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Abstract

Local music content on New Zealand radio has increased markedly in the years between 1997, when content monitoring began, and January 2002. Several factors have contributed to this increase, including a shift in approach from musicians themselves, and the influence of a new generation of commercial radio programmers. At the heart of the process, however, are the actions of the New Zealand State in the field of cultural production. The deregulation of the broadcasting industry in 1988 contributed to an apparent decline in local music content on radio. However, since 1997 the State has attempted to encourage development of a more active New Zealand culture industry, including popular music. Strategies directed at encouraging cultural production in New Zealand have positioned popular music as a significant factor in the development and strengthening of ‘national’ or ‘cultural’ identity in resistance to the cultural pressures of globalisation.

This thesis focuses on the issue of airtime for New Zealand popular music on commercial radio, and examines the relationship between popular music and national identity. The access of New Zealand popular music to airtime on commercial radio is explored through analysis of airplay rates and other music industry data, and a small number of in-depth interviews with radio programmers and other people active in the industry. A considerable amount of control over the kinds of music supported and produced in New Zealand lies with commercial radio programmers. In interviews, programmers expressed openness to the idea of playing New Zealand music on the radio, and an appreciation of the work of New Zealand on Air, while rejecting legislation setting quotas for local content. The Code of Practice for Local Music in Broadcasting introduced by the Radio Broadcasters Association in March 2002 offers a middle way between legislation requiring airtime for local music and the existing strategies of New Zealand on Air. However, New Zealand commercial radio is a nationally networked medium largely owned by global corporations, and its agendas are influenced by global commercial factors. These imperatives may not be consistent with attempts to use locally produced music to foster a unique New Zealand cultural identity. This thesis suggests that a New Zealand identity that is constructed through
fostering New Zealand music on air will be a fluid and negotiated identity. It will reflect the need of the commercial music industry to ‘fit’ with international agendas, while maintaining points of difference and embracing localisation as a marketing tool.
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Chapter 1
Introduction

This thesis had its origins in my work as programme director at ‘rdu’, the student radio station based at the University of Canterbury. As a long-time volunteer DJ, and programmer between 1997 and 2000, I was involved with the local music scene, and active in promoting local music on radio. From 1997, when I became directly responsible for the on-air content of the station, I grew interested in what seemed to be an increasing amount of New Zealand music receiving airplay on other radio stations. Then, when I ceased to work at the station, and began thesis research, my attention was directed much more systematically to issues relating to the broadcasting of New Zealand produced music. In the process of addressing this particular manifestation of cultural nationalism, I explored broadcasting policy, as well as the relationship between the policies of political parties and governments and the operation of local commercial radio stations. This analysis of local content on New Zealand commercial radio is based on interviews with a number of individuals involved in the broadcasting and recording industries, and the network of agencies and groups that shape the context for the broadcasting of local music.

Towards the end of this work, the government announced the introduction of a code of practice for radio, in which the Radio Broadcasters Association undertook to increase airplay levels of New Zealand music to an average of 20% by the end of 2006. As a voluntary quota, the code is the result of extensive negotiations between the government and broadcasters, and represents the firmest step yet taken to ensure airtime for local music. Although the measure is not a State imposed law, its introduction fulfils the Labour party’s 1999 election policy that triggered this research. This code therefore forms an end point of several years of work by lobbyists and New Zealand on Air, aimed at making local music more attractive to

---

commercial broadcasters and increasing local content. While not specifically a part of New Zealand on Air’s mandate, the new quota code reflects the success of the organisation’s strategies and programmes in promoting New Zealand music. The quota itself is an expression of a desire for increased local content on radio, and is therefore an outcome and extension of the processes and issues discussed in this thesis. Even with a quota in place, radio broadcasters must still choose which New Zealand songs will receive airtime, while the nominally voluntary nature of the code provides space for the industry to declare there is simply not enough music of a particular style or standard being released locally to fulfil the quota requirements.\(^3\) The adoption of a quota therefore, does not remove or deny the issues surrounding which locally produced music is given access to airtime.

This exploration of strategies relating to the broadcasting of New Zealand popular music is set within the context of the globalisation of the music industry and its implications for New Zealand. I highlight the ways in which supporting locally produced music often involves accepting the place of the global music industry in this environment, and working within its structures. The thesis systematically deconstructs the opposition between ‘the local’ and ‘the global’ through an exploration of a particular site of cultural production – the New Zealand music industry, specifically, the access to broadcasting time by local musicians. This chapter considers the issues associated with airtime for local commercial music in New Zealand, leading up to the introduction of the Code of Practice for New Zealand Music Content in Radio Broadcasting in March 2002. It outlines the problems and key questions that have shaped the research reported in following chapters, setting the context for the thesis.

---

The global, the local, radio, and pop music

The world is undergoing a process of globalisation, a process of technological innovation, of the movement of capital across national boundaries, and the growth of multinational corporations with financial interests in many countries. This level of global expansion raises questions about the fate of local communities, and local cultures. Some theorists argue that the threat to local cultures comes from the evolution of a new global culture, others that a ‘global’ culture is simply the imposition of one culture on others, mediated by multinational culture industries. There is a sense that national cultures are under threat, and that the local is being overwhelmed by the global. In response to this, national governments are attempting to establish and maintain cultural autonomy and preserve local cultures.

The processes and discourses in New Zealand that address local popular music production engage with the overwhelmingly foreign content of commercial radio - the domination of programming by US and English pop music. Concerns about the dominance of foreign music have generated a variety of efforts to increase the amount of locally produced music on the airwaves - with programmes, policies and debates dedicated to increasing both the production of music in New Zealand and the attitude of commercial radio towards playing it. Traditionally, commercial radio in New Zealand has been extremely resistant to playing local music, often describing it as being of ‘low production quality’ or too gloomy, claiming that it simply is not as good as overseas product, and that audiences do not want to listen to it. These attitudes were publicly challenged by numerous commentators, musicians, critics and record labels, in the quota debate in 1989. It was not until the late 1990s, however, that the amount of New Zealand music on New Zealand commercial radio actually began to...
increase. This increase in airtime for locally produced music is in large part due to the
programmes and policies carried out by New Zealand on Air and the debate over local
music quotas. It is also accompanied by rhetoric about the role of music and the arts
in supporting, creating, or expressing a sense of national identity.

My interest in this connection between local pop music and national identity in New
Zealand was triggered by a series of statements in the political arena in 1999 and
2000. These statements explicitly link a need for local content, and the stimulation of
local cultural production, with symptoms of globalisation, and a corresponding need
to assert national identity. For example, the New Zealand Labour Party’s September
1999 broadcasting policy document was entitled Broadcasting - it’s about us, and
claimed, under the heading ‘Cultural Identity and Diversity’:

In a global society it is important to recognise what makes us different from other peoples.
Therefore we need to see and hear New Zealand stories and issues, New Zealand programmes
for children, New Zealand faces and accents, New Zealand sport, New Zealand landscape and
New Zealand music. Local content is an integral part of our cultural identity.9

A similar argument is made in Labour’s 1999 campaign arts policy document, titled
Uniquely New Zealand:

Through the arts and through cultural activities we New Zealanders express our aspirations as
a nation, who we are, and where we stand in the world. It is through these endeavours also
that we express our cultural identities: as individuals, and within communities. Globalisation
has opened up the world with flows of images and information in an instant. This access to
other cultures has highlighted the importance of a strong sense of place and cultural identity.10

The economic and social benefits of cultural production were asserted in May 2000,
with the government’s announcement of a new arts funding package. Explaining the
funding increase the package contained, the Prime Minister said:

New Zealand is a small nation in an increasingly globalised world...What is unique about us
are our arts, our culture and our heritage. In the 21st century, they will define us as the
confident, proud and creative peoples we are.11

8 Michael Pickering and Roy Shuker, ‘Struggling to Make Ourselves Heard: Music, Radio and The
Quota Debate,’ in North Meets South: Popular Music in Aotearoa/New Zealand, Hayward, Mitchell
and Shuker (eds), Umina, New South Wales, Perfect beat Productions, 1994, p.76.
9 New Zealand Labour Party, Policy document, ‘Broadcasting - It's About Us,’ 1999a, available at:
http://www.labour.org.nz/InfoCentre1/Policies/Broadcastingpol.html
10 New Zealand Labour Party, Policy document, ‘Uniquely New Zealand, Labour on Arts and Culture,’
11 Audrey Young, ‘Clark delivers more than she pledges in arts,’ in New Zealand Herald online, 18
Helen Clark predicted the package would lead to new jobs in a sector that had ‘missed out’ for years but already contributed $4 billion a year to GDP,\(^\text{12}\) while the Ministry of Culture and Heritage explained “the Government considers that contemporary New Zealand music has significant commercial potential.”\(^\text{13}\) The role of cultural production, as explained in these statements, is to express national identity in a manner that differentiates New Zealanders from the rest of the world, and with which New Zealanders can identify. ‘Local content’ means being able to see local cultural products on television and hear them on radio, while the arts are envisaged as a source of both economic and social benefits.

The underlying theme of these statements is that globalisation and the globalising of cultural products (“flows of image and information”\(^\text{14}\)) make it important for New Zealanders to have an identity as “different from other peoples”.\(^\text{15}\) This cultural identity theme is underpinned by a desire for success in the global economy, success that is connected to being differentiated in the global culture market. Encouragement of cultural production, and its access to television and radio airtime, is therefore a means for the State to both develop a potentially lucrative export industry and encourage a sense of nationhood and cultural autonomy. Pop music is an aspect of cultural production that has received a significant amount of attention through a debate over local content quotas for radio, and the funding strategies of New Zealand on Air. It has been drawn into the mainstream of cultural funding issues by statements such as the one quoted above by the Prime Minister. Pop music is also very much a part of the global culture industry, largely controlled by multinational corporations in its recording and distribution, and in its transmission in the media. This makes it an interesting vehicle for New Zealand cultural identity. To an extent, initiatives to increase airplay for local product can be read as an attempt to counteract the flow of cultural products from the global industries. On the other hand, the strategies employed to achieve this intentionally utilise the resources and channels of the multinational recording industry. Support for local products may be an attempt to reduce the effects of globalisation on New Zealand culture, to strengthen the local in

\(^{12}\) Ibid.


\(^{14}\) New Zealand Labour Party, 1999b.
the face of the global, but the processes and rhetoric associated with this assertion of the local actively embrace the tools and products of globalisation. In fact, the overwhelming dominance of a small number of global corporations over the international music scene and the broadcasting industry in New Zealand means that these channels are the only channels available for the distribution of New Zealand popular music. This form of cultural production thus represents a means by which New Zealand may assert itself on the global stage, while using the processes that create the environment in which it is desirable to express cultural autonomy. The global-local relationship within the music industry lies at the heart of this thesis.

Associating New Zealand music with national identity is itself an assertion of the local against the global, a resistance to the effects of cultural globalisation. It could be considered a response or challenge to this form of cultural imperialism in the context of New Zealand’s vulnerability as a small country in a global economy. However, this would mean defining New Zealand music as a particularly local form, bearing some unique relationship to New Zealand culture that is threatened by the predominance of Anglo-American hits from the international recording industry. This is a very difficult claim to support. It is more the case that the uniqueness of New Zealand music lies, not in its isolation from foreign forms, but in its relationship with them. It is impossible to consider New Zealand music or national identity separately from the processes of globalisation, from the arrival of Maori in Aotearoa to European colonisation, and the technological and communications innovations of the twentieth century. The existence of the nation state of New Zealand is a result of globalisation, and the popular music produced here is itself deeply influenced by the global music industry.

Portraying New Zealand music in terms of the influences of particular bands, styles and movements from overseas, does not, however, exclude the possibility of it also being ‘local’. Brendan Smyth of New Zealand on Air considers New Zealand music to be the product of musical influences from overseas made local by being filtered

---

15 New Zealand Labour Party, 1999a.
through uniquely New Zealand experiences. This suggests a process of indigenisation and hybridisation, an aspect of globalisation that implies a complex relationship between popular music and its social and cultural context. Keith Negus explores this complexity and rejects the notion that music can act as a ‘mirror’ simply ‘reflecting’ a society or culture. He believes that “music is created, circulated, recognised and responded to according to a range of conceptual assumptions and analytical activities that are grounded in quite particular processes and cultural activities.” New Zealand music may be simply ‘music made by New Zealanders’, but it is grounded in processes and cultural activities that stretch across national boundaries.

With significant levels of foreign ownership in the New Zealand broadcasting industry, airplay for local music on the radio is itself a form of international success, since radio in New Zealand is increasingly defined and influenced by international standards and practices. The ultimate goal of strategies to support the New Zealand music industry, however, is to achieve airplay on overseas radio, and sales in other countries. This aspect of support for local music sees popular music as a potential export industry, and a means of generating employment in a wide range of industry roles. While this is not specifically discussed in the course of this thesis, it is important to note that New Zealand itself is a very small market, in which a musician needs to sell a huge number of albums to generate a significant amount of money. For record companies to invest in New Zealand music, there has to be a reasonable return on that investment, as illustrated by this quote from Grenville Turner, Managing Director of Polygram Records New Zealand in 1994:

> Essentially the chances of signing, recording, making videos for, promoting and marketing a band within the New Zealand market alone, and doing it properly, and coming out with a return on your investment, are remote. With a major recording company you obviously have the global network potential.

The implication is that only by selling a song internationally can sufficient money be generated to make an initial investment worthwhile, and the global structure of the

---

‘major labels’ is constructed to maximise this global return. The implications of this pressure to produce for an international market is articulated by David Brice, the Chief Programmer of The Radio Network:

To look at the bigger picture, sure it might be important to have more of our own culture on the radio but to make the whole thing work we’ve got to take it to the world stage, and that’s when the country gets the payback on its investment. And that’s not clearly enough articulated in the rhetoric that flies around over the subject.... I come from a pragmatic business approach that says that if I had anything to do with Zed then I’d want them to be a huge international success. Why? Because then we all get rich. And that’s not a bad thing.20

As David Brice points out, international success potentially repays not only the record company’s investment, but also investment from other funding sources within New Zealand, and ultimately feeds back into the local industry as a whole. Michael Pickering and Roy Shuker regard successful New Zealand music as having the potential to generate economic gains through several means, primarily reducing the amount of music imported into the country and the value of royalty payments that flow to artists and collection agencies overseas.21 From this point of view, simply playing New Zealand music on the radio produces foreign exchange savings, as more of the money paid by radio stations in performance rights stays in the country.

