists and artist favouring functions all constitute a network themselves, and additionally enters R3 into the larger sphere of networked publics represented by Facebook and Twitter.

58 Hugo Liu published an article in 2007 entitled “Social Network Profiles as Taste Performances” that also dealt with how lists of preferences, not only friends, constitute a social network. See: Liu 2007
59 The Radio 3 player became embeddable on Facebook on August 10th, 2007.
While the structure and intent of R3 remains firmly influenced by so-called public interests (which, as outlined earlier, has its own share of representational tensions), the dynamics of its place within the networked public means that the R3 community is explicitly tied to commercial tactics. Indeed, profit-motivated SNS infrastructure such as direct or viral marketing campaigns and the data collection they depend on are propped up by desires for community-building. The life-blood for marketing in 2011 are the connections that individuals make to one another through SNS. In his captivating study, “Social Network Exploitation,” Mark Andrejevic (2011) argues that “contrary to conventional wisdom, social networking sites don’t publicize community, they privatize it” (97). Furthermore, that

the reduction of our notion of community to one structured by marketing interests and built upon the exploitation of user labour represents not a limitation of the technology, but of our conception of community and our grasp of the potential of networked interactivity. (99)

Like Andrejevic, I am careful to note that these exploitive situations do not preclude the very real enjoyment, pleasure, and meaning that users gain from their experiences of interacting with one another on and facilitated by SNS. What needs to be understood, however, are what kind of assumptions are made about SNS-mediated communities as neutral, naturally formed, or somehow free from the controls of private enterprise.

With R3 arguably at the helm, CBC’s genuinely innovative digital media initiatives seem to fulfill Andrejevic’s modicum of hope, that “the Internet didn’t start as a privately owned and commercially operated communication system, and it needn’t remain so” (99). However, while the CBC works to include “Everyone” by programming to “specific interests and requirements” (CBC 2011a), as long as the CBC is doing so through the use of SNS as the social connective tissue, these niche audiences (like the one(s) created on
the R3 site) will be used for profit. In other words, the “Everyone” will be explicitly marketed to in “Every Way.”

2.3 Perceptions of R3 as “Community”: Music, Live Shows, Blog Discussion, and the CBC Ideology

cinnie23 stated that the reasons for her relationship to R3 “started as the music, then I got really attached to the hosts, and now I’m really attached to all the other bloggers” (cinnie23 August 2010). All of the members and staff that I interviewed expressed that the music presented on R3 is what initially captured their interest in the site. For some, it is still the most important element of their R3 experience. For others, like cinnie23, it functioned as a gateway to a “community” that has become central to their lives. While cinnie23, who lived (at the time of the interview) in the small Saskatchewan city of Swift Current, finds her offline R3 connections by hosting and travelling to shows of R3 artists, other R3 users congregate together in local R3 clubs, with originating friendships having occurred on the blog. The comfort that users feel in meeting their online buddies at shows largely comes from a perception of shared ideology, one that is often explained by some sense of collective CBC values. Perceived connections within the R3 community are solidified by these key features: a shared interest in independent Canadian music, offline friendships, and a sense of familiarity and safety on the R3 blog.

A commonly articulated sentiment both on the blog and in the interviews I conducted is that R3 “saved music” for users. Bode described that “when I found Radio 3 in 2005, it was like explosions in my head and light bulbs going off and fires being rekindled and a crazy crazy passion just finally gave me a place to find new things and
outlets and find things throughout the country” (Bode November 2010). rmelvin similarly stated that,

I was sick of music until I found Radio3. I was sick of the top 40. I had no connection to these people. Somebody in Detroit or something. A lot of the bands you hear on top 40 you have no connection. They talk about things I know nothing about. Whereas you start listening to Radio 3 and they’re singing about the highway I [sic] drive down. So there’s a much tighter connection. (rmelvin June 2010)

As Simon Frith (1987) states, music influences “the cultural placing of the individual in the social” (139). While there are different musical tastes represented on the R3 site (ie. the genre streams are broken into “Pop,” “Rock,” “Hiphop,” and “Electronic”), they are bound together by a collective sense of “independent Canadian music.” The term “independent music” signifies, as Hesmondhalgh (2000) would have it, the first time that a music genre has “taken its name from the form of industrial organization behind it” (35). In England, where Hesmondhalgh’s research takes place, the link between indie labels and capitalist economics had established itself by the late 90s (Hesmondhalgh 1999), whereas in Canada, fans are still stumbling over themselves in order to explain the commercial success of such “indie” bands as Broken Social Scene and The Arcade Fire (R3 heroes). While the term “independent” is meant to refer to music that is produced independently of major label, what is privileged on the site is, in fact, indie rock. As Ryan Hibbett (2005) convincingly argues in his article “What is Indie Rock?, “while indie rock marks the awareness of a new aesthetic, it also satisfies among audiences a desire for social differentiation and supplies music providers with a tool for exploiting that desire” (56). Hibbett draws on Pierre Bourdieu when he clarifies that indie music scenes function with the same internal logic as “high art” consumers, fields that have often been thought of as opposites in cultural studies. Trading economic profit for the symbolic profit of disinterestedness, in indie rock “obscurity becomes a positive
feature, while exclusion is embraced as the necessary consequence of the majority’s lack of ‘taste’” (57).

In her 2003 book, Site and Sound: Understanding Independent Music Scenes, Holly Kruse describes the exclusiveness of the indie rock scene as a perception among members of participating in a “refusal” of mainstream musical practices (117). This refusal gives users a shared spirit of opposition. As Lawrence stated,

> if you walk up to someone at a Fiery Furnaces show or a Controller Controller show and say ‘what’s CBC Radio 3?’ chances are they will know…but if you ask someone at just a standard university campus they won’t know, they’d have no idea…I’ve often said CBC Radio 3 is like a secret club. (quoted in Sahota 80)

Sahota, in describing the level of estrangement that R3 had within the CBC in 2006, argues that this marginalization actually assists R3’s construction of “hipness” (80) within the independent music scene. The process of refusal that Kruse describes then – this trendiness, exclusivity and elitism – clarifies a definition of indie rock around absence and “otherness,” gaining definition only by what it opposes (Hibbett 2005, 58). Sarah Ahmed (2000) suggests that the “very emphasis on becoming, hybridity and inbetweenness” (13) of contemporary culture reproduces the “figure of the stranger” (13). In the case of indie music, the desire to position oneself as marginal has the effects of estranging those without insider knowledge (knowledge which, drawing on Hibbett, “masquerades as taste”) and granting authority to those “in the know.” In other words, as Hibbett puts it, “to seek an ‘other’ category of music and name it is to transform it into ‘cultural capital’” (56).

The “secret club” of R3 is further delineated from general indie music knowledge to that of Canadian indie music. The phenomenon of obtaining close social ties across the nation is, in fact, part of the constitution of independent music scenes (Kruse 2003; Baym
Insofar as independent and underground music scenes tend to be place-specific (Forman 2000; Porcello 2005), they also have had a tradition of association and cross-cultivation nationally and internationally. Given this characteristic, the surge of independent music scenes in the early nineties grew well alongside the networking technologies of cyberspace. As Scott Henderson (2008) identifies, “the very notion of what constitutes a scene, or even a geographic region, has been altered with the rise of Internet-based communities” (310). Artists, fans, promoters and other people involved in the scene take advantage of the networking capabilities of the internet to augment the sociality of independent music scene(s) and scene-specific knowledge bases (Mall 2006).

As Dan Sinker of Punk Planet puts it,

> especially at the underground, and operating at this kind of seat-of-your-pants level, number one, it helps you to not go down a million dead-end roads…The other thing about it too [sic] is that people that know this stuff are happy to share it, because they know that they’re going to get it back at some point, either from you or from someone else. (as quoted in Mall 2006, 46)

R3 in particular works as a point of contact for fans and artists within the Canadian independent music scene and is often perceived to break through the isolation that one can feel when outside of main centres. As Lawrence articulated:

> What’s happened, which has been very positive, is a lot of these people get into this music, which isn’t mainstream music for their town, like mainstream would be Nickelback or whatever, and they get into this independent Canadian music…They really like it but they don’t feel like they’re part of a community. Radio 3 allows them to feel like they are a part of a community. (Lawrence August 2010)

Henderson (2008) argues that a Canadian music scene is currently (or at least in 2008) “poised to take advantage of a new era in popular music” because “the audience whose tastes are reflected in [online music delivery services] are a youth cohort that has

---

60 There is also a rhetoric among some independent musicians of rejecting social networking in favour of some notion of off-line authenticity. Ironically, in these cases, there is almost always someone managing their Facebook and Twitter feeds for them.
grown up in an era when Cancon⁶¹ was the norm. Canadian musicians have always been part of the sound flow” (314). The mediascape that Henderson makes reference to, however, is the same one that Andrejevic (2011) suspects for its exploitative qualities. As Bryan O’Neill (2006) puts it, “the environment in which [cbc.ca] operates is highly competitive, unregulated in the sense that little protection is offered for public service initiatives, and characterized by increasing degrees of audience fragmentation” (17).

While the R3 site may help to define a community and a scene around Canadian independent music, it is important to recognize how this is a direct outcome of market pressures to create niche audiences.

Insofar as R3 manifests itself as a hub for independent Canadian music, it also encourages what Kruse (2003) terms as “scene-defining spaces” (SDS) (129). For R3 users, not only does the R3 site itself function as an SDS, but spaces traditionally associated with independent music scenes – that of record stores, certain pubs, venues and festivals – all maintain high value for the community. For instance, the biggest jump in commenting on the R3 blog after the first live show of 2007⁶² was the launch of the “Searchlight” contest on March 19th, 2008. The contest professes to “seek out the best that Canada has to offer musically” (Lawrence 2008) with each of the past four years focusing on finding the best record store (2008), the best live music club (2009), the best music festival (2010) and most recently, the best music website⁶³ (2011).