International success itself is a step beyond the issue of local music airplay on radio however, and while there are considerable international influences on the airspace of radio, New Zealand music content is, for the most part, a local issue. Local content is a significant issue for television as well as radio, of course, and calls for quotas on television articulate a similar desire for cultural autonomy within a flow of international images. The television industry is also a global domain within which locally made programmes must compete with expensive foreign productions and conform to international standards for success. There are several significant differences between radio and television, however, which determine the focus on radio for this research. Most significant is the relative cost of content production, and its relationship with broader patterns of consumption. Radio content consists of songs that can be purchased by the listener, and which exist in a social and economic
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context separate from the radio broadcast - as purchase items, as live entertainment, and on television and in films as background music, music videos or live performances. Television programmes for the most part do not have a context away from their broadcast - while it is possible to purchase television series on video or DVD, they do not have the extensive saturation that music has. The broad context music has beyond radio highlights another important difference between local content issues on radio and television. Television programmes are considerably more expensive to produce than songs, with only one potential source of revenue - their purchase by a television broadcaster. Recording a piece of music is invariably considerably cheaper, and radio stations do not, as a rule, purchase songs for broadcast. The ‘return on investment’ for a song is achieved through its purchase by consumers, or less directly, through licensing for use in film, advertising, or on television, and through paid live performances. Radio play is not the only outlet for a song, which makes the relationship more complex than that between television programmes and broadcasters. Primarily, radio acts as a means of promotion for songs, and is characterised by Pickering and Shuker as both an important means of exposure in itself, and also the basis for further promotion, advertising the song’s existence and encouraging listeners to buy the song, album, merchandise and concert tickets.22

Radio airplay is therefore important for local music to increase sales of recordings and concert tickets, and create awareness of particular artists. Radio forms a baseline of support for the whole local music industry. For New Zealand on Air, and this research, the focus for local content strategies is commercial radio, radio stations for which generating advertising revenue is the primary focus of operations. Other kinds of radio, such as public and community radio, which are at least part funded by the State, are limited in the amount of advertising they can sell, and may have specific social functions to fulfil that take precedence over making a profit. New Zealand student radio stations for example, (the ‘b.net’) are to varying degrees dependent on advertising for income. While they intend to make a profit from year to year, they are limited by the terms of their broadcast licences as to how many minutes of advertising

22 Ibid., pp.78-9.
they may play each hour. The b.net stations also fulfil social objectives in the form of specific New Zealand music programming for which funding is allocated by New Zealand on Air. Broadly speaking then, ‘commercial’ radio is that which is not State owned or funded, and for which generating profits is more important than specific social objectives. Because of this, the issue of local music content is a contentious one, as commercial broadcasters resist the imposition of social objectives, such as a compulsory quota, and any perceived interference with their programming that may make them less attractive to advertisers. Chapter four will explore how the profit-orientation of commercial radio leads to an unwillingness to experiment in musical selection, and an increasing reliance on narrow ‘formats’ which determine the style of music played.

For the purposes of this research, I have described the music played by commercial radio simply as ‘popular music’, and referred to it as ‘pop’ music. The nuances of genre in contemporary music are such that only this resort to the ‘mass appeal’ definition of popular, or ‘pop’, provides a sufficiently simple description of the music I am discussing. In any case, the programming selection process of commercial radio is focused on discovering the most ‘approved’ songs for airplay, so that one may expect commercial radio’s music to actually be ‘popular’. In referring to ‘local content’ and ‘New Zealand music’ through this study also, it is the styles of music selected and broadcast on commercial radio, aimed at the largest possible number of listeners, which is being described.

Whether New Zealand produced music commonly features as ‘popular’ is at the heart of the airplay issue for commercial programmers. However, the amount of New Zealand music achieving airplay on commercial radio increased between June 1997 and January 2002. There may be several explanations for this. Contributing factors may include the emergence of a new generation of radio programmers who are more open to the idea of playing New Zealand music; the creation of a radio industry group focussed on improving airplay levels for local music (the Kiwi Music Action Group); the development of new radio stations with higher levels of local music than more established stations, and an increase in ‘radio friendly’ music by New Zealand artists. I would argue however, that these factors are still related to the quota debate and New
Zealand on Air. The Kiwi MAG, for example, is a collaboration between New Zealand on Air and commercial broadcasters. The commercial radio industry is strongly opposed to a legislated music quota, and may have been increasing local music content in order to avoid that compulsion. The code of practice that has been developed is in part a way of demonstrating that commercial radio can increase local music content without legislation. It is a strategy for avoiding the regulation of quotas by securing a nominally voluntary commitment to local music broadcasting.

The increase in ‘radio friendly’ releases by New Zealand musicians is a more complex issue. It raises the question of whether radio has played more New Zealand music because there has been more available that fits commercial formats, or whether musicians have been more inclined to make commercially oriented music because they now have a greater chance of receiving airplay. Arguably, it was the radio and sales success of acts like the OMC, with their song ‘How Bizarre’, and album releases by Bic Runga and The Feelers in 1996 and 1997, that lead to a growing acceptance of New Zealand music by commercial radio, and also by record companies. The record companies, for their part, have lauded New Zealand musicians for consciously making more commercially viable music. As James Southgate, CEO of Warner Music New Zealand told the Listener in December 2001, the “artists themselves have seen the success that some have been able to achieve and they’ve really responded, and that is a massive achievement.” Comparative statements about local music content on radio are extremely problematic however, because there was no official central monitoring of New Zealand music levels on radio until June 1997. At this point, it could be argued, the publication of extremely low airplay figures made the industry, the public, and New Zealand on Air, aware of exactly how little New Zealand music was being played on New Zealand radio, providing a baseline from which to improve.

Whatever the specific factors that have contributed to the increasing levels of New Zealand music airplay on commercial radio, the overall pattern relates to the tension between compulsion and encouragement in the State’s attempts to influence commercial radio content. My focus has been on the work of New Zealand on Air, as
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it provides a background to the new code of practice, and represents the State’s attempt to influence the level of local content on radio, while avoiding legislative compulsion, a strategy that conforms to the broad economic policies of the last two decades.

**Mapping the thesis**

This study began as an attempt to outline some of the debates around airtime for local popular music on commercial radio in New Zealand. I was interested in exploring why local music was receiving more airtime on commercial radio and why there were such traditionally low levels of airtime for this music. I was also interested in the discourses around cultural identity in New Zealand, and the argument that support for the cultural sector is important for a sense of national identity. Popular music is included in the cultural sector and supported by various programmes of New Zealand on Air, while arguments in favour of broadcasting quotas frequently cite the importance of using local music as a means of ‘protecting’ New Zealand culture against the overwhelming influence of foreign produced music. I was interested in examining the relationship between local music and national identity. My interest was not in the ways in which musicological motifs in New Zealand music ‘reflect’ New Zealand and its cultures, but how this version of ‘the local’ is produced, supported and encouraged in relationship to the international music industry.

In chapter two, ‘Patterns’, I set out the major theoretical concerns of the thesis, exploring the literature relating to globalisation, imperialism and the relationship between popular music and ‘place’. I begin by exploring the concept of globalisation - the nature of global culture, and its implications for the autonomy of the nation state. A view of a global/local dichotomy constructs the relationship between local cultures and more powerful dominating cultures as a matter of protecting the local against the imperialist force of the global. The calls for increased levels of New Zealand music on commercial radio reflect an urge to localisation, through asserting an idea of national identity and claiming cultural production to have an important role in developing and expressing it. Contemporary New Zealand culture and pop music, by both Maori and Pakeha musicians, is already a product of globalisation, is already drawn from a
variety of influences before being filtered through influences specific to this context. The binary opposition of global and local is therefore less useful than the concept of hybridisation and indigenisation in the development of cultural practices. It was the combination, for example, of African-American soul and blues music picked up off Miami radio stations and the rhythms of African-Caribbean music that lead to the evolution of reggae and dub in Jamaica. This hybrid became indigenised to the extent of creating a whole new musical form identified with a small island in the Caribbean that has in turn influenced musicians and musical trends the world over. While New Zealand has arguably not yet developed a style as recognisably local as reggae, hybridisation and indigenisation best describe process of development for New Zealand pop music.

Chapter three, ‘Process’, sets out my research process, beginning with my own knowledge of and involvement in broadcasting in New Zealand. Some aspects of this process generated more useful material than others. I had expected, for example, to have access to records of the levels of local music played on New Zealand radio over a significant length of time. At the least I had hoped to be able to trace the levels from immediately before the industry was deregulated, reasoning that this would provide an overview of local music airplay levels across a period of significant transition, and provide a comparison of levels across quite different broadcasting environments. Airplay levels for New Zealand music, however, have only been consistently measured since 1997, meaning they can only be assessed across a period of time in which considerable attention has been paid to commercial radio’s local music content. Another important form of industry data, the singles chart, has presented a variety of issues making them inappropriate for effective comparison. The one area where broadcasters are especially careful about their data is the measurement of audience numbers and of audience ‘acceptance’ of songs being considered for playlisting. Reliance on audience acceptance data, and nervousness about losing listeners and consequently advertisers, are a major driving force in the broadcasting industry. The lack of consistent and reliable figures relating to New Zealand music airplay and popularity meant I was extremely reliant on people within the industry for information on the industry itself, and for their perceptions of the changes that have occurred since deregulation. This interview material has played a major role in shaping the thesis.
Concentrating on commercial radio, I interviewed programme directors representing three major networks, as well as Brendan Smyth, the Music Manager of New Zealand on Air. Further information and background was provided by representatives of Warner Music New Zealand, the Ministry for Culture and Heritage, the Green Ribbon Trust for local content, and the Recording Industry Association of New Zealand.

The perceived threats to cultural autonomy arising out of the globalisation of cultural production have prompted governments to respond by protecting local musical products through broadcasting regulation, legislation, and grants. As chapter four, ‘Policy’, outlines, New Zealand has a particularly deregulated broadcasting environment, with a considerable amount of foreign media ownership, and there are links between this deregulation and a decline in local content that is only recently being reversed. Deregulation brought about an increased commercialisation of New Zealand radio, and an extremely cautious approach to choosing material for airplay. Along with deregulation came the debate over local music content quotas, informed by the quota systems in place in Australia and Canada - countries with similar colonial backgrounds and global musical relationships. Then, in March 2002 a quota ‘code of practice’ similar to the Australian system was introduced. An alternative to quotas had been established in the course of deregulation - the Broadcasting Commission, ‘New Zealand on Air’, was charged with increasing local content on radio and television through non-legislative means. This non-legislative intervention has taken the form of grants and awards and, with an increase in government funding in 2000, a particular strategy, ‘Phase 4’, aimed explicitly at producing local music that commercial radio will play. The low level of regulation in the New Zealand broadcasting industry is maintained by the 2002 code of practice, while the negotiation process between the government and the industry in fact produced several significant commercial gains for broadcasters. The government retains the right to introduce legislation if the code is not adhered to, but for the meantime, the broadcasting of New Zealand music remains a choice of the broadcasters themselves.

---

25 The connection was explicitly made by David Brice, interview, 2000. Discussed in detail in chapter four.
Contemporary popular music has a context well beyond New Zealand’s interest in national identity, with its forms and possibilities determined by a number of powerful global corporations. The relationship between the local and the global music industries is explored in chapter five, ‘Production’. The global music industry has little interest in the role music may play in shaping identities in New Zealand, and New Zealand produced music is constantly being judged against benchmarks set by this global industry. One of the most frequently cited reasons for New Zealand commercial radio playing little local music is that it does not have an ‘international sound’ - it is not part of what Keith Negus calls ‘international repertoire’, a “music business euphemism for the recordings of Anglo-American artists singing conventional rock/pop songs in English.”

The most recent strategy of New Zealand on Air is to invest in music that commercial radio will play, music that has this kind of ‘international’ quality, and to actively promote it to commercial radio, making playing local music a positive goal for radio. There has also been more music emerging that fits the commercial radio sound and is more easily accepted for playlisting. Regardless of the particular set of causal factors, the result is the same - the evolution of commercially successful music in New Zealand that displays the ‘international sound’ demanded by commercial radio. It is unlikely that a quota will change this orientation, as broadcasters will still have to decide which New Zealand songs fit within their formats, alongside the international hits already played, with the ability to renegotiate the quota goals if ‘appropriate’ music is not sufficiently available.

If this commercially acceptable music is to contribute to a specifically New Zealand identity it will need to carefully balance this ‘international’ sound with elements that are specific to the New Zealand context. Such a balance would add something new and identifiably New Zealand to the international repertoire, a balance of local and international influences that stands out in the international music scene and hopefully acts as a profitable marketing point for local music.

---

28 The ‘playlist’ is the selection of songs given regular airtime on commercial radio.
New Zealand on Air and the Code of Practice consider New Zealand music to be simply music made by New Zealanders. This is a pragmatic position to take from an administrative point of view, but does not address the discourses that link popular music production with national identity. Chapter six, ‘People and Place’, extends the global-local issues of chapter five to explore the hybridisation in New Zealand music practice, and more closely examine the relationship between New Zealand music and New Zealand identity. Rather than reflecting an essential New Zealandness through lyrical content or specific musical styles, the important aspect of any local cultural production is its role as a tool for the imagining of the national community. In this respect, chapter six explores the role of local content on radio in disseminating the tools of imagining, and connecting New Zealand communities, ‘embracing the nation,’ in the words of the Ministry for Culture and Heritage.

This thesis has been shaped by the view that the most appropriate way to approach the New Zealandness of New Zealand music is through exploring the community in which music is produced. Benedict Anderson’s concept of the nation as ‘imagined community’ provides an insight into the role cultural production, including the production of pop music, can play in providing the tools with which to imagine the national community. In a small nation like New Zealand, community is also very much a product of proximity, where a sense of connection with a band can be as simple as being able to see them play live more easily than overseas bands, or flatting with their bass player’s cousin. The relationship between music and New Zealand identity is associated with its creation and circulation, the ways in audiences respond to it and claim it as ‘local’, and the ways in which it comes to represent a shared community within the nation.
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Conclusion

New Zealand music is produced in the context of a global music industry, whose standardised ‘international repertoire’ dominates New Zealand commercial radio. For more New Zealand music to be played on commercial radio, it needs to fit within this ‘international sound’, even under a quota system. To be noticed in the global music industry, New Zealand music needs to be interestingly different, and not just a New Zealand version of a generic international pop sound. The most internationally successful New Zealand music has already established itself as involving innovative variations on music from elsewhere in the world. New Zealand popular music is inevitably a hybrid product of international styles, which have been indigenised by being filtered through New Zealand experiences. Recognition of this hybridisation allows for a fluid and socially engaged understanding of the localness of popular, commercial music. To place too much emphasis on musicological traits, or the use of New Zealand place names or events in music is to restrict New Zealand music to being a ‘reflection’ of society and ignores its engagement with the community in which it is produced and responded to. Local musicians are the only popular musicians that are accessible to and connected with the community, and popular music can act as a symbolic resource for the imagined community of the nation.
Chapter 2
Patterns

The New Zealand music industry is located within a global network, whose dominant players are a small number of multinational corporations. ‘Local’ music must meet the demands of the global industry to be successful, either internationally or on ‘local’ radio. The international music industry is indicative of the process of globalisation, but also contains elements of imperialism. Globalisation itself is the dominant political, economic and cultural process in the world at the beginning of the twenty-first century. A far less directed and visible process than earlier forms of imperialism, it produces, in the view of various theorists, a sense of ‘uncertainty’ and a lack of community with which individuals can relate.¹ In response to these processes, ‘localisation’ represents an attempt to identify and maintain local communities. Primary among these ‘local’ communities is the nation. The global-local dichotomy, however, is misleading, as cultures and peoples interact across national boundaries and ‘nations’ themselves represents a process of hybridisation. Hybrid identities therefore form a mid-point between the local and global, a resolution of the dialectic.