The “Searchlight” contests may well have had an influence on the formation of local R3 clubs with their ability to provoke support from groups that rallied around

---

⁶¹ Cancon (Canadian Content regulations) was introduced in Canada in 1971. See Grenier 1990a; Henderson 2008.
⁶² From 108 to 240 comments.
⁶³ To be clear, they did not include Radio 3 itself as an option for “best music website.”
specific stores, venues and festivals. But it was not until more recently that the first R3
groups started conglomerating offline, mostly at live shows and festivals. These groups
began organically, having begun largely because of individuals seeking “gig-buddies” for
shows of R3 artists. Bode told me the story of the moment that “absolutely shaped the
last two years of [his] life”:

on a Trivia Tuesday…[I] called in, got a question, won a prize and because I was
in Vancouver, they had tickets to a show…so I accepted those [and] I just put it
out on the blog, “Hey, I’m the guy who called in and won those two tickets. I don’t
have anyone else to go with, does anyone else want this ticket?” Another pretty
heavy blog contributor piped in [and] said, “Hey, I’d love to go.” (Bode November
2010)

Bode follows this by describing how his relationships with other R3ers in Vancouver
“blossomed from there,” to the point that they have attended Sasquatch music festival
together (facilitated by using a Facebook event page, with invitations sent to R3 fans),
had a long weekend at a cabin together, have a member deemed as “mayor of YQR3,”
hold birthday parties for one another, and attend countless live shows of R3 bands (Bode
November 2010). As tb3 stated about his experience in London, Ontario,

before it was just like we were all fans of CBC Radio 3 and Canadian music. Whereas now we’re fans of that, but we’re also…like in London here we’re trying
to gather and actually meet up every so often. Not at a show, but just to get
together as…friends. So it’s given us a chance to be from somewhere and meet
somewhere. (tb3 September 2010)

This seems to replicate Rheingold’s enthusiasm for online communities that are
extensions of offline communities or that become so after the fact by meeting face-to-
face (Parks 2011; Wilbur [2000] 2006, 46). Skorupski indicated that “recently there’s
been this big boom in how we’ve all connected and I think meeting outside has really
helped that spark up” (Skorupski November 2010). I would argue that in the case of R3,
these offline meetings are integral, not only on the level of personal response, but in the
constitution of these connections as part of the independent music scene of Canada and the privileging of SDS.

The degree to which R3 users feel comfortable enough with one another in cyberspace to meet up in physical space is often associated, by them, with the (perceived) ideology of the CBC. Lawrence gushed that “maybe it’s a CBC thing” that “with CBC Radio 3 fans…the creep factor is non-existent…they’re all just genuinely…very nice, very grounded and just generally into music and into building a community” (Lawrence August 2010). Bode similarly maintained that

I honestly do think that the CBC is part of the fabric of Canadian culture and I think it’s a good thing. The word “community,” [I] don’t see that as translating as easily to a mainstream entity, a strictly commercial entity, it could try to be co-opted. I don’t think it will come as easily. (Bode November 2010)

But while the safety and security felt on the blog can be linked to the perception of the CBC within the Canadian media landscape, bloggers are also quick to differentiate the R3 blog from the main CBC website. As rmelvin stated,

…you compare [R3] to [the] CBC news sites, which is kind of funny we compare ourselves to that on the blog a lot, and how rude the news comments are, and how incredibly mean people are to each other on the news comments, as compared to…any meanness on the Radio3 blog is good natured…There’s some heated discussions where people seriously disagree with each other, but in a respectful way generally, and if anyone goes over the line they get told pretty quickly. (rmelvin June 2010)

Whereas the CBC news blog is seen as a free-for-all for “trolls” and for “flame-wars,” the R3 blog is perceived to be a “positive place to hang out” (Pratt November 2010). But what about the blog commenters that “go over the line” and how are they reprimanded?

As Ahmed (2000) argues,

It is the very potential of the community to fail which is required for the constitution of the community. It is the enforcement of the boundaries between those who are already recognized as out of place that allows those boundaries to be established…the good citizen is a citizen who suspects rather than is suspect. (26)

In cyberspace, sites count on “insiders” to be suspicious in order to self-police. As
Paolozzi stated, R3 does not have tools to manage forums and they do not need them because “in five years, I’ve deleted four comments” (Paolozzi November 2010). Although R3 is known for having very few incidents where people “get told,” this type of self-regulation evokes Foucault’s (1994) notion of “governmentality” – the “conduct of conduct” – wherein power takes on a regulating role by the individual rather than a top-down force. Applied to the idea of community regulations, this concept is reliant on being able to readily identify who is – or what statements are – deviant from the presumed community. In the next chapter, I interrogate how users articulate ideas of “home” in relation to the R3 site and more fully explore the disjunctures that occur in the conceptualization of the R3 community. As Paolozzi put it, “the funny thing about families who have few problems is that the problems they do have…they can’t discuss, because it challenges the belief that they don’t have problems” (Paolozzi July 2011).
3. R3 AS HOME

“Home - is where I want to be, But I guess I'm already there”
- from “Naïve Melody” by The Talking Heads, as quoted on the R3 blog by Raji Sohal on Mar 16, 2008

Referring to how the R3 site functions as a “home” in relation to the community’s multitude of offsite interactions, tb3 stated that, “I really do see it as a nucleus, because for all these things that we try to do outside of CBC Radio3, it still represents where our first tent peg is put in, and where the tent is built from. No matter how far you go, you’re still kind of looking back to there as kind of the centre” (tb3 September 2010). bell hooks (2009) describes the contemporary yearning for a “homeplace,” a place where there is a “sense of being wedded to place” (23). Users of R3 describe the site as home on a number of different levels, and thus actively produce the site as a space of home. Tony Chapman (2001) offers a compelling engagement with the idea of home, stating that “…home is conceptualized in the abstract, not just by social scientists, but by everybody, and that views of this ‘place’ affect social expectations and experiences. In this sense, there is no place like ‘home’ because people construct its memory and imagination” (11).

The myth of home, then, functions well within the geography of cyberspace which, evoking Michael Benedikt ([2000] 2006), exists as “an agreed-upon territory of mythical figures, symbols, rules and truths…” (30). As Alison Blunt and Robyn M. Dowling (2006) would have it, “home is thus a spatial imaginary: a set of variable ideas and feelings, which are related to context, and which construct places, extend across and connect places” (2). Home is constructed, whether on or off-line, through various stages: as an intimately known location, through types of relationships held or desired, through

---

64 Examples of how users described R3 as home include that “pretty much anyone upload their music” (Lee) or because “it makes me feel welcomed” (Benfold 2010) or because “it’s this small little community where everyone will accept you and respect you and stuff like that” (Skorupski 2010) or even “the rec room which we all go to everyday to interact” (MikeV 2010).
the perception of how others experience it, and finally as a “representation of cultural identity,” providing “a collective sense of social permanence and security” (Chapman 11).65

3.1. Location: The Placing of R3

As emphasized in the first chapter of this thesis, users of R3 primarily tune in from work, describing it in terms similar to StephRamsahai’s comment on a June 21st, 2011 blog post: “Radio 3 is what makes my job tolerable, so thanks! You guys keep me alive!” (Lawrence 2011b). cinnie23’s profile page bio states that, “I currently live in a ridiculously small town with very little taste in good music, so CBC3 is my escape! Canadian music is my passion…and I feel as though CBC3 is my home” (http://radio3.ca/#/profile/cinnie23). These articulations suggest that R3 plays the role of “haven in a heartless world” (Lasch 1977) or of “home as escape.” To be sure, there is no material “home” that provides the type of sentimental privacy often evoked by the word. From the “electronic hearth” of radio (Naughton 2000; Taylor 2005; Vipond 1992) to the “window on the world” of television (Spigel 2001), 20th century technologies have aided in blurring the boundaries of public and private and therefore of reconstituting both how the house-as-home functions and where “home” is sought. Just as these new technologies have allowed corporatization within the physical space of home (Tiziana 2004), so too has the myth of home been capitalized on by corporations and organizations seeking

65 Although this chapter focuses on home as a concept applied to a particular sense of space and connection, the use of “home” to describe the closeness of relationships was not only used by R3ers to identify the space and “family” of the blog, but was also often evoked in reference to actual building-dwellings to underline the closeness of their connections. CDNz1 stated that, “there are people I would give my house key to, that I haven’t met…[I’d say] “come on in, make yourself at home, I’ll be there in a couple of hours” (Gordon September 2010). mefflyer stated on the blog that, “This community is extremely important to me. The friends I’ve made - and are making. People I invite into my home…People who invite me into theirs” (Lawrence 2011b).
profit and/or participation. Laura Hammond (2006) understands home as the conceptual and affective space in which community, identity, and political and cultural membership intersect. In this sense, home is a variable term, one that can be transformed, newly invented, and developed in relation to circumstances in which people find themselves or choose to place themselves. (quoted in Blunt and Dowling, 228)

How do members and staff “place” R3? How does this placing influence the construction of “a place we know intimately” (Chapman 144) for R3 users? What are some of the issues with considering the site as a place of “escape?”

Bode located R3 by defining it in terms of its singular focus: “Where else can you go to get solely 100% Canadian content? Nowhere” (Bode November 2010). Berland (2009) states that, “wherever it locates you, whatever it comes up against, music shapes the place you’re in. It speaks to the heart of where you are, and tells you something about what it means to live there” (186). R3 as a centre for Canadian independent music is the first and foremost factor that defines the borders of its space and pronounces the site as “home.” Bode maintained that the uniqueness of the connectivity that comes out of R3’s presentation of Canadian music is because “the people who are behind it are there for love and passion” (Bode November 2010). Indeed, Lawrence stated that he is “an advocate for everything that goes on” (Lawrence June 2010) and host Lana Gay (among others) stated that she is “in love” with R3 and thinks it is “so great” (Gay November 2010). Gay further distinguished both the experiences of working and of listening to R3 from her experiences in commercial radio, where she described “different types of priorities” such as selling advertising, speaking breaks being devoted to products instead of music and “trusting [only] a few people to be in charge of the most important thing, which would be the music” (Gay November 2010).
Not only is the space of R3 distinguished from commercial radio, but also from other music blogs, including other indie music blogs. Pratt describes Lawrence attending a music conference (“M for Montreal”) at which

a bunch of music blogs were talking about how they were probably going to take commenting down off of the site because it just turns into this nasty fighting everywhere. And Grant got up and said, ‘uh, well, that’s really weird cause we don’t have that on our site…I can do a radio show and get 400 comments in three hours’…a bunch of people were blown away…and then a bunch of people also started saying, ‘well, that’s ridiculous, it’s because you have a silly strategy that you don’t ever put anything critical on your website for people to argue about.’ And that’s actually…true. (Pratt November 2010)

As opposed to other music blogs that present reviews of music (eg. Pitchfork, Exclaim, etc.) and therefore have the potential of trashing artists and albums, R3’s official commentary on artists is always one of support. As Gay explained, “we’re not presenting you anything, we’re asking you things” (Gay November 2010). Although curation of shows and site content exposes hierarchies of artistic support, the live shows themselves revolve more around conversation topics and blog discussion. In this way, not only do the users of R3 feel an intimate connection with the shows they participate in, but the site itself represents a retreat from the negativity generated by critical music press.