Political statements of support for local music in New Zealand have been framed by references to the processes of ‘globalisation’.² The implication is that globalisation threatens to overwhelm local cultures with an undefined but compelling wave of images and products from outside. Encouraging the development and strengthening of New Zealand culture in response to this involves a deliberate shift to localisation, an attempt to balance out the global tendencies. However, as a colonial country, New Zealand is already a product of globalisation, through the outward expansion of Europe and its imperialism. The national identity being claimed in New Zealand is a product of a colonial past, Maori culture, and a wealth of influences, both local and

global. New Zealand is a young country and its identity is constantly in process. Indeed, John Tomlinson describes all national cultures as being in process, and the definition of national characteristics and traditions as merely a ‘freezing’ of cultural memory up to that point, a definition which carries the accumulated influence of other cultures.\(^3\)

This chapter will explore the broader patterns that underpin the changes in New Zealand broadcasting and the allocation of airtime to New Zealand produced music between 1997 and the beginning of 2002. The overall context is the pattern of globalisation, and its manifestation in New Zealand economic policy in the 1980s and 1990s. The policy formula of this period lead to changes in New Zealand’s relationship to the global economy, and produced a highly deregulated, internationally-influenced broadcasting system. Against this backdrop, there have been attempts to assert, develop or strengthen a sense of national identity, including efforts to increase local music content on commercial radio. This chapter will begin by surveying the process of globalisation and the countervailing process of localisation. A synthesis of the two is proposed in the concept of hybridisation, constructing national identity as a fluid process, particularly relevant within globalisation. Finally, I will look at the concept of the ‘local’ in popular music and the global-local relationship and hybridity it contains. The debates and discourse surrounding airtime for New Zealand music are inherently concerned with these issues, not just the relationship of popular music and place, but the nature of national identity, and most importantly, the process and implications of globalisation.

**Globalisation – localisation**

The history of nations involves a long process of intentional domination and direct political control, detailed by Edward Said in his work *Culture and Imperialism*.\(^4\) Effectively, the period of massive political imperialism came to an end after World War Two, when “stunningly, by and large the entire world was decolonized”,\(^3\) resulting in the “emergence of almost a hundred new decolonized post-colonial states.
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after 1945”. However, imperialism is still used to describe relationships of cultural domination, regarded as cultural imperialism. Colleen Roach describes the theory of cultural imperialism as gaining currency in the late 1960s, and being defined by the work of prominent theorists such as Armand Mattelart and Herbert Schiller. More recently, theorists like John Tomlinson have come to favour globalisation as a way of describing the relations of power in the period since the 1960s. This new formation is characterised by a reduction in the autonomy of national governments, and a movement to assert national identities to reclaim a sense of autonomy.

Globalisation is characterised by the increasing interconnectedness of nations, and related tendencies such as “the development of increased transnational communication and activities; ... the emergence of global political, economic and cultural organizations and bureaucracies; ... a huge increase in the flows of commodities and cultural products; and the world-wide spread of Western-style consumerism.” John Tomlinson characterises the difference between globalisation and imperialism as lying in the intentionality and centrality of the process:

For all that it is ambiguous between economic and political senses, the idea of imperialism contains, at least, the notion of a purposeful project: the intended spread of a social system from one centre of power across the globe. The idea of ‘globalisation’ suggests interconnection and interdependency of all global areas which happens in a far less purposeful way. It happens as a result of economic and cultural processes which do not, of themselves, aim at global integration, but which nonetheless produce it.

New Zealand’s transition from British colony to nominally independent nation with extensive ownership of business and services by international corporations is illustrative of this process.

For New Zealand, this transition into a globalised rather than directly imperialist position came with the economic changes of the late twentieth century. New Zealand’s economy shifted from dependence on Great Britain (New Zealand’s
colonial power) as a market for pastoral produce, to the establishment of a highly diversified economy with a wide range of markets, in which Britain is a minor trading partner. The move from a heavily protectionist, interventionist economic system, to a ‘more market’ commercialised approach is analysed by Brian Easton in *The Commercialisation of New Zealand*. Easton describes the effect of this as a colonising of New Zealand business, ironically reducing the business power of the ‘New Establishment’ supporters of the commercialisation strategy:

The New Establishment saw the strategy of commercialisation as a means to rid itself of the interference of government in its activities. But independence from the New Zealand government was bought at the price of surrendering the ownership of New Zealand business to overseas concerns.... The New Establishment has become a hostage to foreign investors. Easton identifies a shift in kinds of colonial relationship, the irony of New Zealand’s economic and market independence from Britain lying in the extensive ownership of New Zealand business by foreign investors. This involves a different kind of relationship from New Zealand’s previous dependence on Britain as an imperial national power. The difference between government control, and the far less measurable influence of foreign investors is indicative of the shift from imperialism to globalisation. The power and influence of the international corporations who have shares in New Zealand business is far harder to discern than the direct and intentional control of an imperial national power.

Another significant influence on national autonomy within globalisation is exerted by international trade agreements, and rulings against mechanisms that may restrict free trade. There are suggestions, for example, that music quotas may violate New Zealand’s commitment on the World Trade Organisation’s General Agreement on Trade in Services, as a form of non-tariff trade barrier, and that under the Closer Economic Relations agreement between New Zealand and Australia, Australian artists would have to receive the same treatment as New Zealanders in terms of radio airplay. Affording Australians equal airtime with New Zealanders significantly
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12 Ibid., p.120.
undermines the point of a local content quota. This potential impact of international trade agreements on attempts to protect local cultural production illustrates the reduction in power of the nation state within the mechanisms of globalisation. The code of practice for local content adopted in lieu of legislation, however, may avoid this fate, as it is not technically a government initiated protection mechanism. In this way, the power to resist globalisation is effectively removed from the State itself, although the government may still have some influence over the choices made by other agents. Keith Negus describes policies aimed at cultural protection (such as music quota policies) as representing a “struggle for cultural autonomy” that also forms an attempt at resistance to globalisation.\textsuperscript{15} The State may be caught in a difficult position, having to uphold the values of free trade internationally, yet seeking to maintain this struggle for cultural autonomy, and mitigate globalisation’s effects on national identity.

Tomlinson argues that the effect of globalisation on individuals is an intensification of the mood of ‘postmodernity’, a sense “of uncertainty, of paradox, of lack of moral legitimacy and of cultural indirection.”\textsuperscript{16} This sense of uncertainty is picked up by Easton, observing that the “resulting combination of a mistrusted Establishment, overseas involvement, and public restlessness makes the politics of the rest of the 1990s as uncertain as at any time in New Zealand’s past.”\textsuperscript{17} Uncertainty as a result of globalisation and the kinds of “major political and economic changes” charted by Easton, is observed also by Claudia Bell.\textsuperscript{18} Bell considers these shifts in New Zealanders’ social and economic context as leading to an “increasing uncertainty about sense of place”, and an undermining of “traditional local identification and diversity.”\textsuperscript{19} The response Bell describes is one of consciously reasserting national identity, and of recognising the ability of the tools and technologies of globalisation to provide a means of transmitting “some of our values back out into the world”, giving New Zealand “ammunition with which to fight back, and reassert difference.”\textsuperscript{20} Bell identifies the possibility of resistance, utilising the processes of globalisation to

\textsuperscript{16} John Tomlinson, 1991, p.175.
\textsuperscript{17} Brian Easton, 1997, p.120.
\textsuperscript{19} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{20} Ibid.
reclaim local identities and potentially influence other cultures in turn. Free trade agreements, for example, mean New Zealand cultural products may be exported overseas easily, rather than simply being swamped by overseas products in New Zealand. Resistance to globalisation may also be expressed at a simple consumer level, in the decision by individuals to purchase local products rather than foreign ones. In fact, New Zealand music sales actually grew in 2001, against the trend of the broader music industry, a fact Michael Glading, CEO of Sony Records New Zealand, attributes to a general trend to ‘buy local’: “By and large, people are actually happier about buying a New Zealand product, whether it’s a wheelbarrow or some music.” Glading claims this trend is being repeated in other small countries, such as Belgium and Switzerland, implying a similar desire to assert a degree of autonomy within an alienating global marketplace. Whether this represents a conscious rejection of the global, or a specific embracing of the local, when applied to cultural products this tendency could illustrate another means by which local identities may be claimed in response to the global. Asserting national identity is described by Bell as potentially a resistant and empowering means to establish a new kind of relationship with the world and within the nation.

Tomlinson regards globalisation’s biggest problem as its inability to provide “viable communities of cultural judgement: … communities on a scale to which individuals can relate, and which can provide satisfying accounts of how and why we live as we live.” To accept that the institutions and systems of globalisation are unchangeable or unaffected by cultural will would be to deny the power of ‘cultural will,’ and ultimately the idea of culture itself. In his discussion of human responses to this loss and challenge to cultural ‘will’, Tomlinson quotes Martin Jacques:

As Power moves upwards from the nation-state towards larger international units... so there is a countervailing pressure, whose roots are various, for it to move downwards....

There is a new search for identity and difference in the face of impersonal global forces, which is leading to the emergence of new national and ethnic demands.
This process provides the balance to abstract globalising forces, a process of localisation, and a search for communities on a human scale. The drive to localisation and ‘human scale’ communities is reflected in attempts to stimulate local cultural production, assert national identities, and protect them from external market forces through mechanisms such as local content quotas in broadcasting. New Zealand has sustained a debate on this topic alongside the processes of economic commercialisation that have opened the country up to global forces. At the same time, there has been considerable discourse about national identity, frequently citing the effects of globalisation, such as this claim by the New Zealand Labour Party in their 1999 Arts policy document, *Uniquely New Zealand*:

> Globalisation has opened up the world with flows of images and information in an instant. This access to other cultures has highlighted the importance of a strong sense of place and cultural identity.\(^{27}\)

The policy document echoes Tomlinson’s description of a search for identity in the face of global forces, implicitly asserting the need for a sense of difference from the images and cultural forces heralded by globalisation. Claims to national identity can therefore be constructed as a form of resistance to the global forces.

Bell, however, warns that the assertion of national identity can be regressive, if based on mythical and unexplored and unchallenged assumptions about ‘national character’ or traditions. Bell considers the economic changes of the 1980s and 1990s to have been accompanied by new framings of national identity, in which the effects of the changes are hidden within an assertion that we are all ‘one’:

> The assertion of national identity can be read as a social control mechanism to maintain order and quell resistance that could logically occur as a result of the large gap between rich and poor.... [By] insisting we are all ‘one’, any notions such as class consciousness, or priority of other problematic identities, is suppressed.\(^{28}\)

National identity can be asserted by powerful institutions as both a repressive and regressive mechanism - repressing disparate identities, and regressing to mythical traditions of national character. Bell’s analysis tempers the liberationary tendencies of claims for empowerment and resistance through assertion of national identities and local power against the globalising forces.

\(^{27}\) New Zealand Labour Party, 1999b.

\(^{28}\) Claudia Bell, 1996, p.189.
Bell’s warning of the ability of discourses of national identity to disguise repressive relations of power ought to prompt a cautious analysis of any claims to ‘defining’ national identity. However, the call to construct and preserve national cultural identity in New Zealand does represent a call to establish community on a human scale. Strengthening local cultural output does seem to offer a resistance to the internationalising forces of the global entertainment industries, a struggle for cultural autonomy. Taking heed of Bell’s warning however, the issue is one of how national or cultural identity is to be defined.

Hybridisation

The dangers highlighted by Claudia Bell relate to attempts to define national identity, to hold it down to singular national characteristics. However, much analysis of the nation as a political form regards national identity as a process, an ongoing interaction between internal and external forces. This view denies an essentialist view of nations, and presents potentially liberatory possibilities for the fate of nations and cultures within globalisation. For analysis of the nation itself, an extensively cited approach is that of Benedict Anderson.

‘The imagined community’ is the phrase used by Benedict Anderson to describe the nature and awareness of the modern nation. He proposes that “it is an imagined political community - and imagined as both inherently limited and sovereign.”29 The nation is an imagined community because “the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow-members, meet them, or even hear of them, yet in the minds of each lives the image of their communion.”30 The nation is limited by its borders - which in turn limit and define other nations. Its sovereignty represents its freedom from the pre-Enlightenment “divinely-ordained, hierarchical dynastic realm.”31 The nation is imagined as a community because, echoing Claudia Bell’s observation of the invocation of national identity as a social control mechanism, “regardless of the actual inequality and exploitation that may prevail in each, the

30 Ibid.
nation is always conceived as a deep, horizontal comradeship.” Anderson describes the historical process of imagining community as facilitated by the evolution of nation-specific language groups, and the printing of books in these languages, allowing the reader to grasp that there is a community of people he/she does not know, but who share access to the same knowledge and experience. The evolution of novels, newspapers, education systems, colonial career paths, maps, museums and the census are all envisaged by Anderson to be important components of the process whereby a sense of community is constructed among people who will never meet or be able to know all of those with whom they share that community.  

Anderson’s discussion focuses on both the emergence and awareness of Europe’s sovereign states, and that of their former colonies in the Americas and South East Asia, this postcolonial context being most relevant to New Zealand. Through it Anderson pays most attention to the role of cultural products such as novels and newspapers, as well as official mechanisms of ordering and defining a society - the “census, the map, and the museum”. This focus on cultural products as the tools for imagining, and ordering the imagining of, a national community provides a context for the argument that local broadcasting content is important for New Zealanders’ cultural identity. When the Labour Party asserts that being able to see and hear New Zealand accents, voices, landscapes, faces, and music in the media is integral to our cultural identity, it is using these signifiers of New Zealand to reinforce a dispersed population’s recognition of its fellow members, the community of imaginary citizens who also are assumed to recognise those accents, voices, landscapes, faces, and music.

Thomas Norcliffe traces this process in New Zealand’s colonial period, extending the tools of imagining to the development of transport routes and the telegraph. He argues that the ability to envisage the country as a whole network of communities connected by rail and roads, rather than separate isolated communities, along with the sharing of national news in newspapers, were important factors in the development of a sense of
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31 Ibid., p.7.
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national identity for early Pakeha colonists. Norcliffe provides a view of how technological advancements since the printing press can aid the imagining of community, describing the role of the telegraph in speeding up communications between outlying communities. Claudia Bell also examines the role of media in creating a sense of community in New Zealand, asking how else “can a widely flung population have a sense of connectedness; of all being part of one whole, the nation?”

In his description of the ‘imagined community’, Anderson recognises that the nation state is a relatively new concept, and has evolved through politics rather than being simply the natural configuration of discrete cultural units. An imagined community is an open process, one that is not fixed in time. Further, the national identity associated with it is, “paradoxically, the cultural outcome of the very same processes - expanding capitalism, Western rationality, the breakdown of ‘tradition’, the ‘mediatisation’ of cultural experience - that are said, in other discourses, to constitute cultural imperialism itself!” Certainly, New Zealand as a colonial nation is already a product of cultural imperialism and globalisation. Said claims that all cultures are hybrid products of the processes described above by Anderson, that in part “because of empire, all cultures are involved in one another; none is single and pure, all are hybrid, heterogeneous, extraordinarily differentiated, and unmonolithic.” Some analysts argue that out of the dialectic of the global and the local, new cultural forms are emerging. Anne Cvetkovitch and Douglas Kellner consider that:

… culture is an especially complex and contested terrain today as global cultures permeate local ones and new configurations emerge that synthesize both poles, providing contradictory forces of neocolonization and resistance, global homogenization and new local hybrid forms and identities.

37 Claudia Bell, 1996, p.131.  
38 John Tomlinson, 1991, p.84.  
These new hybrid identities, they argue, offer much more power to people in the creation of communities. While these may exist across borders, envisaging the nation as community provides the possibility of a resolution to the global-local dialectic, the nation as a community in evolution.