R3 is “placed” as a safe space for users and artists alike, located by its loyalties to Canadian independent artists and by the uniqueness of its so-called positive interactivity. The agency given to users’ participation – from deciding directions for site design, construction of shows and ideas for playlists – encourages the investment that users have in the production of the R3 space. The illusion of “safe space” where “the creep factor is non-existent” (Lawrence November 2011) actually suggests that it is a space of safety for only some. That is, as Leonardo and Porter (2010) put it, “safe space is…laced with a narcissism that designates safety for individuals in already dominant positions of power, which is not safe at all but perpetuates a systemic relation of violence” (151). This is not
to suggest merely a demographic failure on the part of R3 but rather that the “taken-for-granted principles of benevolent or even critical equality” (Jones 1999, 300) actually works against themselves by reaffirming already established systems of power.

The “home” of R3 is furthermore not as much of an escape as users might hope, for it is actually still work. Skorupski stated that “I try to say that, yes, I’m a blogger, but people usually think [that I] work for Radio 3, and it’s like, no, no, no” (Skorupski November 2010). But not only are R3 users participating from work, protests aside, they are also doing work for R3. As Gay remarked, “you ask people questions and you really genuinely want to know their answers because that’s content for your show” (Gay November 2010, my emphasis). The “our input is their output” mentality of R3 (and MTV) has some corollary effects: as Andrejevic puts it, “any comparison of industrial-era production to information-age creativity needs to take into account not just the fact that productive resources are in the hands of consumers, but also that the means of communication and distribution are not” (97).

Insofar as R3 functions as a space of home within a networked public, it has the capacity to generate what Andrejevic (2011) describes as “networks of sociability, taste, and communication” (89) or, drawing on M. Lazzarato (2011) “a series of activities that are not normally recognized as ‘work’ – in other words, the kinds of activities involved in defining and fixing cultural and artistic standards, fashions, tastes, consumer norms, and, more strategically, public opinion” (quoted in Andrejevic, 89). Although the “affective” and “immaterial” labour done by the users of R3 is not necessarily linked with the kinds of commercial gains that Andrejevic associates with Facebook and Myspace, the data produced by the network is still imbued in the production of social space, in particular
around independent Canadian music. On one hand, this labour is quite directly providing profit to the creative expression of the artists who make the music that is shared and consumed through the site. But as Lovink and Rossiter (2011) argue, “herein lies the perversity of social networks: however radical they may be, they will always be data-mined. They are designed to be exploited” (quoted in Andrejevic, 82). While R3 staff maintain that they do not use demographics or other information gleaned from user data to make decisions on the site, the networks of association that span outward from the R3 site still hold quantifiable data. R3, then, is the home location for not only independent Canadian music and the people that gravitate towards this music, but also for the data that represents them.

3.2. Relationships and Fandom

On the June 21st, 2011 blog, mj2k1 commented that, “Awww the entire Radio 3 FAMILY [sic] is here. Mama Radiohead. Big Papa Beav. Uncle Grant….Grandpa Benoit?” In an interview for this thesis, Bode also claimed that he thinks of Grant as an uncle, and additionally described the relationships on the site as, “it’s music fans, there’s a space for them to talk and they take those relationships to whatever end they want” (Bode November 2010). cinnie23 also underlined the linkage between fandom and the relationships on the site, remarking that, “really it’s all about the music, that’s what brought us together and that’s what’s going to keep us together” (cinnie23 August 2010). As Simon Frith (1988) put it, “The experience of pop music is an experience of placing: in responding to a song, we are drawn, haphazardly, into affective and emotional alliances with the performers and with the performers’ other fans” (139). Insofar as the
R3 site facilitates these alliances, what is the nature of these fan friendships, and how do they aid in constituting a space of home? Further, if, as Chapman and Hockey state (1999), “it is our response to the actual or imagined intrusions of outsiders that help people conceptualise the ideal home,” what exclusions to the community of R3 fans enable a solidification of a home ideal? This section takes a closer look at the connection between fandom and the relationships of the blog community, particularly exposing some of the problematics of this overlay.

In her article, “It’s All In the Family: Intersections of Gender, Race, and Nation,” Patricia Hill Collins (1998) remarks on the invocation of family to define social organizations and hierarchies. She states that “the power of [the] traditional family ideal lies in its dual function as an ideological construction and as a fundamental principle of social organization” (63). The trope of the family has been utilized by an endless range of social and political aggregations to demonstrate kinship and create organization for membership in these communities. Paul Gilroy (1993) has provided key insights into this issue in identifying that, for example, a conflation of “family” with “race” exposes how communities may rely on traditional ideas of the family in order to separate themselves from an “other.” Responses to the family that mj2k1 described on the R3 blog were in agreement with his perception of R3 as family and included such responses as naming mj2k1 “the wise-cracking misfit brother. [sic] who we have to love, regardless” (louveeda) and Benoit from Ottawa agreeing that Grant is “that cousin, or brother in law, or yea even uncle, of which there usually seems to be one in every family. You know the one. Life o’ the party. Lampshade and good times” (Lawrence 2011b). In the case of R3, not only does the invocation of “family” help in the establishment of indie “otherness,”
the family that mj2k1 refers to helps to clarify, not only who is a part of the R3 family, but also that the hierarchy is perceived through hegemonic notions of the family.

Users who participate regularly on the R3 blog describe themselves not only as fans of Canadian independent music, but also fans of R3 itself. Drawing on Jenkins (2010), people tend to move between fan experiences – once you become a fan, you tend to belong to a larger “fan” community. Almost all of the R3 users that I spoke to described having been music fans – not necessarily of independent Canadian music in particular – prior to finding R3, but that R3 provided new impetus and new stimulation for this fandom. As Baym (2007) argues, online fandom has created new types and intensities of interpersonal relationships between fans as well as between fans and artists. This is certainly the case for R3, where fans describe the intimacy provoked by billeting bands, hosting house concerts, helping with artist promotion and participation in other modes of support for artists. As Russ Gordon, who hosts many R3 artists who come through Detroit, explained, “to have a whole playlist full of bands that you know personally?…that’s where the ‘home’ comes from” (Gordon September 2010). These relationships are, thus, facilitated through the blog, R3 profiles and the networked public in which R3 is the central node. The comfort level between fans and artists is often triggered by feelings of equilateral respect on blog discussions. For instance, though profile pages are different for artists than for other members, on blog comments usernames and artist names will show up in the same way, lending to a blurring of distinctions between fans and artists. This scenario, as well as the ease in uploading
music to the site and support for emerging artists, also lends itself to fans becoming artists and vice versa.66

One contentious issue that has been raised surrounds the connectivity fostered through the reading of user comments on the live programs. Some users, like EricR, feel that the reading of comments “on-air” is vital to the connections made on the site:

I think that hearing our input – [sic] from the blog, twitter, eMail, etc. – [sic] does help make it feel like we’re all actually part of the Radio3 community. We’re not just blindly posting on a Canadian Indie forum somewhere and just all happen to listen to the same radio station. It’s that feedback loop that helps make this community what it is (for me). (Lawrence 2011a)

Others, like TheRadioHead for instance, feel that “the blog is for listeners, air time is for professionals… Think beyond the thrill of hearing your comment on the air, it is bigger than that” (Lawrence 2011a). The debate here centres around what De Certeau (1984) refers to as a struggle for “possession of the text” and control over meanings (Maxwell 2002).

Although agreeing with TheRadioHead that the blog atmosphere has transformed to focus more on inside jokes and to be “less about the music and more about the blogger” than when she began using R3 in 2007, Jakobsen admits that this type of insularity contributes to a uniformity that helps establish “a complete community” (Jakobsen February 2011). Ian Maxwell (2002) writes about the limitations created by fan cultures’ systems of insider/outside wherein “the curse of fandom” cripples an insiders’ breadth of knowledge (Maxwell even goes so far as to state that outsiders may have “insight and knowledges not available to insiders” (110)). In addition, Rodman (2003) states that
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66 Examples are many, but include: themountainsandthetrees, a solo artist from Corner Brook Newfoundland, who shows up as a participant on the blog enough that his artist page begins with “yes, I am that The Mountain and the Trees”; saskatchewansounds who participated on the blog regularly before performing under the name Jeans Boots and becoming a R3-played artist; and calculust from Victoria, who started playing in a band after building up the confidence from the support of the R3 blog community.
“with any community (virtual or otherwise), prevailing social norms and pressures create
de facto limits on who feels free to speak, what subjects people are willing to discuss, and
what sort of on-list behaviour is deemed appropriate” (30).

In addition to TheRadioHead and Jakobsen’s dismay over the degradation of
standards of musical expertise, other users expressed additional ways that the R3
community closes itself in. Lee spoke about consistently wondering,

what is it about Radio 3 and in particular, Canadian independent music that seems
to draw a specific kind of crowd, a specific kind of economic class, of race, of
ethnicity, and so on, that doesn’t seem to draw…the other parts of the population
within Canada, even within Vancouver, which is so diverse in terms of the people
that live here (Lee November 2010)?

According to many (primarily white) R3 bloggers and staff, race either does not exist or
exists limitlessly on the R3 site. One blogger explained this limitlessness, saying that “the
fact that anybody can put up a band page…you’ve got every race of post” (Campbell
June 2010) implying that not only is the democratic ideal of equal access manifested on
the R3 site, but that it guarantees a balanced and boundless representation of races. This
simultaneously casts race as a symbolic commodity, complete with exchange value (the
“collect-all” mentality), as well as blindly moves past the problematics of access and
desire that inform whether or not bands choose to upload their music to the R3 site. Race
does matter online, as Beth Kolko et al. (2000) puts it, “precisely because all of us who
spend time online are already shaped by the ways in which race matters offline, and we
can’t help but bring our own knowledge, experiences, and values with us when we log
on” (4-5).

The attitude that race does not exist on the site is exemplified by the claim of one
of R3’s key music programmers that, “we’re…multiracial, sure, we don’t really see
colour or anything…” (MacArthur November 2010). This statement, and statements like
it, reveal what Leonardo and Porter (2010) call a “health-care version of anti-racism, an insurance against ‘looking racist’” (141). When asked in interview how R3 upholds various aspects of the CBC broadcasting act, most users responded enthusiastically that it certainly “reflects the multicultural and multiracial nature of Canada.” Interviewees would then list artists who are explicitly not white, counting them off on one hand. In addition, they (including music programmer Mark MacArthur) would point to the Ab-Originals Podlatch as an example of R3’s multiculturalism (this included music programmer Mark MacArthur).

There are many problems with this invocation of the Ab-Originals “Podlatch” (podcast). First of all, it is not produced at R3\(^67\) and therefore any claim to it “filling a void” is not the work of R3 staff. Secondly, since the Ab-Originals Podlatch began, there has been a marked absence from the main R3 streams of many Aboriginal artists who had previously been played there (ie. Kinnie Starr, Eekwol). When asked whether he or any of the other R3 music programmers use the Ab-Originals podlatch to find music for the main R3 streams, MacArthur responded that they do not. Finally, none of the users that I interviewed listen to the “podlatch.” “Aboriginal” has become a genre on the R3 site, managed by the Ab-Originals staff, kept separate from other genres and distinct from the streams of the rest of “Independent Canadian Music.”\(^68\)

There is an overt denial of “whiteness” as race on R3, and therefore a denial of its dominance in that space. As Richard Dyer (1997) claims in his seminal work White, “as long as race is something only applied to non-white peoples, as long as white people are
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\(^67\) The Ab-Originals Podlatch is produced by Kim Ziervoegal at CBC Manitoba and hosted on the R3 site. It is the first completely Aboriginally staffed CBC production.

\(^68\) For a more in-depth analysis of the Ab-Originals podlatch and its relation to both the CBC and the R3 site, see my (unpublished) paper “Colonizing Cyberspace: CBC Radio 3 and the “Ab-Originals ‘Podlatch,’” presented at the annual meeting of IASPM-Canada in Montreal in June 2011.
not racially seen and named, they/we function as a human norm” (1). The consequence of these attitudes in relation to the R3 family, then, means that the safety and comfort of the space is skewed, or in Leonard and Porter (2010)’s words, “the term ‘safety’ acts as a misnomer because it often means that white individuals can be made to feel safe” (141). As user Campbell said of R3,

I don’t really think it needs to [reflect the multicultural and multiracial nature of Canada]. We’re all very different people, we all have different music tastes. And so they play to that already, but I don’t think it’s necessarily on purpose. Good music is just good music, right? (Campbell June 2010)

In the words of Carol Schick (2010), “This is a very old justification that gets used for any medium in which white people want to pretend that whiteness doesn’t exist.”

Not only does Lee claim that the disparities of acceptance on the blog may be more clear to her given that she is “often the only Asian person at the shows that [she goes] to” and “the only person without blue eyes” in the group of R3ers that she hangs out with, but her concern also rests with the values and ideologies that she feels are “endorsed as acceptable and encouraged for people who are looking for this kind of music” (Lee November 2010). A clear example of this, both Lee and cinnie23 expressed that they are at least somewhat “in the closet” about their identities as Christians on the blog. cinnie23 stated that,

…most of the people that I’ve met…when I look at their Facebook pages, most of them are atheists…I haven’t found anyone whose beliefs match up with mine at all… If there’s a chance for me to bring it up and talk about then I will, but I’m not going to go on there and preach to everyone because then they’re going to ignore me completely… (cinnie23 August 2010)

While it is not surprising for religion to be off-limits in a secular media space, especially within the history of broadcasting in Canada (Fortner 2005; MacLellan 2010; Vipond 1992), this brings about questions of what other aspects of self are held back by users on

69 Personal communication, December 8, 2010.
the blog in a (likely unconscious) effort to maintain the collective status of otherness (Hibbet 2006).

Furthermore, contrary to indicating an openness that is assumed by the absence of religion, the environment of R3 reflects a connection to the rituals of indie music. As Wendy Fonarow (2006) points out in Empire of Dirt: The Aesthetics and Rituals of British Indie Music, “in this economic and institutional sector [of indie music] that is considered to be wholly secular, one finds a community shaped by metaphysical concerns regarding authority, exploitation, and the nature of ‘authentic’ experience” (22). These are the concerns that outline, in Lee’s words, that “there are definitely a lot of things that indicate whether you fit as an insider or an outsider within the content that is posted on Radio 3 itself” (Lee November 2010). If, as Blunt and Dowling (2006) put it, home “provides a setting in which people feel secure and centred,” but “meanings of home vary across social divisions such as gender, class and race” (9), the idea of sanctuary that presides over users’ sense of home on R3 is a limited one.

3.3. “Who Knows About Your Affair with Radio 3?”: Perceptions of Others

R3 users are drawn to talk about R3 to others as the “home of independent Canadian music” in order to promote the music played on the site, but shy away from fully explaining the intimacy of their connection to the site. Many users commented in interviews that it is “very hard to explain” (Skorupski November 2010) the degree of closeness formed through the site and that they either fear or have experienced people thinking that “it’s really weird…you hang out with these people you only talk to online
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and you go to concerts with them now and it’s like, no, it’s ok, it’s a community” (Campbell June 2010).71

Users are especially careful to withhold their level of involvement with R3 from their workplaces (often due to fear of reprimand from their employers). The majority of internet users create or enhance relationships online (See: boyd; Goodings et al.; Ito; Parks), but safety concerns continue to arise when online friendships transition to offline interactions. For users who make this transition, whether the source of friendship is a site like WarCraft or Second Life, or whether it is R3, “the relationship part is…awkward to navigate” (Lee November 2010). In an effort to avoid confronting this awkwardness, the relationships that R3ers hold with each other offline can be explained in terms of “gig-buddies” and other generally accepted social connections. As Lee put it, “it’s kind of like the whole thing with online dating…if you build a relationship offline, that doesn’t really matter that you were dating online.” Explaining the R3 site as the central location for these friendships does not, according to her, “add anything to the fact that these people are my friends” (Lee November 2010). The protectiveness that surrounds R3 users’ articulations of their online community to others reveals an important stabilization of the idea of “home” on the site, as it reflects a desire to keep the source of these close ties private, whether out of fear of judgment, expectations of misunderstanding or in order to defend the borders of intimacy.

Chapman and Hockey (1999) state that the perception of an “ideal home has since the nineteenth century afforded the possibility of retreat from public view, and a place for the exercise of private dreams and fantasies, personal foibles and inadequacies” (10). In

---

71 Tactics used varied between those who were of the opinion that online dating was weird and those who didn’t.
addition to previously mentioned indications that users feel that the site is a “home-as-escape,” as cinnie23 explained, “we’re at home with our family when we’re on the blog…I would be lost without it” (cinnie23 August 2010). In other words, R3 functions as a reference point for users’ daily lives. However, cinnie23 chuckled when asked how she discusses blog relationships off-line, stating that “I try, but they just don’t get it…it’s gotten to the point where it’s just not worth it” (cinnie23 August 2010). tb3 explained that “it sounds weird, like, ‘these are my online friends’,,” but that he tells people about the music on R3 every chance he gets, stating that “the biggest thing where I see people interested is when [I] talk about how much music is on there” (tb3 September 2010).

Clearly, there are two tiers of how R3 is spoken of as “home”: as the “home of independent Canadian music,” which is articulated in public terms, and the “home” for the R3 “family” on the blog, which is articulated in private terms or only talked about privately. As Blunt and Dowling (2006) put it, “home is best understood as a site of intersecting spheres, constituted through both public and private” (18) (Heidegger 1993 [1978]; Irigaray 1992).

A separation of public and private spheres associates well with the hegemonic notions of family that are used to describe R3 relationships. That is, a “doctrine of separate spheres” has long served a bourgeois domestic ideal, maintaining hierarchies of class, racial and sexual privileges (Irigaray 1992; Spigel 2001, 5). As Spigel (2001) clarifies, “…the division of spheres is a socially and politically motivated way of organizing social space, rather than a response to universal human needs” (9). The separation between the publicly talked about “home of independent Canadian music” and
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72 Of course, all of the activity of the R3 community, whether on the R3 blog or through SNS, is publicly accessible. Therefore, in this circumstance, the “private” can only be referred to as myth.
the privately talked about “home of the R3 family” clearly supports an organization of the social space of R3.

The “ideal home” as constituted by the R3 “family” – the private sphere of R3 – involves a sense of protection from evil described in chapter two – that the “creep factor” is very low in comparison with “usual” encounters online. But where Lawrence described, “if there is a troll or a bully, I’ll call them out on air. And that kind of fixes it…or they do it themselves. Like someone will say, hey, chill out, don’t be such a jerk” (Lawrence August 2010), Lee showed the other side of this type of control, stating that, within the shows if someone posted a blog comment, even something as benign as ‘stop talking and play more music,’ you would get five or six bloggers jump in and go, ‘who the hell are you, stop it,’ or ‘don’t be an asshole’ or whatever. There’s definitely a regulating effect, a mob mentality. (Lee November 2010)

As Ahmed (2000) remarks, “the good citizen is a citizen who suspects rather than is suspect, who watches out for departures from ordinary life in the imagined space of the neighbourhood” (26), and more dramatically, the imagined space of home (Hepworth 1999). Further, as Chapman and Hockey (1999) explain, However determinedly we police the boundaries of our ‘private’ space, it is difficult to ignore or exclude the possibility of incursions into that space…However much effort we expend in keeping areas of our private space from the public gaze, we cannot easily stop ourselves from imagining how ‘outsiders’ might perceive us if they gained access to these hidden territories. (10)

R3 users do not mind exposing their music fandom, but are much more reticent to have their personal relationships on the blog displayed to non-blog users. Further, the self-regulation that occurs on the blog maintains that users or listeners who might perceive the relationships to be “weird” are kept “outside.”

Despite the “weirdness” of communicating his R3 friendships, tb3 explained that people’s general relationship to the CBC gives them a reference point:

…what Radio 3 has…that not a lot of other online communities have is [that they’re] part of CBC…that’s part of our vernacular from growing up…it’s a piece
that people know and understand…so when I’m explaining it to people, [if] I’m saying these are music friends I make on a website, I may get a crooked eyebrow. But when [I] say that it’s CBC Radio 3…all of a sudden it starts to make sense to them. (tb3 September 2010)

This “making sense” that occurs in reaction to the invocation of the CBC brand reflects a knowledge of what values the CBC reflects. What, then, are the values that the R3 community sculpts itself around?