The national community therefore, is not a fixed, stable unit, but one that has evolved out of layers of power and exchange, as a product of globalisation. Cultures evolve and develop as they mix with and influence each other. Tomlinson explains:

Movement between cultural/geographical areas always involves translation, mutation and adaptation as the 'receiving culture' brings its own cultural resources to bear, in dialectical fashion, upon 'cultural imports'.

Tomlinson explains that the definition of a culture “at any one time will be a kind of ‘totalisation’ of cultural memory up to that point.” The cultural memories that add up to this totalisation will have been selectively preserved in the media and politics, and will always include the remnants of previous cultural interminglings. Cultures, national or otherwise, are always part of an ongoing process of hybridisation. This process is particularly noticeable in a young colonial culture like New Zealand’s, with the interaction between Maori and Pakeha culture and ongoing waves of immigrants.

For this immigrant community the evolution of a national/local cultural identity requires negotiating the gap between ‘here’ and ‘there’, and finding ways to embrace the ‘here’. Claudia Bell argues that the Pakeha colonists’ attempts at “developing... a concept of what it meant to be a ‘New Zealander’” involved “creating a history that included themselves and was unrelated to Maori history.” Bell characterises the attitudes of the colonists as simultaneously about the past and the future, the ‘here’ and the ‘there’, while nostalgia played an important role in the development of the colony: “This was simultaneously a forward-looking and pro-active decision for immigrants to better themselves, while drawing their vision of the colony from idealised versions of the past.”

The simultaneous inward and outward view, seeking unique images of New Zealand, but looking to Britain or ‘overseas’ for affirmation and cultural models has persisted particularly in the arts.
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This process has been analysed more extensively in terms of New Zealand literature than it has with respect to popular music, and has been consciously explored by many writers and poets, reinforcing Anderson’s claims about the importance of the indigenous novel for the evolution of the imagined national community. Mark Williams has explored the relationship between Pakeha New Zealand’s cultural identity and its writers’ attempts to come to terms with the geography and distance from ‘home’. ‘Home’ has traditionally signified Britain, but the term evokes a particular displacement, the apparent knowledge that home is always ‘not here.’ Williams describes writers of the 1930s:

who set about overcoming the colonial sense of distance, isolation and inferiority by establishing a distinctive local literary tradition, something which would be, in a phrase of [poet Allen] Curnow’s, ‘different, something/Nobody counted on’. This was the period of the establishment of the post-provincial period.46

Curnow’s attitude in particular was significant in that he “trenchantly condemned any sign of aversion towards what he called ‘the New Zealand referent’ in favour of an arid internationalism.”47 The ‘post-provincial’ period in New Zealand literature was important for both attempting to come to terms with the ‘New Zealand referent’, and for recognising that the process of developing New Zealand identity was ongoing. Allen Curnow’s poem ‘The Skeleton of the Great Moa in the Canterbury Museum, Christchurch’ speaks to this elegantly:

Curnow looked to a child ‘born in a marvellous year/ who will learn the trick of standing upright here’. In this poem about adaptation and the failure to adapt, about the amount of time it takes for an organic national culture to take shape after the brutal wrench of transplantation, New Zealanders are seen as crippled by geography.48

Curnow’s vision was of a cultural scene that could assert itself and identify itself as being of New Zealand, without recourse to international models - the ability to ‘stand upright’ as a New Zealander.

It was the colonising Pakeha who had suffered the ‘brutal wrench of transplantation’, and were crippled by the geographical gap between their new and old homes. For

48 Ibid.
Maori, the brutal moment was not a wrench of transplantation, but of imperialist force, which imposed in its own form a wrench from their ‘home’ culture. Maori culture has already suffered the process of imperialism and the domination of what by contrast was an ‘arid internationalism’, insofar as colonial English culture was an international one. Pakeha culture has come late to the threat of imperialism, and any hybridisation that has occurred within New Zealand culture between Maori and its colonisers has been severely one sided. However, coming to terms with the existence of Maori culture did, to some extent, allow the white settlers to develop a sense of a new cultural form:

By seeing themselves in relation to the Maori rather than in relation to Britain, the Pakeha were advancing their claims to authentic belonging in New Zealand. This process of indigenization of the settlers is marked by the evolution of the meaning of the term New Zealander which meant Maori in the early nineteenth century and white descendant of the settlers by the latter part of that century.... The late twentieth-century habit among the European New Zealanders of accepting the designation Pakeha carried yet further the task of self-naturalization.49

The colonial New Zealand experience has required ‘letting go’ of ‘home’, collapsing the distance between ‘home’ and the sense of home, and developing new ‘New Zealand referents’. Tomlinson and others argue that no national cultural identity is ever fully realised, that all cultures are constantly in flux, intermingling and hybridising. The ongoing discussions of cultural identity in New Zealand seem to accept this, it seems that there is still a striving for Curnow’s something ‘different, something/Nobody counted on’, yet also an increasing recognition that this may emerge out of a hybridisation that is internal to New Zealand and specific to that physical and social environment.

New Zealand culture has evolved out of the colonial relationship with Britain, but now exists in a much more complex relationship with corporate capital and trade relations in a globalised rather than strictly imperial world. For cultural production, however, the question of whether New Zealand has a developed a ‘New Zealand referent’ is a central part of the issues surrounding airplay time for New Zealand music. The global music industry favours what Curnow would call ‘an arid

49 Ibid., p.22.
internationalism’, and the relationship between commercial popular music and place is uncertain.

**Cultural production, popular music and the ‘local’**

New Zealand’s position in the international music industry is very much as a ‘receiver’ of images and sounds. There have, however, been some notable successes in the local music scene. There are examples of the flow being reversed. Significantly however, this has been in a highly ‘non’ commercial area, where the flows of information and product take place outside the control of the dominant music powers. The local referent achieved in New Zealand, as in other cultures, has been very much a reflection of the hybrid societies in which it was produced, and a result of relative isolation from the global industry. As the music industry has become increasingly globalised, achieving the local, or reversing the flow of product, is very difficult.

The music most associated with the phrase ‘New Zealand music’ has been decidedly non-commercial in orientation, yet has achieved considerable international success in its own terms. The ‘Dunedin sound’, represented by Flying Nun records (which was founded in Christchurch in 1981) is probably the sound which is most associated with New Zealand internationally, through bands like the Chills, the Clean, the Straitjacket Fits, the Jean-Paul Satre Experience, the Verlaines and the Bats. Exposure on US college radio stations and influential English DJ John Peel’s radio show lead many of these bands to contracts with overseas record labels, and a strong cult following all over the world. The Chills’ 1990 album *Submarine Bells* reached number 1 on the US college radio charts. The email discussion group for ‘New Zealand music’ is run out of MIT. The 2000 Dunedin Festival of the Arts ‘Dunedin Sound’ sub-festival was recorded and webcast by San Francisco radio station KALX. There is another layer of New Zealand music, even less commercial than the Flying Nun ‘Dunedin sound’, associated with the Xpressway, and more recently, ‘Corpus Hermeticum’ labels, run by Bruce Russel. Roy Shuker and Michael Pickering describe Xpressway bands such
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as Russel’s own Dead C, as having “achieved cult status in the USA.” 51 Russel’s current label ‘Corpus Hermeticum’ is now a significant player in the small but global ‘noise’ music scene, releasing artists from France, Norway, Japan, and ‘superstars’ like Thurston Moore of New York’s Sonic Youth. It is hard to quantify this status in terms comparable with the commercial music market, but anecdotes abound relating to the passionate cult nature of New Zealand music. 52

The Dunedin/Flying Nun ‘sound’ is probably the most successful New Zealand musical export, in terms of international recognition, if not sales numbers. The sound developed out of a particular scene, a group of people who inspired each other to start bands, taking elements of bands they knew - such as the Velvet Underground - and turning them into something new. Theories as to why this particular scene should have been so prolific range from the cold of Dunedin winters inspiring people to stay inside and play guitar, to the simple confluence of specific people at a specific time, which in turn encouraged other people to move there and become involved. An undoubtedly important factor was Dunedin’s isolation, its distance from Auckland as the centre of the New Zealand music industry, and from the world beyond. 53

Significantly, the Dunedin Sound was a ‘new’ sound developed out of specific influences and produced in relative isolation, This hybridising is an important feature of many new musical styles, of which Jamaican music is a well-documented example:

musical impulses via foreign radio stations combined with local traditions seems to have been the catalyst for the development of blue beat, ska, reggae, etc. Bob Marley biographer Timothy White, has described how Jamaican youth in the 1950s were listening to foreign radio stations, and how this began affecting their own music-making.

Weather conditions permitting, they listened to the sinewy music being played on New Orleans stations, or Miami’s powerful WINZ, whose playlists included records by Amos Milburn, Roscoe Gordon and Louis Jordan. They could relate to... Fats Domino’s lamenting ‘Walking Blues’... Jamaican bands began covering US R&B

51 Ibid., p.267.
52 While travelling in Ireland and Europe I have met several passionate and dedicated collectors of Xpressway, Flying nun and ‘Hermescorp’ releases. Also, in March 2001 I saw Dunedin’s Alastair Galbraith play at a festival in Belgium, he then recorded a studio session for Dutch national broadcaster VPRO who made a documentary about him and New Zealand music.
53 Information on the Dunedin scene has been taken from interviews with musicians: Paul Kean and Bruce Russel, conducted in 1995 for an extended essay in BA (Hons). Department of Sociology,
hits, but the more adventurous took the nuts and bolts out of the sound and melded them with energetic jazz concepts... and emerged around 1956 with a hybrid concoction christened ‘ska’.

Jamaican music is a rich fusion of Black musical traditions - soul and jazz picked up on North American radio, and the hybrid African traditions of the Caribbean nation. Lee ‘Scratch’ Perry’s biographer describes this particular mix in what was arguably the first ‘reggae’ song, Perry’s ‘People Funny Boy’ in 1968:

the resultant sound was startling, the beat truly frenetic. It contained an unfettered urgency and frustrated clamour that went against the relaxed pace of the waning rock steady [style], but instead of hankering back to the American jazz influence of ska, this crazy, pounding beat went in another direction, with Scratch’s reinterpretation of the midnight Pocomania revealing the transmogrified suffering of Africans transplanted to a hostile and alien environment.

The hybridity that forms reggae reflects the social environment of Jamaica, its proximity to the US, and the religious tradition of a displaced and suffering African people. Reggae therefore is a product of the particular colonial relationships of the Caribbean, combined with the creative genius of the individuals involved. The combination of influences in a relatively isolated environment, which can then grow its own scene and develop new traditions, is a common feature of local musical traditions around the world. In Tanzania, for example, traditional forms have merged with Afro-American music producing so-called ‘Swahili jazz’, while ‘Taarib’ is a traditional form with Arabic origins, mixed with Indian film music.

The hybridity of national identity is mirrored in the hybrid nature of ‘local’ popular musics. To discern any closer relationship to the local is, Keith Negus suggests, very difficult:

For a number of writers who have been concerned with this issue there has frequently been an assumption that ‘local’ music has something valuable that connects it to a particular place - something that ‘global’ or ‘international’ music does not have. However, it is very unclear what this might be ...attempts to ‘define’ the local can lead to many ambiguities and
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contradictions... Just as no sound, cultural form or corporation can be ‘global’ in anything but a partial way, so the characteristics of ‘local music’... are so varied and lead to a rather confusing array of potential ‘global-local’ relationships. The ‘local’ seems to become as elusive, vague and all embracing as the ‘global.’\textsuperscript{57}

Negus warns against conceiving of the local and global as musically opposed. Instead, as the examples of reggae and ‘Dunedin’ music show, ‘local’ styles are the result of the interplay of cultures mediated through the products and processes of the global media. For both Jamaica and Dunedin however, an important feature was relative isolation, with input from the occasional ‘spillage’ from US radio, or the relatively few records that would reach New Zealand in the late 1970s and early 1980s.\textsuperscript{58}

Changes in import regulations, the proliferation of television and radio stations, the internet, and the massive increase in information flow around the world mean that New Zealand is far less isolated at the beginning of the twenty-first century than twenty years earlier. The changes are indicative of globalisation and raise the question of whether there is sufficient cultural space left for new musical forms to emerge.

While globalisation is an accepted description of global flows of information and capital, Keith Negus believes imperialism is still a useful description of the global music industry.\textsuperscript{59} This is evidenced by the ways in which dynamics of power between the five major corporations running the global music industry affect the global processes of production and distribution of music. Herbert Schiller also regards this kind of corporate power as imperialism, terming it “trans-national corporate cultural domination”.\textsuperscript{60}

Negus cites the euphemism ‘international repertoire’ used throughout the music industry as representing the ‘dominant particular’ that shapes this particular global. ‘International repertoire’ means “the recordings of Anglo-American artists singing conventional rock/pop songs in English (the occasional non-Anglo artist is admitted to this category, provided they sing in English)” and is frequently referred to

\textsuperscript{57} Negus, 1996, pp.181-3.
\textsuperscript{58} Michael Flint details the lack of records available in New Zealand in the 1960s: ‘What the Air was Like up There - Overseas Music and Local Reception in the 1960s,’ in North Meets South: Popular Music in Aotearoa/New Zealand, Hayward, Mitchell and Shuker (eds), Umina, New South Wales, Perfect Beat Productions, 1994, pp.1-15. In interviews I conducted with New Zealand musicians of the early 1980s in 1995, the musicians indicated little had changed in the availability of contemporary overseas music.
\textsuperscript{59} Keith Negus, 1996, pp.178-80
\textsuperscript{60} Colleen Roach, 1997, p.53.
in New Zealand as the ‘international sound’. The international sound is reminiscent of Curnow’s ‘arid internationalism’, and will be considered in greater depth in chapter five.

Negus further draws attention to the means by which the global music industry ensures the dominance of ‘global’ stars, such as Madonna and Michael Jackson, claiming that imperialism does not necessarily mean the transmission of dominant cultural values, but simply control over access to the means of production:

*Cultural Imperialism does not need to imply that audiences are dancing to Madonna because they have rather passively absorbed cultural values from elsewhere.... [A]udiences can make their own meanings, develop their own uses and gratifications and use cultural products in a variety of ways. But, making meanings, actively using technologies and interpreting texts is not the same as having the power and influence to distribute cultural forms.*

New Zealand audiences may or may not be absorbing cultural values from the dominant centres of cultural production through pop music. Negus makes two important points in relation to this issue. One is that audiences can choose the meanings they take from popular music, the other refers to the question of access to the means of production rather than reception in the global music industry.

‘Active audience’ theory refers to the idea that audiences are not simply passive consumers of cultural products, absorbing Western values along with Western pop music (or other cultural products). Active audience theory argues that “individuals and individuals as members of different sub-groups can and do construct their own meanings from media messages and cultural products, thus refuting the central idea of domination through Western culture.” The major objection to this theory is related to Negus’ second point - that the ability to attach one’s own meanings to a received cultural product, is not the same thing as having access to the means of producing cultural products. For example, New Zealand musicians do not have equal access to the global music market, because New Zealand is not a centre of cultural production like the US or Britain. New Zealand is still a colony of sorts, and its musicians still face the difficulties Said illustrates in relation to Imperial England, where “subjects can be taken to places like Australia, but they cannot be allowed a ‘return’ to
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metropolitan space”.

Said is referring to the problems of the convict Magwitch in Dickens’ *Great Expectations*, but the sentiment is apt; the global music industry, as imperial power, allows musical activity to carry on in the ‘colonies’, but it is very difficult for those acts to ‘return’ to the metropolitan spaces of the US or Britain.

While New Zealand is now far less isolated in terms of reception of cultural products, the local music industry is still very much a colony of the global industry in terms of production. ‘Returning’ to the metropolitan centres of musical production is a major goal of the New Zealand music industry, and being able to reverse the flow of cultural products would indicate that the international music industry’s imperialism was actually becoming a form of globalisation. The strategies and policies taking place in the New Zealand music industry, and the discourses about national identity and popular music in the broader media, government, and other agencies are indicative of attempts to reverse this flow. With New Zealand commercial radio largely foreign owned, even achieving airplay on local radio stations is a form of reversing the flow, while achieving overseas success, particularly in the US, is the ultimate goal. Whether, in a global industry with massive flow of international products, and a dominant ‘international sound’, it is possible to achieve this international success, even on ‘local’ radio, while retaining some kind of local identity, is another question. There could, however, be space for local audiences to actively construct and engage with the ‘localness’ of New Zealand acts in ways to which overseas audiences simply do not have access. These issues will be explored further in chapters five and six.

---

Conclusion

Globalisation is a widely accepted description of the increasing interconnectedness of the world economy and cultural industries. It represents a move away from the imperialism that dominated global politics until the post-World War Two period, and accounts for the massive flow of information, capital, people, and goods that define the contemporary cultural and commercial landscape. The effects of globalisation are various however, and have been characterised by theorists like John Tomlinson as heralding a dissolution of community, and a sense of uncertainty and powerlessness for individuals. In response to this are efforts to assert the national community, defining national and local identities and retain a sense of the national community as a secure and discrete unit in world politics.

Claudia Bell however, shows that attempts to define national identities can mask the relations of power within society, framing identities in ways that suit existing power structures, and provide little scope for resistance. Benedict Anderson further demonstrates that national identities are themselves precarious things. The nation is the result of political and colonial forces, a construction whose identity has evolved through the imposition of national languages, and is established and maintained through State institutions. Bell and Norcliffe illustrate this process for New Zealand, where the national telegraph system, local museums and national ‘icons’ act to link a widely dispersed population and generate a sense of national community. The media play a central role in this process. Globalisation and colonialism themselves mean that any identity in New Zealand is necessarily a product of various cultures and influences.

Identity expressed through popular music is also a hybrid creation. New Zealand’s most famous musical export, the ‘Dunedin Sound’ was a product of the isolation and hybrid musical activities of certain talented people in Dunedin. Success in the international music industry, marked in the first instance by getting airtime on foreign-owned New Zealand radio, means being able to conform to an ‘international sound’ that itself represents the persistence of imperialism in the dominant structures of the industry. Seeking a New Zealand identity in this context means being able to
combine a hybrid musical activity with the international sound. Achieving such a sound would represent a significant level of ‘resistance’ to the norms of the music industry and a reversal of the flow of cultural production in New Zealand. For local audiences however, the ‘identity’ contained in such music may be a result of their own resistant, active readings that can find specific elements and relationships that relate to New Zealand.

These issues will be explored further in the rest of this thesis, which will include discussion of the role of government policy in the airtime granted to New Zealand music on commercial radio, the relationship of the New Zealand music industry with the global, and the role of national identity in New Zealand pop music. The next chapter will outline the process of information gathering involved in this particular research project, and the people who influence the New Zealand music industry.
In December 1999 for the first time, the overall broadcast level of New Zealand music on New Zealand commercial radio was measured at over ten percent.\(^1\) In 1995 local content had been estimated at only two percent, and by January 2002, the average had reached 11.24%.\(^2\) For New Zealand on Air, reaching ‘double figures’ has simply been ‘first base,’ but exceeding ten percent local content marks an important milestone in their work to increase local music levels on commercial radio.\(^3\) New Zealand content in broadcasting had become a significant enough issue by 1999 for quotas to become an election issue, reviving a debate that had reached Select Committee in 1989.\(^4\) The quota debate has subsequently reached a resolution with the introduction of a voluntary code of practice for broadcasters, developed in negotiation between the Radio Broadcasters Association, and the Labour-led coalition government, in March 2002. Paving the way for this quota, in May 2000, the government significantly increased funding to arts and cultural organisations, resulting in a near doubling of the music promotion budget of New Zealand on Air. This increased funding, and the revival of the quota debate which marked the period 1999-2002, were framed in terms of benefits for New Zealand identity, and the importance of a strong cultural sector for developing a sense of ‘who we are’ as a nation.\(^5\)

In 1999/2000, the new political discussion of quotas, the talk of culture and identity, and the increase in local music content on commercial radio seemed to signal an intriguing shift in attitudes towards New Zealand music on several levels. Why did the radio airtime for New Zealand music increase so steadily between 1995 and 2000?
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\(^2\) Ibid.


\(^4\) Michael Pickering and Roy Shuker, ‘Struggling to Make Ourselves Heard: Music, Radio and the Quota Debate’ *North Meets South, Popular Music in Aotearoa/ New Zealand*, Hayward, Mitchell and Shuker (eds), Umina, NSW, Perfect Beat Productions, 1994, p.76. The contemporary version of this debate will be discussed in chapter four.

Why had quotas returned to the political agenda after the original quota bill was refused a vote in Parliament in 1991? What had changed in the political spectrum in the intervening eight years? What policy directions shaped this reorientation to local music? How did these developments relate to the role of the multinationals that record and distribute popular music in a global market? And what connections are there between airtime for local music on radio and New Zealand’s cultural identity? This chapter explores the research strategies I used to answer these questions and expands on some of the analytic issues associated with globalisation and localisation explored in the previous chapter.

My interest in New Zealand music content on radio, and the debates surrounding it, came from my own involvement in the radio industry. I was a volunteer DJ at ‘rdu’, a student radio station in Christchurch, from March 1992 until November 2000. Between October 1997 and May 2000, I was also the Programme Director, responsible for all on-air content. In particular, this meant maintaining the station’s high level of support for the local music scene - and an average New Zealand music level of 25-30 percent. From this position I followed the local content debate closely, and when the opportunity arose to research it for this thesis, my main interest was to look outside student radio. It was commercial radio that was displaying a new attitude to local music, and I was interested in the decision-making strategies and orientations to New Zealand music of commercial stations. I was interested in the amount of airtime being allocated to local popular music, but I also wanted to know why commercial programmers were playing more New Zealand music in 2000 than they had in 1995. I was particularly interested in their reasons for playing so little in the past, and the process by which they had increased this amount - whether there were conscious decisions involved, and what external and internal factors had influenced these decisions. Pursuing these questions, I spoke to three Programme Directors in the country’s major radio networks, and these discussions have shaped the focus of my research: David Brice, Director of Programming and Marketing, The Radio Network; Rodger Clamp, Programmer Director, More FM and Channel Z; and Brad King, Programme Director, The Rock. At the time of the interviews, September 2000,
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6 Michael Pickering and Roy Shuker, 1994, p.76.
quotas were still an election promise rather than a fact, and the programmers’ responses to this promise provide an interesting background to the recent introduction of a local content code of practice.

An important influence on radio programmers is the work of New Zealand on Air in the promotion and development of New Zealand music. I interviewed Brendan Smyth, the New Zealand on Air Music Manager, to gain background and his insight into their increasingly pro-active music policies, and evolving relationship with commercial radio. Similarly, the work of the recording industry plays a significant role in investing in and releasing local music for commercial radio to play. To explore this I interviewed Grant Hislop at Warner Music New Zealand. Having previously been a radio programmer himself, Grant was able to reflect on both sides of the industry. I also spoke to key figures at the Ministry of Culture and Heritage; the Australasian Performing Rights Association (APRA); the Green Ribbon Trust campaign for local content; and the Recording Industry Association of New Zealand. Coming from within the industry myself made it easier to gain access to these interviewees, as I had had contact with several of them in my role at rdu, and had a useful knowledge of processes and institutions within the industry.

I had intended the interviews to sit alongside quantitative data relating to the production, retail and broadcast of New Zealand music in New Zealand, illustrating rates of change over a period of time. However, this data proved to be virtually nonexistent, which has itself provided an interesting commentary on the industry, implying that keeping a record of New Zealand content on radio has only been regarded as important in recent years. I had hoped to be able to trace New Zealand music content since the beginning of the 1980s to see if there were notable patterns of decline and rise to compare with periods of particular promotion or support for local products. I had expected to see, for example, a decline in content leading up to the report of the 1986 Royal Commission on Broadcasting’s recommendation that quotas be introduced, and a subsequent rise in levels to match the work of New Zealand on Air in the 1990s. Instead, there are only fragmented and incomplete data available,
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with limited radio station involvement, and considerable commercial sensitivity. In
the absence of industry wide data, it was interesting to note the kinds of internal
research undertaken by radio stations, in particular the reliance of radio on official
surveys of audience numbers, and their own internal research into audience responses
to particular songs.

The research involved three major research strategies to explore the current situation
with respect to airtime for New Zealand popular music. These will be outlined in this
chapter, which links the research strategies I used to some of the key questions and
analytic issues that drive this thesis. The chapter begins with an outline of some of my
own experience in the industry, to establish a context both for the organisation of the
interviews, and the role of the Programme Director. Next, I explore some of the issues
involved in trying to form a more ‘quantitative’ perspective on the New Zealand
music industry. There are some forms of data readily available, while others seem
hardly to exist, and none seem to offer a complete picture of audience numbers, local
music content, or record sales. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the
interview process itself. This qualitative material generated in the semi-structured
interviews forms the main basis for the discussion in the following chapters, but the
process of searching for useful figures on airplay levels and sales, and my own work
experience within the industry provide an important frame for the interviews.

**Participant observation - being an insider/outsider**

My position in the radio industry situated me quite specifically as a supporter of New
Zealand music - as a radio DJ, programmer, and ‘fan’. Working within student radio,
or the ‘b.net’ as it became known in 1997, also involved a degree of ‘opposition’ to
commercial radio - the b.net’s ‘alternative’ music format requires a ‘mainstream’
against which it can position itself as alternative. A traditional symbol of this
oppositional stance has been support for local music; in 1989 for example, the (then)
Student Radio Network made a submission in favour of the then-proposed New
Zealand music quota, while both the private radio sector and Radio New Zealand
opposed it. My position in the industry certainly enhanced my access to other industry members, but I was also aware that I could be seen as biased against commercial radio, the music it plays and advocates, and particularly its attitude towards New Zealand music.

Rdu is part of the b.net radio network, which emerged out of the Student Radio Network (SRN) in 1997. The rebranding of this network was an attempt to move away from a ‘student’ image and position the stations as an innovative youth radio network without the training and ‘learning on the job’ implications of the word ‘student’. The core value of the b.net, like the SRN before it, has been to support New Zealand music. The removal of the student connotations from the name was seen also as a way of legitimising our role in the development of music in New Zealand. The first ‘student’ radio station in New Zealand, bfm, is now over 30 years old, while rdu’s broadcasting licence dates back to the mid 1970s. Support for New Zealand music was a core value early in the history of these and the other 4 stations that comprised the SRN. The development of these stations was contemporaneous with the development of an extremely strong independent music scene and the so-called ‘Dunedin sound’ that made New Zealand ‘famous’ in alternative music circles in the US, Britain, and Europe. The growth of the student radio stations was one of the factors that helped the local music industry become established in the 1980s. Supporting local musicians (who were frequently friends and contemporaries) was a central part of the student radio ethic. While precise records of airplay are not available for the SRN stations, New Zealand on Air and APRA calculate airplay for New Zealand music to average 25-30% for the b.net. In addition, all of these radio stations have had New Zealand music specialist shows devoted to local music, as well as ‘New Zealand Music weeks,’ which dedicate all programming to local music, and organise numerous gigs, events, interviews, and live to air performances featuring local musicians. In fact, the stations receive significant funding from New Zealand on Air based on airtime devoted to promoting New Zealand music. In 1998, the network
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developed the ‘b.net New Zealand Music Awards’ as a way of recognising musicians who were not ‘commercial’ enough for the mainstream New Zealand Music Awards (the ‘Tuis’), and a means of strengthening the b.net’s identity as a supporter of New Zealand music.

The roots of this research however, lie in my observation of the broader industry from 1997, as I became immersed in the programming environment, and interactions with record companies, New Zealand on Air, and APRA. It seemed to me that commercial radio stations were showing a new level of interest in New Zealand music. This perception was highly subjective, but it appeared that other radio stations were beginning to promote themselves on the basis of their support for New Zealand music, and that the b.net’s claims to specialness in this regard was being challenged by other stations. In particular, the purchase by CanWest (owners of More FM) and the networking of the ‘youth’ station Channel Z in 1997 brought the first commercial challenge to the b.net’s position as the primary supporters of New Zealand music on radio. Brendan Smyth of New Zealand on Air credits Channel Z and a ‘new generation of programmers’ as signalling a major shift in the position of New Zealand music within commercial radio: “I think that the arrival of Channel Z does give the b.net an opportunity to redefine its turf, because Channel Z is now playing consistently 20% New Zealand music.... which means that an affirmative attitude to playing New Zealand music is no longer a b.net prerogative.”

Rather than reduce the b.net’s support for local music, the arrival of a commercially focussed station that plays such high levels of New Zealand music has broadened the opportunities for bands to get radio airtime.

More surprisingly, however, it seemed that not only youth or rock oriented stations were beginning to promote themselves as supporters of local music, but the major adult and pop stations were increasing their airplay levels of New Zealand music. These commercial stations had strongly opposed the introduction of a local music quota when the debate began in the late 1980s. Commercial radio opposition had contended that the New Zealand public had “no great desire... to hear New Zealand-
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produced music”,\textsuperscript{12} and that what local music has been available “is qualitatively inferior to overseas product.”\textsuperscript{13} In my own interviews, David Brice, Director of programming for The Radio Network, referred to New Zealand music as too often being “dark and gothic”, claiming, “people generally like music to lift their spirits and make them feel good, they don’t wanna be rolled over by it.”\textsuperscript{14} This critique of local music by commercial radio had seemed to be entrenched, yet, from 1997, an increasing amount of New Zealand music was receiving airplay and promotional support from this same section of the industry.

In formulating my research strategy, I was most interested in the people in commercial radio stations who were responsible for making the decisions about which songs actually get airplay - the people who were central to the increasing New Zealand content. These were my counterparts, the programme directors. The programme director has responsibility for all on air content - DJ voice breaks, advertising content, and the music. Music is chosen from the CDs that arrive daily from the record companies. These reflect the record companies’ agendas, their current and impending releases whose promotion and marketing will depend on radio play. An important outlet for New Zealand music however is unreleased recordings, or ‘demos’ sent to radio stations by the musicians themselves, and which typically represent a large proportion of local programming on b.net stations, circumventing the record companies. Positioned partway between full releases and demos is the New Zealand on Air ‘Hit Disc’ programme, which compiles local music onto format appropriate CDs to provide a ready resource for programmers. Whatever the source, the songs selected for airplay become part of the ‘playlist’, literally, the list of tracks to be played, which in turn is divided in terms of ‘rotation’, which determines how frequently, and at what times of day, a song is played. The songs considered ‘hits’ will be on a higher rotate - played more often, and at peak listening times, than those that are being tested, or are simply less instantly likeable. Frequently, a song will

\textsuperscript{13} Roy Shuker and Michael Pickering, 1994, p.274.
begin on a low rotation playlist and move up in frequency over a number of weeks as (or if) it becomes more popular.\textsuperscript{15}

The process of music selection can be very complex as record companies seek to ensure their ‘priorities’ get airplay levels that will enhance sales and ensure that the companies recover the costs of the recording and promotion associated with each CD.\textsuperscript{16} Radio stations in turn have ‘formats’ to adhere to which determine the style of song they will consider playing, and more importantly, the styles they will not play. The format of a station determines every factor of its sound and brand, not just the particular style of music it plays, but the way the DJs speak and the style of news and information content. David Hendy regards the use of formats as a method of “‘gatekeeping’ the content” - ensuring everything about it fits with the profile of the station, and the expectations of its targeted audience.\textsuperscript{17} Canadian radio researcher Jody Berland explains:

> Every format follows a complex set of rules for programming, including the style and range of music selections, size and origin of playlist, quotas for musical repetition, relative numbers of current and past hits and their usual sequence, conventional relationships between music and speech, and so forth.\textsuperscript{18}

To be accepted for airplay therefore, New Zealand music must both compete with the many other songs that arrive on a programmer’s desk every day, and also fit within the accepted limits of the station’s format.