3.4. Collective Cultural Experience

As the previous sections have outlined, the development of a sense of home on R3 is closely attached to processes of placing (in this case through music), relationships (in this case through fandom) and through ideas of how others might perceive (or dismiss) this “home.” In order for users to negotiate the expectations for their behaviour and to feel the security that this “home” provides, they must feel a sense of shared cultural experience. As Chapman (2001) puts it, “even if people do not think about it much, they know the rules and generally act according to convention” (145). Given that a knowledge of convention is produced through both family structures and how these family structures are more broadly informed by organizations and governing bodies (what Louis Althusser (1971) calls the “Ideological State Apparatus”), the location of R3 within the CBC greatly informs users’ concepts of shared ideology. As Pratt explained,

…you know, it’s funny, all the retro logo t-shirts, huge with our audience…I think a lot of our audience grew up on…iconic [CBC] properties…or their parents listened to CBC Radio, it was just on all the time in the house and they’re at an age where Radio 3 is their CBC and it speaks to them in their voice, in their place on the internet or on social networks or those sorts of things, where [it] gives them the same sense of Canadian community… (Pratt November 2010)

There are two consistently agreed-upon distinctions of how the CBC contributes to a sense of collectivity on the R3 site: that it is Canadian and not American, and that it is
able to be committed to primarily independent rather than mainstream music because it is publicly rather than commercially funded. A general perception is that the R3 site is a concentration of the values that come out of these distinctions. This section draws on two particular examples from the R3 site to highlight how the values attributed to the CBC by R3 users are defended in order to maintain a perceived collective cultural experience on the site: the discussion around keeping R3 100% Canadian and the invocation of the band Nickelback as symbolic of the musical borders of R3.

TheRadioHead illustrated a common sentiment among R3 users, that the CBC “is what we need to keep in order to not be totally absorbed into American culture” (TheRadioHead June 2010). Preferences for Canadian music over American music are often expressed on the blog, as is the idea of what makes Canadian music “Canadian.” But the most heated and referenced moment in R3 blog history as it pertains to Canadian content happened when the staff asked the blog community whether R3 should start including 10-15% international content in its web radio programming. This question arose in the form of a poll on June 5th 2009, when the R3 satellite programming – which had contained this small percentage of international music – was to be amalgamated with their online service – which up until that point had been 100% Canadian. The response was overwhelmingly in favour of having both satellite and online feeds become or remain fully Canadian. As user Russe commented on the blog that day, “I love this site because it's a place for me to feel at home. It's my favourite for the Can-con not [sic] stuff I [can] hear other places!” As Paolozzi remarked, “…we did what the audience wanted even though we didn’t necessarily want to do that. So the audience controlled the feed”

---

73 It was noted on the blog that “international” could be code word for “American.”
moniski spoke of this moment in regards to how R3 helps form a Canadian consciousness, saying that

...you know, there was that whole thing last year that they were going to start maybe playing American music and everyone just really really contested that and really really didn’t want that to happen. So I think that really proved how important it was to everyone’s Canadian identity and how much it meant to them… (Skorupski November 2010)\(^{74}\)

The commitment to Canadian music on R3 has a further stipulation that is near and dear to users – that of independent music in particular. When asked to define what this is beyond the classic definitions of unsigned artists or as a genre (eg. “indie rock”),\(^{75}\) users were at a loss. But an explicit way in which the music on the site is defined is by the negation of artists who are openly despised and rejected, with the Canadian band Nickelback most often invoked as a symbol of this border. Indeed, on the same blog post that debated the inclusion of non-Canadian music, the first comment (by user Silvorgold) remarked that “All I hope is that there won’t be a day where there’s a poll question asking “Should Nickelback and Avril Lavigne\(^{76}\) be played on Radio 3?” The band came up multiple times in my interviews (without my provocation),\(^{77}\) The use of Nickelback to

\(^{74}\) For an in-depth analysis of Canadian content regulations in the conflicting context of commercial broadcasters and online music consumption, see Henderson 2008.

\(^{75}\) The use of the word “independent” on the site to indicate unsigned artists is immediately contested by the heavy rotation of bands such as Feist, Arcade Fire and Metric, all or whom are signed to major labels. Furthermore, the use of the word as an indication of the “indie” genre does not hold much weight on R3, as the site includes substantial hip-hop, electronic, folk and other types of music collections.

\(^{76}\) Avril Lavigne seems to be a close second to Nickelback in terms of bands invoked to define what R3 does not play. In addition to Fetterley’s study, it would be interesting to conduct a more rigourous examination of the representation of these two bands within the Canadian independent music (a scene that they seemingly help to define.)

\(^{77}\) Examples of R3 users’ and staff’s rejection of Nickelback are many, from moniski stating that the artists on R3 are “not as commercially [sic] as people like Nickelback,” tb3 commenting that, “Nickelback…nothing about them says to me that they’re Canadian. They’re just a rock band, no different than say, a rock band from L.A. would be” and Jones remarking that “Nickelback…to me that’s sort of an international act. I don’t really see them as Canadian” (Jones October 2010) to Lawrence clarifying that, “a lot of these people get into this music, which isn’t mainstream music for their town, like mainstream would be Nickelback or whatever, and they get into this independent Canadian music and they really like it.” More examples of the negation of Nickelback on the R3 blog itself include: November 23\(^{72}\), 2010, comment on Jay Ferguson’s “Gadzooks, My Little Shakespeare! It’s New Release Day” by user Cicero: “Every time Nickelback plays, God kills Llama [sic].” Aug. 10\(^{th}\), 2011, comment on Lana Gay’s, “Today on Lanarama:
clarify the edges of R3’s musical values is neither a random or innocent choice, as Nickelback in particular is a band fraught with debates about authenticity. As Leanne Fetterley (forthcoming) proposes in her article “Hey, Hey, I Wanna Be a Rockstar”:

Nickelback, Sincerity, and Authenticity,” “despite Nickelback’s widespread popularity and soaring record sales worldwide…the group’s reputation is largely characterized by its negative critical reception in the music press and in entertainment reviews.” That is, in a musical climate characterized by hierarchies of value that include attachments to authenticity and irony, Nickelback, described in the press as “lacking real rock moments” (Moser, quoted in Fetterley, my emphasis) and “kitschy” (Kane, quoted in Fetterley), provides the perfect target for establishing spaces that are dedicated to what is seen to represent the band’s opposite, or more specifically, the indie music scene.

What both of the above examples demonstrate are a clarification for users of what the cultural identity of the R3 site represents. In order to feel bound together enough to feel “at home” on the site, a shared identification must be established. In the case of R3, this is done through establishing allegiance to the perceived values of Canadian identity and independent music. The meeting of these two ideologies on the site inform the devotion and allegiance that R3 users have for the site – a collective cultural experience that Chapman (2001) describes as the part of home that provides a “sense of social permanence and security” (144).

But while an attachment to the values of Canadianism and a rejection of Nickelback – that is, “mainstream” music – mark the shared ideology of R3, this ideal

Summer of Lust! Sex & Comedy!”: by user Benoit from Ottawa: “Sex can’t make us actually like Nickelback.” Aug.18th, 2011, Dave Shumka writes on his blog post “Today: Hey Rosetta! and Fashion Fight Club – Guilty by Association” that “I have a pair of sunglasses that I really loved until I realized that Chad Kroeger [lead singer of Nickelback] has a similar pair.” See the R3 archives for these examples and more: http://radio3.cbc.ca/#/blogs/archives.aspx.
contains a great deal of complications. While the CBC is committed to contributing to a “Canadianisation of the web” (O’Neill 2006), it must do so by using the same tactics of its competitors. For instance, while the privacy agreement that members of R3 agree to (“applicable to all CBC websites”) professes to “collect only information that is voluntarily provided by the user,” it also reserves the right “to perform statistical analyses of user behaviour and characteristics” as well as automatically collect “non-personal information and data” through “cookies,” which “allow the site to track [a] browser’s movement through the site over several sessions.” Lawrence Lessig (1999) describes this type of user agreement as one of cyberspace’s “architectures of control.” The situation he describes on Amazon.com is not dissimilar to R3:

When you first purchase a book from Amazon.com and establish an account…Amazon.com’s server places an entry in your cookie file. When you return to the site, your browser sends the cookie along with the request for the site; the server can then set your preferences according to your account. (34)

While the CBC might argue that it is not explicitly selling anything to the R3 members that agree to their privacy policy, there is more than a parallel to Amazon.com. As Andrejevic (2011) puts it, “the free and spontaneous production of community, sociality, and shared contexts and understandings remains both autonomous in principle from capital and captured in practice by it” (90). To suggest that exploitation may be occurring on the R3 site is not a suggestion that users are any more “duped” than they are somewhere else online. In fact, exploitation by online data mining practices does not necessarily mean coercion or victimization but works because of users’ desires for interactive participation (Andrejevic 2011). What users find on R3 are the same ideals that Facebook and Myspace use to market their websites: “Facebook helps you connect

---

78 See the CBC Radio 3 “New Member Sign Up” page at http://radio3.cbc.ca/#/memberssignup/.
and *share* with the people in your life”79 (my emphasis) and “Myspace, LLC. is a leading *social entertainment destination* powered by the *passions of fans*.”80 Such sites are creating a social space that allows companies to capitalize on the interactions and connections between users. R3 feeds into this a cohesive community of independent Canadian music lovers.

The demarcation that this “family of fans” has made for itself plays out by the same rules that indie-rock authority has in other places on the web. As Hibbett (2006) explains, “it would be too simple to describe the power at work as concentrated in the marketplace and acting on individuals or consumers” (75). As described in chapter two, the elitism of indie “cred” has been highly profitable as a marketing strategy. From the authority gained by finding an unreleased album in a record store to the social capital of finding an unreleased single submerged within the masses of online music services, indie fans “strive for a possession of social value” (Hibbett 2006, 75). As such, the perceived seclusion of R3 – that is, the perception of “home” - serves users with ready-made symbolic power within a boisterous market of indie music. While I do not reject the meanings that R3 users derive from their R3 home, nor do I deny that the music library found on the site provides truly impressive access to Canadian music, the R3 site must be viewed as a partner – not an alternative – to commercial culture online.