Despite these restricting factors, New Zealand content had been increasing steadily on commercial radio for three years by the time I left my job and began my research. But before speaking to programmers, I wanted to have a picture of the longer-term patterns of New Zealand music content on radio, as well as its support by record companies and sales. I was interested in finding out whether increases in airtime were simply a return to a steady state from a severe dip, or whether current airtime for New Zealand music represented a new direction in New Zealand radio.

\textsuperscript{15} The technicalities of this system will vary between stations and networks, but all the programmers I interviewed used similar principles, and it is the basis I used for my own programming decisions at rdu.
\textsuperscript{16} Frederic Dannen’s \textit{Hit Men} provides a detailed account of the more underhand methods employed by the recording industry in the US to ensure airplay for their releases: New York, Vintage Books, 1991.
Data collection in the music industry

There are several types of data I hoped to gather to assess my impression that New Zealand music was receiving increased airtime on commercial radio. To provide an overall picture of local content trends, I wanted a breakdown of airplay figures covering a long enough timeframe to account for the effect of particularly popular releases. To measure the effect of radio play on music purchases, I wanted a breakdown of New Zealand content in the sales charts, and hopefully the figures themselves. And finally, I wanted to measure the effect of radio play on artist signings, and vice versa, with figures of the number of musicians signed to major record labels in New Zealand over the same timeframe as the other data sets. I reasoned that the analysis of this quantitative data would establish a fairly comprehensive picture of the relationship between record labels, radio stations, and music purchasing. As it turned out, very little of this data is publicly available at all. Radio airplay figures have only been centrally recorded since 1997, while the singles charts are a highly subjective and manipulated survey tool. In fact, the most comprehensive data on music and airplay in New Zealand is the audience research carried out by radio networks themselves, in order to determine ‘audience acceptance’ of songs being considered for airplay. With extensive testing of the songs, networks can determine the probable popularity of a song and its likely impact on audience figures, which in turn impacts on advertising and profits.

I began by looking for records of New Zealand music in the singles chart, to see if there was a pattern in the popularity of New Zealand music. The only comprehensive collection of chart figures in New Zealand is Dean Scapolo’s catalogue of all entries in the singles charts between 1966 and 96.19 Scapolo lists all placings in those years, without a specific breakdown of New Zealand material, so I attempted to identify and catalogue all of the New Zealand entries. The data provided some insight into New Zealand singles released during that particular timeframe, but as I researched the charts themselves, they proved extremely problematic as a source of information into actual sales or radio play. And since the official measurement of radio play by APRA

18 Jody Berland quoted in ibid.
(Australasian Performing Rights Association) only began in 1997, it was impossible to draw conclusions between the sets of figures. In any case, the value of the singles chart as a source of information on the popularity of New Zealand music is questionable on a number of different grounds.

The first issue is the method of data gathering and the responsibility for that data, which has changed considerably since 1997, while the method of compiling the charts has been under review by the industry itself. Scapolo explains that The New Zealand Singles Chart changed in structure several times between 1966 and 1996. The chart began on March 25 1966 as the top 20 “Pop-o-meter” published in the New Zealand Listener, and was the result of reader votes until sales figures were used in 1970. In 1975, these Pop-o-meter charts were replaced by the national top forty, compiled by the Record Publications branch of the Recording Industry Association of New Zealand (RIANZ). The charts became a top 50 in May 1979, as is still the case.²⁰

The more significant issue is the construction of the charts themselves. I discussed this with Jennie Allen at RIANZ, who explained that chart listings bear little relationship to the actual sales proportions in any one week. As a ‘numbers person’ she says she gets frustrated with record companies trying to claim that the figures are direct representations of sales and/or popularity.²¹ In fact the charts are made up of part sales, and part radio airplay. Jennie Allen explained that the sales portion only reflect the sales of singles or albums listed by the record companies in any one week. By listing company sales priorities and gaining information on the sales of those products only, the record companies can then use a high chart placing to gain more radio airplay and thus boost sales. In an analysis of the charts published in the New Zealand Listener in March 2001, Chris Bourke wrote that the airplay component is based on

- the “number of “adds” by stations, weighted according to markets.... Though RIANZ won’t confirm the actual breakdown, other music industry insiders say the charts are now based 25 percent on retailers’ sales figures and 75 percent on radio airplay.²²

²⁰ Ibid., p.5.
²² Chris Bourke, “Number one without a bullet, why the New Zealand singles charts are not what they seem,” The Listener, March 10, 2001, p.50.
The inclusion of radio play from September 1999 was a result of the decline in singles sales and the vulnerability of a small market to manipulation. It was believed that the market for singles in New Zealand was predominantly young Maori and Polynesians buying R&B and hip hop, and that the resulting chart did not reflect the tastes of the general public. The singles chart is very much a sales tool and the basis for entertainment programmes - television and radio ‘chart shows’ - rather than research into sales. The effect of this on New Zealand music’s chart placings is uncertain, reinforcing, as it does, the role of radio programmers in making significant decisions over local music. Speaking to The Listener, Paul Kennedy, who compiles the playlist charts for the industry publication Median Strip, suggests that radio programmers now have some local guide to base their decisions on, not just the US magazine Radio & Record. “Local music has more of a chance of getting onto playlists. It’s a more level playing field.”

Radio airplay rates for New Zealand music are gathered by APRA, the Australasian Performer’s Rights Association, primarily for the calculation of rights-payments for the artists. It is only since 1997, however, that these figures have been compiled for the monitoring of New Zealand music content; meaning that comparison of airplay rates before 1997 is impossible. Radio stations have kept their own internal figures, but it was only with the consistent compilation of the statistics and their public announcement (usually covered by the general media) that an overall picture of New Zealand music on the radio was available. Radio stations send APRA a record of the number of ‘plays’ New Zealand music gets every quarter, so the statistics show the number of times a New Zealand song is played, rather than the number of actual songs played. A couple of big hits with high playlist rotation can result in the same amount of local ‘plays’ as several lower rotation songs. However, the figures from June 1997 to January 2002 show a definite increase across formats (A/C - Adult Contemporary; Pop; Rock; and Alternative). In this time, the overall airplay level for New Zealand music has grown from 6.01% in June 1997 to 11.24% in January 2002.
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24 Ibid., p.51.
25 The figures themselves are included as Appendix four.
The lack of records of New Zealand content before 1997 suggest this had been a minor concern for radio, and for the music industry as a whole. During the 1980s, Radio New Zealand stations published percentages of the kinds of music they played during given periods, but the stations owned by members of the Independent Broadcasting Association “refused to publish individual figures for each station.” Instead, they published average figures across all of the twenty-one stations then privately owned, not all of which had necessarily reported their local content levels at all. Michael Pickering and Roy Shuker relate that, in an IBA survey conducted before the 1989 Quota Bill, only sixteen of the twenty-one private stations reported their local content levels. Two of these stations met the period’s voluntary quota of ten percent, but the remaining fourteen played an average of 6.9% New Zealand music. Even this average is greater than the two percent average reported across privately owned stations in 1995. The single most significant change in the industry in the intervening period is deregulation: Ministry of Commerce figures show that in 1988, there were 30 privately-owned radio stations broadcasting in New Zealand, and by November 1996, there were 181. The increased number of stations will most likely have diluted the data, however, deregulation did have a significant impact on New Zealand music levels, and this will be discussed more fully in chapter four. The increase in the number of radio stations in New Zealand, and the competition between them itself produced a new focus on research and data collection within the industry.

Competition for listeners and advertising revenue has lead the radio industry to develop comprehensive methods of measuring audience share and researching what their target markets think of different songs. Networks can use this information to map their market share across all time segments over the course of a day, a system illustrated most powerfully by The Radio Network as it monitors the popularity of songs on its classic hits and top 40 ZM formats. TRN programmer David Brice explains that:

There is a programming rule that says you shouldn’t play a song unless it has an absolute minimum of 40% acceptance, which means that at least 40% of the audience have some degree of liking for it, which is pretty low. So then if you’re adding up each hour, the research

26 Michael Pickering and Roy Shuker, 1994, p.75
27 Ibid.
value of the songs you’re playing, you’ve got to have enough hit quotient in there to maintain
the listeners. And if you start putting in kiwi sings that don’t check out, like if you have a 15
or 20 positive acceptance and my competitor over the road’s got a 40% song on against me,
on a cumulative basis that can become harmful to your ratings.

... one of the things I could do is pull up an hour clock, like the next hour on ZM and then
pull out the research data on each song. And if its not strong enough I would say to Dallas,
who’s the music director, ‘hey we’ve got three low ranking songs in here, one of those should
be swapped out for a higher testing song.’ The thing about ZM as it is now is that because
we’ve got so few of them [songs], under 180, they’re all pretty powerful songs, except for the
new ones that we are putting in at the bottom and we know that they’re not going to test
anyway for a minimum of six weeks.29

Audience acceptance figures are gathered in several ways. David Brice spoke
particularly of ‘auditorium tests’; another common method is the weekly telephone
‘call out’.30 David Hendy explains that in ‘call-outs’ participants are asked to listen to
small pieces of music over the phone and then “asked whether they would like to hear
it on the radio.”31 Auditorium tests involve a great deal more organisation and more
motivated, involved participants. Target listeners are gathered in an auditorium and
given ‘instant-response’ tests, where each participant has a handset with a dial, and is
asked to rate how they feel about a piece of music, or example of ‘speech output’
(news, announcements, advertisements) second by second.32 The TRN regularly tests
several hundred songs a night in this way with the target audiences for their different
radio stations, and conduct phone call outs weekly.33 They test both familiar songs
that are already receiving a lot of radio play, to check for changes in the ratings of
songs, and also ‘wildcards’ - songs that have not received much airplay on the TRN’s
own stations but have performed well in other markets, countries or radio stations. A
major critique of these methods of audience testing is echoed by David Brice in
talking about these ‘unfamiliar’ songs: “it’s quite rare for those wildcard songs to
perform because they haven’t had enough play for people to be familiar with them.”34

Hendy describes the industry’s extensive, expensive, and secretive research process as

28 Brendan Smyth, NZ on Air and NZ Music: The Fourth Phase, 2000b, available:
http://www.nzonair.govt.nz/pag.cfm?i=468
29 David Brice, interview, September 2000.
30 Ibid.
31 David Hendy, 2000, p.33.
32 Ibid.
33 David Brice, interview, September 2000.
ultimately leading to one common conclusion, that “pop music focusing on familiar, melodic hits is the most appealing of all.”

It is a familiar paradox of radio, and the music industry in general: an assumption, backed up by research, that people tend to gravitate towards music that is familiar, which simply limits and restricts the ability of the industry to introduce anything new. The broader ramifications of this in the music industry are beyond the scope of this research, but the impact of these processes on the development of New Zealand music will be explored in chapter five.

The radio industry is dominated by research - into audience numbers and market share, and specifically, into what this audience thinks of the songs they hear. Audience acceptance is the basis of many programming decisions, which are given an apparently scientific basis by this rigorous quantitative material. The research allows programmers to reject songs on the basis of rational numbers - a particularly useful tactic when it comes to defending themselves against charges of low New Zealand content in their programming. Of course, this material is not publicly available, so we cannot use it to gain a broader picture of what the New Zealand public (or commercial radio’s target audiences) think of New Zealand music. Of the figures that are publicly available however, the singles charts are an extremely flawed data collection tool, and are now governed by the decision-making in the radio industry, which in turn is based on stations’ own audience research. It has been impossible to draw any firm conclusions over the popularity of New Zealand music over any period of time from this material. The only useful information that exists is the APRA records of New Zealand music airplay beginning in 1997. This means it is possible to note the increase in New Zealand music airplay since then, but not to make consistent conclusions over a longer period of time.

Without consistent, reliable data from which to draw conclusions about New Zealand music support within the radio industry, assessment of this increase in airtime for New Zealand music had to depend on interviews with key actors. I needed to get as much of this information from them as possible, as well as an understanding of their own attitudes and perceptions of the changes. Basically, I wanted to assess whether

34 Ibid.
35 David Hendy, 2000, p.33.
my impressions as programme director generated agreement among others in the industry, and to explore what factors they thought were driving the increased airtime for New Zealand music.

**Talking with key actors - the interviews**

My priority for the interviews was to talk to programmers from the major radio networks in New Zealand. I also wanted to talk to other actors in the industry – representatives of record companies, staff at New Zealand on Air and lobbyists. My goal was to gain access to more figures and processes and a sense of the context in which commercial radio operates. However, as the increase in radio play for New Zealand music was the impetus for the study, it was the programmers who were the most important industry members to interview.

**The radio programmers**

To organise the interviews I turned to one of my main contacts from my time at rdu - Paul Kennedy, the editor of Median Strip. Median Strip is the radio industry magazine, publishing news, gossip, and airplay lists, with a strong emphasis on the industry’s relationship with New Zealand music. As editor, Paul Kennedy knows the people in the industry very well and was able to advise me on the most significant musical decision makers in each of the networks. As an informal source he was also able to paint a useful picture of the politics of New Zealand music on radio in recent years. Paul provided me with phone numbers for several programmers he thought would be most useful for me, but I used these to call the stations and ask for email addresses, as I felt email was a more appropriate way to explain my project and give them time to consider the possibility of participating in this research. I like the fact that email is a relatively non-intrusive way to present requests, and is far less linear in the communication of information than the telephone.

In presenting the research agendas of this project to these programmers, and seeking their participation in this research by email, I was very conscious of how I presented
my position in the industry. It was important to mention my own role in radio - I felt it may have made me ‘safer’ than a student with no idea how radio works. I thought it was possible that they would be more likely to give time to someone from inside the industry. However, I was also very aware that my involvement with b.net and the differences between b.net and commercial radio could be the basis for them refusing to participate in the study. This presented a potential conflict between my role as a sociologist studying these programmes in the broadcasting industry and my role as an insider with a very public agenda in the industry. My position as a programmer for a b.net station could be read as embodying an anti-commercial radio attitude, a dislike for ‘popular’ music, and a potentially negative attitude towards the methods and decisions of the commercial programmers. I really do not know to what extent the programmers I spoke to shared these feelings or even cared about my role in the b.net, but I found I could not ignore the possibility. In my email I decided to be straightforward about this and, while congratulating them for their work in playing more New Zealand music, explained that I was not bringing any ‘anti-commercial’ agenda to the research, that I was sociologically and professionally interested in their decision making and their increasing acceptance of local music. It was impossible for me to approach this research from the inside and have any claims to neutrality let alone objectivity, so I decided the best approach was to declare my location in the industry, and my intention to look beyond this.36

I received responses from all but one of the programmers I contacted. Paul Kennedy had told me that the person who did not respond was unlikely to contact me as he is notoriously difficult to get hold of, so I decided it was not worth pursuing a potentially unco-operative subject. The others all made appointments with me very quickly. David Brice, Director of Programming and Marketing for The Radio Network, emailed me a time and place for me to see him, which epitomised his efficient approach to programming. Brad King, Programme Director of The Rock Network, and Rodger Clamp of Channel Z and More FM Networks both sent very friendly casual invitations to meet on my trip to Auckland the following week.

36 My email communication with the programmers can be found in Appendix 2.
In the interviews themselves I was conscious of wanting to appear knowledgeable about the music of each programmer’s format, and to demonstrate my appreciation of significant recent songs in those genres. This interest in the music was genuine, and I found that being able to discuss current artists like Robbie Williams, Zed, and Destiny’s Child, in terms of their ‘radio qualities’ seemed to overcome any latent feelings that I might be judging their stations negatively. Again, this was an approach I adopted purely to make myself feel more comfortable and I do not know if the programmers noticed or even cared, but it felt to me as though it reinforced my position as an insider within in the industry. Music aside, I was also very conscious of appearing judgemental about their programming techniques and other attitudes. Again, I consciously expressed professional interest in learning the practices of others in the industry, and used my own experiences as a point of comparison and in order to have some stories of my own to ‘give back’ and to stimulate discussion of differences and similarities in audiences and expectations.

I had originally intended to speak to a wider range of programmers, but constraints on my time and opportunities to do research beyond Christchurch meant that I focused on three of the programmers most interested in speaking to me and available during my scheduled research trip to Auckland. In fact, the concentration of radio programming in New Zealand into networks means there are very few people making the ultimate programming decisions on New Zealand radio. So even though it might appear that I was interviewing a small number of people, they were significantly positioned within the commercial radio industry. David Brice controlled the ZM pop network, i98FM Easy listening, and Radio Hauraki classic rock for The Radio Network. Roger Clamp controlled More FM, Adult Contemporary, and Channel Z, alternative/rock. Of the three programmers I interviewed, only Brad King ran one station, The Rock FM, but this is itself nationally networked, and part of the Radio Pacific network, so he could speak a little about the network as a whole. The three also represent all four areas of radio listed by APRA in their New Zealand music content breakdown - Adult Contemporary, Alternative, Pop, and Rock. For David Brice and Roger Clamp running stations of different formats highlights the differences in availability of local music across formats. The advantage of speaking to programmers who operate across formats like this was that they could offer insights
into both sides of the programming coin - Roger Clamp framed it in terms of pop music being more dominated by solo artists or groups of singers who require greater record company investment in the hiring of backup musicians for performance and recording than the rock bands who tend to contribute to the large amount of local music on alternative and rock radio.37

The interviews themselves were semi structured. I had a group of questions I wanted to discuss with each programmer but I remained flexible enough to follow the areas that were more important for each format and programming technique.38 Primarily I wanted to flesh out the extensive gaps in the research data about airtime for New Zealand popular music with the perceptions of these radio professionals. In the absence of airplay data before June 1997 for example, I wanted to access their perceptions of the amount of airtime New Zealand music had received over the past 10 to 20 years. I asked why they were playing more New Zealand music in mid 2000 than they had over the previous two years of record keeping. This was followed by discussion of the efforts of New Zealand on Air to facilitate the playing of local material, the history of internal radio station record keeping, and the evolution of ‘radio friendly’ New Zealand music.

To gain an insight into their own approach to the programming role I asked about how they chose the music they playlisted. This led to discussion of audience research and perceptions of the ‘quality’ of a track, and who actually makes the day-to-day music decisions in their radio stations. I asked all of them about quotas for local material, whether they thought they would happen and whether they agreed with the idea. In the case of the two overseas-owned networks - More/Z and The Radio Network - I asked how their parent companies dealt with quotas in other countries in which they operated.39 While they were all against the idea of quotas on principle (as I expected), the discussion led to the question of why it was important to play New Zealand music on New Zealand radio. Despite being against the compulsion of quotas, all were very

38 The draft questions are included as Appendix 3.
39 The patterns of ownership across these networks will be elaborated in chapter four. At the time of the interviews, The Rock was still part of the New Zealand owned Radio Pacific Network. However, in
anxious to express their support for New Zealand music and its right to airtime. I would have liked to have been able to conduct the same interviews ten or even five years earlier, to see what their response would have been then, to see what degree of shift in opinion had really taken place. Obviously, this study was informed largely by the coverage and support given to New Zealand music in the media and by Parliament in the late 1990s. I suspect that this means no radio programmer in the country would publicly speak against the idea of New Zealand music by 2000 - the weight of political and critical opinion was in favour of supporting ‘home-grown’ talent. All three programmers were very happy to talk to me and keen to be seen as highly supportive of local music. Indeed, this appeared to be quite genuine, not simply a matter of political expediency. I think a more detailed study of the industry should look at the previous generation of programmers for a fuller picture of the shifts in practice and opinion, particularly those associated with deregulation.  

The record companies

To explore the symbiotic relationship between radio and record companies, I intended to speak to Artists and Repertoire representatives of each of the five major record companies in New Zealand in late 2000 - EMI, Warner music, Sony Music, BMG, and Universal. I wanted to see what relationship the increase in radio play for New Zealand music bore to actual releases of New Zealand music - which came first, the radio play for the music, or the music to play on the radio. To make contact with potential record company interviewees I emailed the promotions reps with whom I had worked closely when I had been a programmer. This was some three months after I had left rdu so I took the opportunity to explain my research project and asked if they could help by suggesting contacts within their own company. Unfortunately, the two major New Zealand Artists and Repertoire representatives were unavailable. Malcolm Black of Sony Music (former member of 80’s group The Netherworld Dancing Toys and responsible for Bic Runga and True Bliss) was in the US at the time I was scheduled to conduct the interviews, and BMG’s Kirk Harding had recently left to work for a hip hop label in New York (having established DLT and May 2001, this was bought out by Canadian company CanWest, owners of More FM, Channel Z, TV3 and TV4.
Supergroove in New Zealand). I spoke instead to Grant Hislop at Warner music, who in fact provided a perspective that enabled me to focus more strongly on radio. While the radio and recording industries are certainly mutually dependent, it is in radio that the tension between the New Zealand State and global corporations has been most evident in the past two decades, balancing the profit imperative of the broadcasters with the State’s desire to maintain cultural autonomy.

Grant Hislop provided an interesting link between radio and the record industry. In September 2000 he had been at Warners for only four months, and had worked at no less than twenty-two radio stations in the previous fifteen years. Most recently he had been the programmer for the ZM network under David Brice. I was a little disappointed to not be able to get a ‘pure’ record company point of view on the discussions I had had with the programmers, but Grant Hislop offered the valuable perspective of a radio person learning about the recording industry. He also said that he knew of me and my work at rdu, which I found disconcerting as I attempted to balance my insider and outsider roles of programmer and sociologist. I was a bit concerned about the kind of reputation I may have had in commercial radio circles or Warner Music and its possible impact on research participants’ responses to my questions. Paul Kennedy and others had already advised me that Grant had been largely responsible for the ZM network’s increased local music figures, and he had a strong reputation for promoting local music in the other radio stations he had programmed, training a new generation of programmers, as he put it, to value their local culture. The interview was marked by his enthusiasm for local music, and I found it easy to respond positively to Grant’s critique of programming and his enthusiasm for New Zealand bands and individual performers.

In terms of information on shifts within the record company, it was clear that there had been an increase in artist signings to match the increase in radio airplay for New Zealand music, but Grant’s own personal perspective was limited a little by the short time he had been at Warners and his own process of learning about the company. I asked him about the artists signed to or distributed by Warners and we discussed the
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40 See chapter four, Policy.
effects of changing technology on the recording industry - particularly improvements in home recording technology and its effect in making recording more accessible for more people.

**Government Agencies and other areas of the industry**

Beyond the record companies and radio stations there are several important organisations that provide a support structure for New Zealand music, and I spoke with representatives of some of these over the course of my research week in Wellington and Auckland in September 2000. First was Martin Durrant, a policy analyst at the Ministry of Culture and Heritage, who was a source of information on the role of the ministry and its relationship to government declarations about cultural identity. He was also a source of information about other work in this field in New Zealand. While in Wellington, I spoke with Brendan Smyth, the Music Manager for New Zealand on Air. This role had changed significantly in 2000 with the announcement of substantially increased funding for music projects, taking the budget from $1.8m a year to $4m. Out of this money New Zealand on Air established a programme known as ‘Phase Four’. This involved creating a range of new recording grants for young bands and a series of larger grants for established bands to be met by record company investment. The implications of Phase Four were an important factor for discussion over the rest of the week, and form a central thread of this research.

Another important development in New Zealand music in 2000 was the establishment of the Music Industry Commission, a body set up to liaise between radio, record companies and other groups to support the industry and extend the earning potential of New Zealand music. The Chief Executive role was jointly filled by music promoter Cath Anderson, and Arthur Baysting, who is a member of the APRA board, founding member of the Green Ribbon Trust, and long time campaigner for a Youth Radio Network as an way of increasing young people’s access to New Zealand music. I met with him briefly as he was about to fly out to Sydney for an APRA meeting, however

---

42 Martin Durrant also turned out to be a former member of Dunedin Flying Nun band Sneaky Feelings.
he did not wish the interview to be recorded. I also met with Suzanne Wilson, the manager of bfm, rdu’s Auckland sister station, for an informal chat about the Music Industry Commission, of which she is a member. Finally, I also spoke with Jennie Allen at RIANZ, the Recording Industry Association of New Zealand. Paul Kennedy had suggested that she was the ideal person to talk to me about how the New Zealand charts are compiled and also how rights for the performance and broadcast of music are collected in New Zealand.

These contacts all provided important contextual material for the discussions with the programmers, however the interviews were a lot less structured and more focused on gathering information than the radio-oriented interviews.

**Conclusion:**

There were three levels of research involved in this study: empirical research into the levels of airplay New Zealand music has received on New Zealand radio, the sales figures for New Zealand music, and the numbers of New Zealand artists signed to major record labels; participant research and knowledge from my own role as a radio programmer; and interviews with significant industry figures – commercial radio programmers, major record labels, and representatives from government agencies. There are actually very few figures relating to New Zealand music – airplay rates have only been compiled since 1997, and the singles chart since 1999 has consisted of about 75% airplay figures. The project has therefore been heavily reliant on interviews with programmers who provide a context for analysing these figures. Speaking to the programmers also provided insight into the attitudes and business context within commercial radio as it relates to New Zealand music.

The significant issues to arise from the interviews will be discussed in the following chapters. This discussion focuses on the role of government policy in shaping the radio industry in New Zealand and its relationship with New Zealand music; the issue of ‘quality’ in New Zealand music, most commonly framed as the need to conform to an ‘international sound’ that will fit in with the rest of commercial radio formats; and the issue of New Zealand music’s role in a developing sense of identity as a nation. A
recurring theme was the work of New Zealand on Air, which I had discussed extensively with Brendan Smyth before meeting the radio programmers. It seems that New Zealand on Air’s programmes for increasing local music airplay since 1994 have played a major role in the local music airplay increases recorded by APRA since 1997. The programmers were particularly appreciative of more recent projects that have directly engaged with their own decision making processes, encouraging them to play more New Zealand music without the compulsion involved in the establishment of quotas, which were still under discussion in September 2000.

New Zealand on Air was established when the industry as a whole was deregulated in 1989 and the proposal for government imposed local music quotas was rejected. The issue of local music airplay is therefore closely related to the issue of regulation in the industry. The following chapter explores broadcasting policy and its relationship to airtime for New Zealand popular music. It draws on the interview material discussed in this chapter and documents available from a variety of different sources about government regulation and deregulation of broadcasting.
Chapter 4
Policy

Government policy has had a significant impact on broadcasting practice in New Zealand. Until 1989 the Government owned 34 of the 64 radio stations in New Zealand classified as “broadcasting separate programmes on a continuous basis”, as well as the country’s two television networks.¹ Entry into the industry and the social objectives of broadcasting were both controlled by the Government. The State broadcasting agency, the Broadcasting Corporation of New Zealand, “collected and disbursed the broadcasting fee”, and “was the Government’s principal policy adviser on broadcasting issues.”² The broadcasting reforms of 1988 and 1989 reorganised this State apparatus, opening the industry up to new broadcasters, and ultimately allowing New Zealand to become part of the global broadcasting market. In part, this deregulation of the New Zealand broadcasting industry offers a case study of the processes of globalisation that intensified in New Zealand in the mid 1980s. The process of deregulation has also had considerable implications for the extent to which New Zealand music is played on New Zealand radio. This is partly a consequence of the direct effects of deregulation itself, partly an outcome of responses to the processes, and particularly a product of the establishment of New Zealand on Air.

This chapter discusses recent changes in the policy environment for New Zealand broadcasting, and the implications of these changes for the amount of airtime New Zealand music receives on radio. Specifically, the discussion focuses on the deregulation of the broadcasting industry in the late 1980s and its impact on radio programming. Deregulation prompted an ongoing debate about whether quotas should be introduced as a means of ensuring radio stations play a certain amount of New Zealand music. As this thesis was being completed the Minister of Broadcasting announced the introduction of voluntary quotas, to be followed by compulsory quotas if the industry did not demonstrate significant improvements in airtime for New Zealand music.

² Ibid., pp. 4-5.
Zealand products. Changes in the airtime allocated to New Zealand music in the period 1997-2001 were, however, largely a response to the threat of compulsion through legislation, of which the new voluntary code represents a continued resistance.

Several other factors have also been identified as contributing to this increased airtime for New Zealand popular music, from the new attitudes of a younger generation of programmers, to the more commercial orientation of a new generation of musicians, who are more focussed on commercial radio success and more prepared to fit commercial formats than earlier generations of New Zealand musicians. On the other hand, the increased likelihood of being played on the radio may itself have encouraged musicians to make more commercially viable music. The success of a few significant local bands such as The Feelers, Stellar and Zed has certainly lead to an environment in which radio programmers know that New Zealand music can be extremely popular, and musicians can see that there is a chance of being successful within New Zealand. The concentration of radio station ownership in the wake of deregulation has also lead to the development of new radio formats in order to create specific audience ‘target markets’ for their advertisers. The more ‘youth’ oriented of these, in particular Channel Z, have a particularly high level of local music content - by September 2000, they were consistently playing an average of twenty percent New Zealand music.

The concentration of radio station ownership in the hands of just a few major international corporations is a significant feature of the processes of globalisation. New Zealand radio is now as much a part of this global ownership as the recording companies that produce the music it plays. The centralising ownership of the global recording industry is addressed in greater detail in Chapter five, as the recording industry has historically been less shaped by State involvement than broadcasting. The broadcasting reforms of 1989 were aimed specifically at reducing government influence over New Zealand broadcasting, but the establishment and ongoing funding
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of New Zealand on Air represents the government’s attempt to shape local broadcasting, without the state having overt control. Moves to introduce a compulsory local music quota, on the other hand, would constitute a considerable level of intervention in a highly deregulated industry. As a ‘Code of Practice’ rather than an Act of Parliament, the March 2002 quota forms an attempt to reach a middle ground in allowing broadcasters to ‘choose’ to play more New Zealand music, while retaining the government’s right to legislate if the agreed levels are not met. As a code of practice, the new measure retains the ideal of deregulation in the industry. The revival of the quota debate alongside the increase in New Zealand music funding granted to New Zealand on Air in 2000 represent ways in which the State is attempting retain some influence over what is broadcast, while at the same time embracing the structures of a deregulated industry.