**CONCLUSION**

The work that has been presented here helps clarify how R3, in establishing a convergence of interactivity on its CBC-branded site, has situated itself, and been situated by its users, as a unique demonstration of radio cyberspace. This manifestation of

79 My emphasis.
Canadian public radio in the niche market era of new media has led to users creating a distinctly intimate community with this intimacy fostering dedicated and exclusive attachments. Shifting notions of public and private space inform the definition of this community, with problematic results in terms of the ideological certainty users have in regards to the CBC, Canadian music, indie music and each other. Furthermore, as R3 members use commercial sites to solidify their relationships with each other, the resultant community has implications that challenge the idea of public media. The existence of radio without terrestrial airwaves is emphasized by the social history and present of radio in cyberspace. While this thesis has sought to convey how the users of R3 have clarified this evolution, there are many questions left to be considered.

As explored in the first chapter, there has thus far been little clarification on what constitutes “web radio” or “internet radio.” What I have proposed by looking at the social interactions and use on the R3 site is that it is possible to create more definition for how these words are used, particularly when the various forms of “online radio” are conceived of as part of a broader category of “radio cyberspace.” Doing so takes into account the evolution of the uses, impacts and meanings of radio rather than focusing merely on the changes in technological production and distribution.

In examining how R3 may function as an online music community within the context of current forms of entertainment and socialization, I have indicated that such SNS-mediated sites must take this dispersal into account in conceiving “community.” Furthermore, I have shown how, despite R3’s location within a public institution, in the context of online data collection, the development of such communities of users aids in digital marketing strategies and reinforces a commercially-motivated cyberspace.
The final chapter’s analysis of how users think of R3 as home expands on chapter two by examining how the connective tissue of the R3 community is solidified. That is, users paradoxically use the language of family and sanctuary to discuss relationships that are formed in what is both funded and displayed as public. The safety and security that is felt on the blog is limited by who feels safe and secure, which in turn limits who participates in the core fandom of R3. The limitations and closures of the R3 “home,” however, create a alluring space for the exchange of symbolic indie music value (and values). The R3 home, then, builds a cohesive family of consumers that functions well with the indie music marketplace.

What I have presented here, however, is only an initial experimentation with these concepts, limited both by the scope of the research as well as by the use of only one particular site to explore these issues. Although I have established that R3 is impacted as part of a public radio institution within a cyberspace dominated by corporate interests, there are many more dynamics to be explored about the relationship between radio cyberspace and commercial, community and pirate radio. More work needs to be done in order to clarify the “radio present” as associated with a “radio past,” as well as how listeners and users interact socially with contemporary forms of radio. Important questions to ask are: What are the differences in instances of radio cyberspace that originate from an organization with a history of radio broadcasting (like the CBC) and those that have started within the online sphere (like iTunes)? How does the proliferation of mobile technologies affect the everyday uses of radio cyberspace and how does this affect users’ perceptions of “radio?” How does radio cyberspace change the relationships or perceived relationships between public, commercial, community and pirate radio?
With the release of the *Everyone, Every Way* plan, the CBC has committed to an even bigger increase in its digital media offerings than has been seen in the last decade (throughout which they held many “firsts” for Canadian media (such as podcasting, free online television viewing, etc.)). Part of the *Everyone, Every Way* plan is to create similar online communities as the R3 community for other genres of music. For instance, “CBC Electronic” is in the beginning stages of development, having initiated a Facebook group to investigate audience interests and to start disseminating Canadian electronic music content\(^{81}\) and “CBC Classical” is in the process of hiring a community manager.\(^{82}\) Thus, a much more in-depth analysis needs to be made of how commercial SNS are used in the development of connections for public, community and private media outlets. Furthermore, how does the fostering of “genre communities” create marketable niche audiences and at the same time nurture music fans’ desire for streamlined content?

At the same time as requesting more critique of the CBC and its new media strategies, I am struck by a grave concern for the safety of the CBC’s publicly funded model. That is, while a reliance on the CBC as the only major Canadian media source outside of commercial options is problematic, the option has proven important for genuine support of arts, culture and political dialogue in Canada. With the current Conservative government likely to steadily decrease funding for the CBC (as well as actively support other news models, such as Sun News Network\(^{83}\)), many of the media choices that the CBC is making will ensure more continuity of delivery. For instance, as part of the *Everyone, Every Way* plan, the CBC intends on “being the leader in regional presence in all served markets using a multimedia approach” (4). The CBC is able to

---

\(^{81}\) See the CBC Electronic facebook page at http://www.facebook.com/CBCElectronic.

\(^{82}\) See the CBC job search page at http://www.cbc.radio-canada.ca/jobs/current.shtml.

\(^{83}\) See the Sun News Network website at http://www.sunnewsnetwork.ca/.
increase regional and rural presence with less infrastructure and less staff without an increase in funds by maximizing on their sophisticated online presence. Further, the aforementioned usage of outside sites (such as Facebook and Twitter) by the CBC is a strategy that enables cost-savings on their part.

However, if R3 has been a testing ground for many of CBC’s digital media initiatives, including (but not limited to) music streaming, online community creation, user-created interfaces, online contests, and live programming distinctly offered online, how will the problems with the R3 model, namely the entrance of this public media into the commercial spaces of SNS, be addressed within the wider context of CBC’s online presence? For instance, as the Everyone, Every Way plan encourages more narrow-casting and niche appeal (CBC 2011a) – that is, if listeners and users experience the rest of the CBC in as private of terms as they do with R3 – how will this impact the “publicness” of public radio in Canada? If the CBC seeks to create or represent a “commons,” what of Andrejevic’s (2011) fear that the intersection of social networking with data retrieval for market interests leads to “a contemporary process of virtual enclosure of the commons of social life?” (85)

As Chapman (2001) has pointed out, “…the study of ‘home’ is peculiarly complex because of the difficulties of defining its boundaries, its organizational type, its physical features, its participants and their experiences” (136). This study is necessary, however, in order to expose the complexities of creating particular types of spaces and the desire to do so. In the case of R3, “The Home of Independent Canadian Music,” the degree to which the music, as well as the members, find a home on the site helps to clarify the need, perceived or otherwise, for such a site.
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APPENDIX B – Interview request sample

Hi there! You are receiving this message because someone thinks you could help me out! I am pursuing a Masters in Interdisciplinary Fine Arts Studies, specifically in Interactive Media and Performance. Why is this relevant to you, an R3 listener, producer, musician, blogger, technician...? My work is focused directly on the community of CBC Radio 3, and without your help, it would be a sad little community of just me. I am asking specifically for a chance to interview you, whether by phone or in person. If you are touring through Saskatchewan this summer, please let me know, as this would be a perfect chance to meet! The following will hopefully better inform you of the intentions of my work - please feel free to ask any questions about it before agreeing to be interviewed! You can also forward this email to others that you think would be interested in participating or post it on a blog, etc. If you do share this email, please CC me or send me the web address of your post, as the dissemination of this request could, in itself, reveal some of the interesting ways that information is shared within the R3 community. Many thanks, and I look forward to talking to you!!

Elizabeth Curry
bassish@gmail.com

“Radio 3, Canada, and Me: Nationhood and Identity-formation in Radio Cyber Space”

The topic of my Masters thesis stems from an interest in the ways that subjects articulate themselves through interactive media and particularly through online music communities. The particular site of examination, CBC Radio 3, is a provocative and necessary point of exploration due to its attachment to the ideals and mandates of the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation and also due to its continuing growth as a powerful influence in Canada’s music industry. In negotiating CBC Radio 3’s complex location as both online and Canadian, I will figure this research within the context of nationhood, exploring how both online presence and the affect of music can simultaneously set up and break down borders.

The guiding questions of this thesis are as follows:

Insofar as Radio 3 articulates itself as the “Home of Independent Canadian Music,” how does the music on Radio 3, as an affective experience, manifest itself as Canadian music? How does the consumption of this music materialize as cultural practice, national discourse and personal identification?

In 1932, Bertolt Brecht made the claim that: “Radio could be the most wonderful public communication system imaginable, a gigantic system of channels - could be, that is, if it were capable not only of transmitting but of receiving, of making the listener not only hear but also speak, not of isolating him but of connecting him.” In 2007, dana boyd made the claim that social networking sites provide “public displays of connection” that “serve as important identity signals that help people navigate the networked social world.” In what ways does Radio 3, as a conjunction of “public communications systems” and “social networking sites” isolate, connect and help navigate the networked social world?

In order to address the above ideas, it is important that I build a keen knowledge of how the CBC Radio 3 website is being used. As such, I will interview (in person, by phone and by email) users and producers of site content - that's YOU!. With your
consent, I will record audio of our interview. Using a series of questions that I have created to address the use of CBC Radio 3, I will facilitate a conversation about your interactions with the website. As the intention of the data collected from these interviews is for research towards my master’s thesis, all participants will be given a copy of the thesis. If further productions of this research are made, I will make every reasonable attempt to advise you of when and where the data collected will be published and how you may gain access to all forms of dissemination.
APPENDIX C – Sample of Consent Form

Letter of Agreement and Informed Consent

Title:
“Radio 3, Canada, and Me: Nationhood and Identity-formation in Radio Cyber Space”

Principal Researcher: Elizabeth Curry (curry99e@uregina.ca)
Supervisors: Dr. Charity Marsh (charity.marsh@uregina.ca)
Dr. Randal Rogers (randal.rogers@uregina.ca)

Description of Research:
The topic of my Masters thesis stems from an interest in the ways that subjects articulate
themselves through interactive media and particularly through online music communities.
The particular site of examination, CBC Radio 3, is a provocative and necessary point of
exploration due to its attachment to the ideals and mandates of the Canadian
Broadcasting Corporation and also due to its continuing growth as a powerful influence
in Canada’s music industry. In negotiating CBC Radio 3’s complex location as both
online and Canadian, I will figure this research within the context of nationhood,
exploring how both online presence and the affect of music can simultaneously set up and
break down borders.

Procedure:
I will interview users (listeners, members, DJs, producers, etc.) of the CBC Radio 3
website. During the process I will record interviews, with permission from the
participants.

Expected Interview Duration: 1 hour

Intentions:
The intention of this project is to use the data collected for research towards the
production of my master’s thesis. This thesis will be shared with the participants and if
further productions of this research are made, I will do everything in my power to advise
participants of when and where the data collected will be published and how they may
gain access to all forms of dissemination.

Confidentiality:
As a participant in my research, you have the option to remain anonymous for any and all
portions of the process by choosing to use a pseudonym at any time (your Radio3
username or another name). Any personal contact or “off the record” information will be
kept confidential. Please note that limitations to confidentiality may include:
identification due to the nature or size of the sample; your personal relationship with the
researcher; referral procedures (e.g. participants are referred to the study by a person
outside the research team); the public nature of the broadcasting on CBC Radio 3,
particularly in the case of on-air personalities such as DJs.
The researcher will ensure the collected data remains locked for the 3 years, as required
by the Research Ethics Board at the University of Regina. The data (both digital and hard
copies) will be filed in The Interactive Media and Performance Labs' archives. These archives are part of the Interactive Media and Performance (IMP) Labs, which are housed at the University of Regina and directed by Dr. Charity Marsh, Canada Research Chair in the Faculty of Fine Arts.

**Letter of Consent (page 2)**
I understand that the project, “CBC Radio 3, Canada and Me: ,” was approved by the Research Ethics Board of the University of Regina. If I have any questions or concerns about my rights or treatment as a participant in this project, I may contact the chair of the Research Ethics Board at 306.585.4775 or by email: research.ethics@uregina.ca.

I, __________________________, have read the above protocol and voluntarily agree to participate. The researcher has explained the objectives and the procedures of this project to me. I understand that I am free to withdraw from this project at any time without penalty. I understand that the dialogue will be used in the creation of future scholarly publications, and for pedagogical purposes. I also understand that some of these documents will be archived for future use by the researcher. I understand that my anonymity will be protected if I so desire.

- [ ] I would like to use my Radio3 pseudonym: __________________________
- [ ] I would like to use another pseudonym: __________________________
- [ ] I would like to use my name as submitted below.

If you have any further questions regarding your participation, please feel free to contact Elizabeth Curry at:

Elizabeth Curry  
Graduate Student in Interactive Media and Performance  
University of Regina, Regina, SK S4S 0A2  
306.757.5567  curry99e@uregina.ca

Name (print):_____________________________________________________

Address: ______________________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________________________

Telephone: ________________________ Email:____________________________

Signed: ____________________________ Date:__________

Anonymity (Pseudonym):______________________________________________
APPENDIX D – Sample of Interview Questions

Involvement in CBC Radio 3

Name:
Member name (if applicable):
Relationship(s) to or position(s) in CBC Radio 3 (ie. DJ, user, artist, etc):
How long have you had a relationship/held a position with CBC Radio 3?
Why did you begin using CBC Radio 3?
Has this relationship changed over time?
How do you articulate this relationship(s) within the context of the CBC Radio 3 site?
How do you articulate this relationship(s) elsewhere or in other ways?
What are your primary reasons for your relationship/position with CBC Radio 3?
Do you have a CBC Radio 3 profile?
What is on it and why?

Ways of Using
How do you consume music on the CBC Radio 3 site (ie. Live DJs, podcasts, streams, etc.)?
How do you consume music outside of the CBC Radio 3 site?
How do you interact with people on the CBC Radio 3 site (blog, favouriting, etc.)?
How do you interact with people outside of the CBC Radio 3 site?
Do you use/participate in functions on the site such as
  - the blog
  - favouriting artists
  - playlists
  - searchlight & other contests
  - Bucky awards
How do you use/participate in these aspects of the site and for what reasons?
Do you listen to other user’s playlists? Why or why not?
What else?

Radio/CBC
What are your radio-listening habits? Do you listen to other radio stations?
Do you listen to local radio? How does this relate to your CBC Radio 3 experience?
Do you listen to other CBC stations? For what reasons?
How would you describe your relationship to CBC as a whole?
Considering that the CBC was created, like the railroad, in order to create a cohesive nation, do you think that CBC Radio 3 continues this goal? In what ways does CBC Radio 3 contest or reframe this goal?

How do you think CBC Radio 3 enacts/contests/reframes the CBC’s mandate? Do you think the aspects of this mandate contribute to concepts of national identity in Canada? :
*The 1991 Broadcasting Act states that...
...the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, as the national public broadcaster, should provide radio and*
television services incorporating a wide range of programming that informs, enlightens and entertains; ...the programming provided by the Corporation should:
- be predominantly and distinctively Canadian,
- reflect Canada and its regions to national and regional audiences, while serving the special needs of those regions,
- actively contribute to the flow and exchange of cultural expression,
- be in English and in French, reflecting the different needs and circumstances of each official language community, including the particular needs and circumstances of English and French linguistic minorities,
- strive to be of equivalent quality in English and French,
- contribute to shared national consciousness and identity,
- be made available throughout Canada by the most appropriate and efficient means and as resources become available for the purpose, and
- reflect the multicultural and multiracial nature of Canada.

How is identity (local, national, political, cultural) produced and narrated through the CBC Radio 3 site?
How important/significant is the CBC, and CBC Radio 3 in particular, to Canada’s identity as a nation?
How does CBC Radio 3 contribute to concepts of community, identity and consciousness in Canada?

Music/Identity
The CBC Radio 3 site has a slogan of “Home of Independent Canadian Music.” Do you think this is an appropriate slogan?
Considering that the genres represented on the site are multiple and many of the artists on the site are signed to major labels, what do you think “Independent” means in this case?
How would you define “Canadian Music”? Is it important to be able to describe this concept?
How does CBC Radio 3 provide a “home” for all of the above concepts?
In its place on the world wide web, and considering recognition on the international level (ie. Nerve magazine deeming it, “possibly the world’s best radio station”), how does CBC Radio 3 carry out a national identity beyond its geography and citizenship?
How has the site been shaped by ideas of Canadian national identity?
How is CBC Radio 3 connected to the local? What are the effects of broadcasting locations? Listening locations? What is CBC Radio 3’s relationship to local radio/music scenes/communities and politics? How does the local help define or contest the national?

Continuation of Research
What other questions do you think would be valuable to ask about CBC Radio 3 in relation to identification and nationhood?
Is there anything else you would like to add?
Who else should I speak to and why?
Would you be open to a follow-up interview within the next year
Figure 1. Example of R3 Member (“Profile”) Page (Cameron Bode)
(APPENDIX E cont.)

Figure 2. Member Page profile picture of R3 Member in CBC Radio 3 Merch (Brenda Lee)

Figure 3. Member page profile picture of R3 member at concert of R3 artist (Monica Skorupski with Jason Collett)
Figure 4. Member page profile picture of R3 member with R3 host. (MikeV with Vish Khanna)

Figure 5. Member page profile picture of R3 member with tattoo of a line from Lawrence’s book. (“rebbey”)
(APPENDIX E cont.)

Figure 6. Member page profile picture of CBC logo made out of perogies. (Dave Shumka)

Figure 7. Member page profile picture of R3 member’s specialized R3 license plate (Russ Gordon)
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License

THE WORK (AS DEFINED BELOW) IS PROVIDED UNDER THE TERMS OF THIS CREATIVE COMMONS PUBLIC LICENSE ("CCPL" OR "LICENSE"). THE WORK IS PROTECTED BY COPYRIGHT AND/OR OTHER APPLICABLE LAW. ANY USE OF THE WORK OTHER THAN AS AUTHORIZED UNDER THIS LICENSE OR COPYRIGHT LAW IS PROHIBITED.

BY EXERCISING ANY RIGHTS TO THE WORK PROVIDED HERE, YOU ACCEPT AND AGREE TO BE BOUND BY THE TERMS OF THIS LICENSE. TO THE EXTENT THIS LICENSE MAY BE CONSIDERED TO BE A CONTRACT, THE LICENSOR GRANTS YOU THE RIGHTS CONTAINED HERE IN CONSIDERATION OF YOUR ACCEPTANCE OF SUCH TERMS AND CONDITIONS.

1. Definitions

"Adaptation" means a work based upon the Work, or upon the Work and other pre-existing works, such as a translation, adaptation, derivative work, arrangement of music or other alterations of a literary or artistic work, or phonogram or performance and includes cinematographic adaptations or any other form in which the Work may be recast, transformed, or adapted including in any form recognizably derived from the original, except that a work that constitutes a Collection will not be considered an Adaptation for the purpose of this License. For the avoidance of doubt, where the Work is a musical work, performance or phonogram, the synchronization of the Work in time relation with a moving image ("synching") will be considered an Adaptation for the purpose of this License.

---

84 See http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/3.0/legalcode.
"Collection" means a collection of literary or artistic works, such as encyclopedias and anthologies, or performances, phonograms or broadcasts, or other works or subject matter other than works listed in Section 1(f) below, which, by reason of the selection and arrangement of their contents, constitute intellectual creations, in which the Work is included in its entirety in unmodified form along with one or more other contributions, each constituting separate and independent works in themselves, which together are assembled into a collective whole. A work that constitutes a Collection will not be considered an Adaptation (as defined above) for the purposes of this License.

"Distribute" means to make available to the public the original and copies of the Work through sale or other transfer of ownership.

"Licensor" means the individual, individuals, entity or entities that offer(s) the Work under the terms of this License.

"Original Author" means, in the case of a literary or artistic work, the individual, individuals, entity or entities who created the Work or if no individual or entity can be identified, the publisher; and in addition (i) in the case of a performance the actors, singers, musicians, dancers, and other persons who act, sing, deliver, declaim, play in, interpret or otherwise perform literary or artistic works or expressions of folklore; (ii) in the case of a phonogram the producer being the person or legal entity who first fixes the sounds of a performance or other sounds; and, (iii) in the case of broadcasts, the organization that transmits the broadcast.

"Work" means the literary and/or artistic work offered under the terms of this License including without limitation any production in the literary, scientific and artistic domain, whatever may be the mode or form of its expression including digital form, such as a book, pamphlet and other writing; a lecture, address, sermon or other work of the same nature; a dramatic or dramatico-musical work; a choreographic work or entertainment in dumb show; a musical composition with or without words; a cinematographic work to which are assimilated works expressed by a process analogous to cinematography; a work of drawing, painting, architecture, sculpture, engraving or lithography; a photographic work to which are assimilated works expressed by a process analogous to photography; a work of applied art; an illustration, map, plan, sketch or three-dimensional work relative to geography, topography, architecture or science; a performance; a broadcast; a phonogram; a compilation of data to the extent it is protected as a copyrightable work; or a work performed by a variety or circus performer to the extent it is not otherwise considered a literary or artistic work.

"You" means an individual or entity exercising rights under this License who has not previously violated the terms of this License with respect to the Work, or who has received express permission from the Licensor to exercise rights under this License despite a previous violation.
"Publicly Perform" means to perform public recitations of the Work and to communicate to the public those public recitations, by any means or process, including by wire or wireless means or public digital performances; to make available to the public Works in such a way that members of the public may access these Works from a place and at a place individually chosen by them; to perform the Work to the public by any means or process and the communication to the public of the performances of the Work, including by public digital performance; to broadcast and rebroadcast the Work by any means including signs, sounds or images.

"Reproduce" means to make copies of the Work by any means including without limitation by sound or visual recordings and the right of fixation and reproducing fixations of the Work, including storage of a protected performance or phonogram in digital form or other electronic medium.

2. Fair Dealing Rights. Nothing in this License is intended to reduce, limit, or restrict any uses free from copyright or rights arising from limitations or exceptions that are provided for in connection with the copyright protection under copyright law or other applicable laws.

3. License Grant. Subject to the terms and conditions of this License, Licensor hereby grants You a worldwide, royalty-free, non-exclusive, perpetual (for the duration of the applicable copyright) license to exercise the rights in the Work as stated below:

to Reproduce the Work, to incorporate the Work into one or more Collections, and to Reproduce the Work as incorporated in the Collections; and,

to Distribute and Publicly Perform the Work including as incorporated in Collections. The above rights may be exercised in all media and formats whether now known or hereafter devised. The above rights include the right to make such modifications as are technically necessary to exercise the rights in other media and formats, but otherwise you have no rights to make Adaptations. Subject to 8(f), all rights not expressly granted by Licensor are hereby reserved, including but not limited to the rights set forth in Section 4(d).

4. Restrictions. The license granted in Section 3 above is expressly made subject to and limited by the following restrictions:

You may Distribute or Publicly Perform the Work only under the terms of this License. You must include a copy of, or the Uniform Resource Identifier (URI) for, this License with every copy of the Work You Distribute or Publicly Perform. You may not offer or impose any terms on the Work that restrict the terms of this License or the ability of the recipient of the Work to exercise the rights granted to that recipient under the terms of the
License. You may not sublicense the Work. You must keep intact all notices that refer to this License and to the disclaimer of warranties with every copy of the Work You Distribute or Publicly Perform. When You Distribute or Publicly Perform the Work, You may not impose any effective technological measures on the Work that restrict the ability of a recipient of the Work from You to exercise the rights granted to that recipient under the terms of the License. This Section 4(a) applies to the Work as incorporated in a Collection, but this does not require the Collection apart from the Work itself to be made subject to the terms of this License. If You create a Collection, upon notice from any Licensor You must, to the extent practicable, remove from the Collection any credit as required by Section 4(c), as requested.

You may not exercise any of the rights granted to You in Section 3 above in any manner that is primarily intended for or directed toward commercial advantage or private monetary compensation. The exchange of the Work for other copyrighted works by means of digital file-sharing or otherwise shall not be considered to be intended for or directed toward commercial advantage or private monetary compensation, provided there is no payment of any monetary compensation in connection with the exchange of copyrighted works.

If You Distribute, or Publicly Perform the Work or Collections, You must, unless a request has been made pursuant to Section 4(a), keep intact all copyright notices for the Work and provide, reasonable to the medium or means You are utilizing: (i) the name of the Original Author (or pseudonym, if applicable) if supplied, and/or if the Original Author and/or Licensor designate another party or parties (e.g., a sponsor institute, publishing entity, journal) for attribution ("Attribution Parties") in Licensor's copyright notice, terms of service or by other reasonable means, the name of such party or parties; (ii) the title of the Work if supplied; (iii) to the extent reasonably practicable, the URI, if any, that Licensor specifies to be associated with the Work, unless such URI does not refer to the copyright notice or licensing information for the Work. The credit required by this Section 4(c) may be implemented in any reasonable manner; provided, however, that in the case of a Collection, at a minimum such credit will appear, if a credit for all contributing authors of Collection appears, then as part of these credits and in a manner at least as prominent as the credits for the other contributing authors. For the avoidance of doubt, You may only use the credit required by this Section for the purpose of attribution in the manner set out above and, by exercising Your rights under this License, You may not implicitly or explicitly assert or imply any connection with, sponsorship or endorsement by the Original Author, Licensor and/or Attribution Parties, as appropriate, of You or Your use of the Work, without the separate, express prior written permission of the Original Author, Licensor and/or Attribution Parties.

For the avoidance of doubt:
**Non-waivable Compulsory License Schemes.** In those jurisdictions in which the right
to collect royalties through any statutory or compulsory licensing scheme cannot be waived, the Licensor reserves the exclusive right to collect such royalties for any exercise by You of the rights granted under this License;

**Waivable Compulsory License Schemes.** In those jurisdictions in which the right to collect royalties through any statutory or compulsory licensing scheme can be waived, the Licensor reserves the exclusive right to collect such royalties for any exercise by You of the rights granted under this License if Your exercise of such rights is for a purpose or use which is otherwise than noncommercial as permitted under Section 4(b) and otherwise waives the right to collect royalties through any statutory or compulsory licensing scheme; and,

**Voluntary License Schemes.** The Licensor reserves the right to collect royalties, whether individually or, in the event that the Licensor is a member of a collecting society that administers voluntary licensing schemes, via that society, from any exercise by You of the rights granted under this License that is for a purpose or use which is otherwise than noncommercial as permitted under Section 4(b).

Except as otherwise agreed in writing by the Licensor or as may be otherwise permitted by applicable law, if You Reproduce, Distribute or Publicly Perform the Work either by itself or as part of any Collections, You must not distort, mutilate, modify or take other derogatory action in relation to the Work which would be prejudicial to the Original Author’s honor or reputation.

5. **Representations, Warranties and Disclaimer**

UNLESS OTHERWISE MUTUALLY AGREED BY THE PARTIES IN WRITING, LICENSOR OFFERS THE WORK AS-IS AND MAKES NO REPRESENTATIONS OR WARRANTIES OF ANY KIND CONCERNING THE WORK, EXPRESS, IMPLIED, STATUTORY OR OTHERWISE, INCLUDING, WITHOUT LIMITATION, WARRANTIES OF TITLE, MERCHANTABILITY, FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE, NONINFRINGEMENT, OR THE ABSENCE OF LATENT OR OTHER DEFECTS, ACCURACY, OR THE PRESENCE OF ABSENCE OF ERRORS, WHETHER OR NOT DISCOVERABLE. SOME JURISDICTIONS DO NOT ALLOW THE EXCLUSION OF IMPLIED WARRANTIES, SO SUCH EXCLUSION MAY NOT APPLY TO YOU.

6. **Limitation on Liability.** EXCEPT TO THE EXTENT REQUIRED BY APPLICABLE LAW, IN NO EVENT WILL LICENSOR BE LIABLE TO YOU ON ANY LEGAL THEORY FOR ANY SPECIAL, INCIDENTAL, CONSEQUENTIAL, PUNITIVE OR EXEMPLARY DAMAGES ARISING OUT OF THIS LICENSE OR THE USE OF THE WORK, EVEN IF LICENSOR HAS BEEN ADVISED OF THE POSSIBILITY OF SUCH DAMAGES.
7. Termination
This License and the rights granted hereunder will terminate automatically upon any breach by You of the terms of this License. Individuals or entities who have received Collections from You under this License, however, will not have their licenses terminated provided such individuals or entities remain in full compliance with those licenses. Sections 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, and 8 will survive any termination of this License. Subject to the above terms and conditions, the license granted here is perpetual (for the duration of the applicable copyright in the Work). Notwithstanding the above, Licensor reserves the right to release the Work under different license terms or to stop distributing the Work at any time; provided, however that any such election will not serve to withdraw this License (or any other license that has been, or is required to be, granted under the terms of this License), and this License will continue in full force and effect unless terminated as stated above.

8. Miscellaneous
Each time You Distribute or Publicly Perform the Work or a Collection, the Licensor offers to the recipient a license to the Work on the same terms and conditions as the license granted to You under this License. If any provision of this License is invalid or unenforceable under applicable law, it shall not affect the validity or enforceability of the remainder of the terms of this License, and without further action by the parties to this agreement, such provision shall be reformed to the minimum extent necessary to make such provision valid and enforceable. No term or provision of this License shall be deemed waived and no breach consented to unless such waiver or consent shall be in writing and signed by the party to be charged with such waiver or consent.

This License constitutes the entire agreement between the parties with respect to the Work licensed here. There are no understandings, agreements or representations with respect to the Work not specified here. Licensor shall not be bound by any additional provisions that may appear in any communication from You. This License may not be modified without the mutual written agreement of the Licensor and You.

The rights granted under, and the subject matter referenced, in this License were drafted utilizing the terminology of the Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works (as amended on September 28, 1979), the Rome Convention of 1961, the WIPO Copyright Treaty of 1996, the WIPO Performances and Phonograms Treaty of 1996 and the Universal Copyright Convention (as revised on July 24, 1971). These rights and subject matter take effect in the relevant jurisdiction in which the License terms are sought to be enforced according to the corresponding provisions of the implementation of those treaty provisions in the applicable national law. If the standard suite of rights granted under applicable copyright law includes additional rights not granted under this
License, such additional rights are deemed to be included in the License; this License is not intended to restrict the license of any rights under applicable law.

**Creative Commons Notice**

Creative Commons is not a party to this License, and makes no warranty whatsoever in connection with the Work. Creative Commons will not be liable to You or any party on any legal theory for any damages whatsoever, including without limitation any general, special, incidental or consequential damages arising in connection to this license. Notwithstanding the foregoing two (2) sentences, if Creative Commons has expressly identified itself as the Licensor hereunder, it shall have all rights and obligations of Licensor.

Except for the limited purpose of indicating to the public that the Work is licensed under the CCPL, Creative Commons does not authorize the use by either party of the trademark "Creative Commons" or any related trademark or logo of Creative Commons without the prior written consent of Creative Commons. Any permitted use will be in compliance with Creative Commons' then-current trademark usage guidelines, as may be published on its website or otherwise made available upon request from time to time. For the avoidance of doubt, this trademark restriction does not form part of this License.

Creative Commons may be contacted at [http://creativecommons.org/](http://creativecommons.org/).