Government policy has had a major impact on the broadcasting of New Zealand content on radio, from the deregulation of the industry itself, to the establishment of New Zealand on Air and the debate over quotas. Deregulation was the particular state action that has most shaped the sound of radio in New Zealand through the nineties and into the twenty-first century.

**Deregulation**

The New Zealand radio industry was deregulated in 1988/89, with the reduction of restrictions on broadcasting ownership and aspects of broadcasting practice. The 1989 reforms in particular were aimed primarily at increasing economic efficiency in the industry through competition in a flexible marketplace. Deregulation was justified on the following grounds:

- it would be made easier for new broadcasters to enter the industry; ownership restrictions would be reduced or removed altogether; it would be made easier for new technologies to be used, and new services provided; and to help increase efficiency, the Government’s commercial and non-commercial objectives would be separated.

The process sat within the broader aims begun by the 1984 Labour government - to liberalise the New Zealand economy, moving away from long-entrenched
interventionist programmes. As Brian Easton shows, the anti-interventionism evolved into an ethic of commercialisation and corporatisation, a process illustrated by the shift from a fully government controlled broadcasting service, albeit with several privately owned radio stations, to one controlled almost entirely by commercial interests. The statements above regarding broadcasting deregulation illustrate how this was framed in terms of efficiency and ease of access and development, enabling the government to step away from being involved in the commercial side of broadcasting.

The reforms happened in several stages during 1988 and 1989. The 1988 Broadcasting Corporation of New Zealand Restructuring Act split the Broadcasting Corporation into two separate state-owned enterprises; Radio New Zealand Limited (RNZ) and Television New Zealand Limited (TVNZ). RNZ was in turn split into public radio (National Radio, The Concert Programme), and commercial radio - this part was sold and commenced private operation in 1996 as The Radio Network. Next, the Broadcasting Act of 1989 removed restrictions on advertising hours, permitted election broadcasting and established the Broadcasting Standards Authority. Also in 1989, the Radiocommunications Act established a market-based system for allocating broadcasting frequencies, replacing the Broadcasting Tribunal’s warrant system. Further reviews of this Act have introduced “multiple round, ascending bid auctions as an allocation mechanism” for frequencies, providing for broadcasters to bid for frequencies, and a “removal of the 20 year limit on the term of new licences and management rights.” The 1991 Broadcasting Amendment Act removed “all restrictions on foreign ownership specific to broadcasting media.” As a result of these deregulation measures, there has been a huge increase in the number of privately owned radio stations in the country. In 1988, there were 47 AM and 17 FM radio stations “broadcasting separate programmes on a continuous basis” in New Zealand, 30% of which were privately owned. By 20 November 1996 there were 184 radio
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5 Communications Division, Ministry Of Commerce, 1997, pp.6-7.  
7 Communications Division, Ministry Of Commerce, 1997, pp.7-8.  
8 Ibid., p.10.  
9 Ibid., p.11.  
10 Ibid., p15.
stations fulfilling this criteria, all but three of which were privately owned. In June 2001, the government estimate was that there were over 200 radio stations in New Zealand. By the end of the 1990s there had been a significant consolidation of ownership of New Zealand radio stations into major international corporations. New Zealand radio is now very much a part of the global media industry.

As outlined in chapter three, no consistent official records of New Zealand content across the radio industry exist before the Australasian Performing Rights Association (APRA) began separating levels of New Zealand content out of their Australian/New Zealand radio logs in June 1997. However, links can be drawn between the level of New Zealand content on radio and the deregulation of the industry. For instance, David Brice, who was a programmer at Radio New Zealand during that period, recalls that:

> at that time [1987, the time of the first quota debate] RNZ had put in as a policy that we would play 10% kiwi music on our radio stations, and that was monitored up to the chief exec level on a monthly basis, across all the stations, and pretty much at that stage our stations were able to pretty well meet that. Then you had a change of government, a different perspective on culture. Not only that, but a different requirement on the company which was more profit driven, rather than being concerned about social programming policies. So it moved away from being an area of concern on a monthly basis how much New Zealand music we were playing.

Pickering and Shuker explain that this 10% level was the result of a voluntary quota established in 1987 at a Kiwi Music Convention organised by the New Zealand Music Promotion Committee. The Radio New Zealand stations largely complied with it, but few of the private stations at that time met the minimum, and the idea of a voluntary quota faded. David Brice indicates here that the election of the 1990 National Government changed the expectations on Radio New Zealand’s commercial stations to focus on financial matters, with little concern for the social implications of local music programming.
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11 Ibid., p.15. The figures carry this caveat: “The exact number of stations cannot be guaranteed, as the Ministry of Commerce licenses frequencies rather than broadcasters and has no control over the use of frequencies once licenses have been issued.”

While deregulation has greatly increased the number of radio stations in New Zealand, by the end of 2001 approximately 84% of the market share was held between two major, largely foreign-owned networks: The Radio Network, with 41% of surveyed markets, and CanWest/Radioworks with 43%.\(^\text{14}\) The Radio Network was formed in 1996 with the sale of RNZ’s commercial operations to ‘the New Zealand Radio Network Limited’, a consortium including Wilson and Horton and GWR.\(^\text{15}\) GWR is one of the largest radio operators in the UK, with investments in stations across Europe and South Africa.\(^\text{16}\) By September 2000, the network was owned two-thirds by Independent Newspapers of Dublin, and one-third by Clear Channel Communications, the ‘largest radio broadcaster in the world’.\(^\text{17}\) CanWest Global Communications Corporation is a Canadian company that owns the More FM and Channel Z radio networks, TV 3 and 4 in New Zealand and substantial media holdings in other countries. In 2001 they bought out previously New Zealand owned Radioworks, formed by a merger of Radio Otago and Radio Pacific in 1999.\(^\text{18}\) New Zealand’s largest radio networks are now entirely owned by major international corporations.\(^\text{19}\)

Many of the radio stations started independently in the years after deregulation have now become part of these two networks, some being dismantled and used only for their frequencies, others playing an acquisitive role themselves. The Rock is one of the latter type, started in 1991, by Hamilton business man Joe Dennehy. Dennehy sold it to the Radio Pacific network in 1993, where it became part of Radioworks in 1999, and in May 2000, it became part of CanWest. In the intervening years, The Rock itself
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\(^{17}\) David Brice, interview, September 2000.


\(^{19}\) The vulnerability of this situation was highlighted in April 2002, with announcement of the possible sale by CanWest of its New Zealand assets. Whether this happens or not, it illustrates the position of radio networks as tradeable ‘assets’ for international media companies. Cosima Marriner, ‘CanWest’s NZ TV and radio up for sale,’ in the *Sydney Morning Herald*, April 17 2002, available at: http://www.smh.com.au/articles/2002/04/16/1018333520070.html
had grown from a small local radio station to a national network, acquiring other stations and frequencies during the late 1990s. According to Brad King

[The Rock] started in 1991. It was just a local station in Hamilton for about seven years, then we started diversifying and branching out into the regions. So it’s been a network as such where we’ve been broadcasting nationwide for about four years, although it’s only been in Auckland, Wellington and Christchurch for about 18 months, at most. [We first] started branching into Taranaki and Bay Of Plenty - just piping in the breakfast show, they still had their local PD in [previously established stations acquired by The Rock in] Taranaki and Tauranga, and when we saw the success of [networked hosts] Nick and Rog on Breakfast in those areas... we just networked the whole radio station into those two markets. There were local commercials running in there, that was the only local content they had, and that worked particularly well and then the company started buying up frequencies left right and centre all round the country and piping it everywhere else. It was in the rural markets for a good two years and the next step obviously was the metropolitan markets.20

The ‘History of The Rock’ provided by the station’s website describes the acquisitions slightly more explicitly: “1996.... Brad joins the team as the Rock networks to Tauranga and Taranaki. Hundreds lose there [sic] jobs as the Rock trims the fat.”21 In 1999 the station relocated from Hamilton to the Radio Pacific head office in Auckland from where it is now networked around the country.

The centralised model represented by The Rock and its expansion illustrates a shift in the focus of the radio industry away from locally owned stations to large nationally networked ones. The trend is most obvious in the United States, since the Telecommunications Act of 1996 removed the national limit of 40 stations to allow companies to own an unlimited number of stations nationwide, and broadened the limits on how many stations a company can own in one market.22 The most significant player in this has been Clear Channel Communications, part owner of The Radio Network in New Zealand, which in 2000 operated “874 radio and 19 television stations in the United States, reaching more than 120 million people each week... [with] stakes in another 240 stations in 36 countries.”23

The economics of scale are generating huge profits for companies like Clear Channel in the US, through “an unprecedented corporate consolidation of sales, promotion, marketing, management, news, contests, formats and talent.” Networks can enable the broadcasting of identical radio shows in multiple locations, either with local information slotted in for each location, or presented in a non-geographically specific way. In the US, local stations have been subsumed by large networks, and individual owners and locally based radio have largely disappeared. As the Rock example shows, this trend has been occurring in New Zealand as well.

Within the industry, the consolidation of the New Zealand radio market is seen as increasing audience choice through the variety of formats offered by the networks. This is especially relevant for advertisers and radio sales companies like Lennox Media Brokers, whose description of the industry is interesting for the way it describes consolidation and networking to perspective advertisers.

The radio market in New Zealand caters to all possible listening tastes. Most of the newly established stations have been part of an on-going strategy by the two main radio organisations (The Radio Network and CanWest/Radioworks), to develop effective national brands.

The concentration of ownership within these two organisations has resulted in the development of specific target markets, and a variety of cross-market and individual market station combo’s that enable advertisers to now achieve greater cost efficiencies in what was a short time before, a very fragmented marketplace.

The national branding and target market development are tools to increase advertising revenue and profits, while moulding radio stations for very specific demographics with carefully planned formats. The company (which sells radio space to advertisers) frame the developments in the New Zealand radio industry in terms of the ease with which target markets may now be reached, and advertisers’ needs met. The disappearance of local stations in favour of the two large networks represents a ‘tidying’ of the industry. Clear Channel’s own official statement about their New Zealand holdings illustrates another way of describing the operation of radio:

25 Ibid., and David Hendy, 2000, p 64.
The New Zealand operation is uniquely positioned with a series of content streams delivered from Auckland to transmitters located in population centers throughout the country. This unique blending of technology and basic broadcasting has materially improved operating margins and secured our position in this country.\(^{28}\) This centralised broadcasting ‘stream’ functions to increase profits and implicitly makes the broadcaster’s job easier. The phrasing implies a great deal more centralisation than necessarily existed in 2001, when it was written, but foreshadows the consolidation of all radio services to a central location in Auckland. Even if this degree of centralisation is not in practice for all brands in the TRN (which includes the ZM network, once the individual RNZ pop stations, like 3ZM in Christchurch), the efficiencies of this model are obviously more important for Clear Channel than the possible social benefits of retaining the local stations.

Building and growing market share, in order to keep advertisers and improve operating margins and cost efficiencies, is something radio networks monitor very closely. Networks gather comprehensive statistics on listenership and musical preferences, using the methods outlined in chapter three, such as auditorium testing, and telephone call-outs, to track their market share throughout the day. This information is directly linked to the commercial imperatives of commercial broadcasting, such that TRN’s Chief Programmer David Brice can describe the network’s role as being “in the business of generating listeners to generate advertising.”\(^{29}\) The process of generating and retaining these listeners has a major impact on the selection of songs that get played, reducing the possibility of ‘risk’ taking for radio, and providing an apparently ‘scientific’ and unarguable basis for making decisions over music. In this competitive environment there is little room for experimentation and the inclusion of songs simply because they’re from New Zealand:

> The average person doesn’t care: ‘Should we have more New Zealand music on the radio?’ ‘Yeah that sounds like a good idea I’ll tick that’ and that’s about as deep as the thought process goes, for most people. People in the industry and journalists, they raise the stakes on it, but your average listener is more concerned about ‘how do I pay for the increased petrol prices?’, or ‘I’ve gotta pick my daughter up from school’ and all of that sort of stuff. I can


\(^{29}\) David Brice, interview, September 2000.
show you numbers where we’ll take the risk, we’ll do the good programmer thing and we’ll put the kiwi songs on and we’ll play them for six weeks and [the song] just gets trashed, every week. It comes out bottom of the list. Not just bottom of the list because they’re unfamiliar with it, but bottom of the list because they friggin hate it, they give it a negative score of 28 or 30. Now that says to me, kiwi music or no kiwi music, they don’t like it, so why should we play it? And you can’t force people to listen to stuff they don’t like. If we put it on, and we play it and it’s on our radio station and we know we’re playing a song that’s got a 25 neg [rating], someone in a car’s just gonna push the button and listen to another radio station, and how’s that helping our identity?30

The ‘proof’ produced by extensive and expensive surveying provides programmers with an apparently unarguable basis for their musical decisions. And for as long as a station remains popular, and profitable, there is little reason for the owners to question these methods.

Another measure of popularity for a song is in the amount of commitment displayed by the record company - ensuring that if a radio station plays a song it will seem popular by virtue of its coverage in other media and advertising. As Fredric Dannen describes the traditional programmer-record company relationship in the American music industry:

Top 40 stations lived and died on ratings. You plied programmers with reasons (It’s a real funky tune, just right for an urban audience). You plied them with statistics (The song tested well at stations in Topeka and Omaha). The PD wanted to be assured, though, that the single was a priority. The record company was going to be behind the artist. It was going to lay out huge sums for a concert tour, hang displays in record store windows, and take out full page ads in Rolling Stone.31

The commitment of record companies to marketing New Zealand acts was a factor mentioned several times by the programmers, as a way of ensuring success on radio, as distinct from actual record sales. Rodger Clamp at Channel Z and More FM illustrated this with regard to pop duo Deep Obsession, who had several radio hits in 2000: “one of the biggest bands we’ve had success with in NZ is Deep Obsession. It hasn’t sold the albums, but radio wise it’s kind of worked, because the image is right and the songs are kind of easy to hum along to.”32

__________________________

30 Ibid.
radio is not immediately obvious, but it is apparent that recognition of bands from other sources, from music videos to record store displays, increases the familiarity and profile of their music on the radio. While it may not help to sell records, it does contribute to radio audience ratings.

For programmers in an environment of intense competition for both listeners and the advertising dollar, the value of each song played is carefully measured. Low ratings for New Zealand music has been taken as proof that it is not popular, and is too risky to play. In response it can be argued that music becomes known, recognised and popular through radio play. It becomes a chicken and egg situation where music needs radio airplay in order to be popular, but needs to be popular to receive radio airplay. In New Zealand, the movement to increase radio airplay for New Zealand music acknowledges the relationship between radio play, popularity and success, but it has also had to address programmers’ fears of undermining their ratings. The most direct tactic, and one which has been successful in several other countries, would be through legislation - imposing an airplay quota requirement on broadcasters to ensure a certain percentage of playlists are made up of New Zealand music. At the moment the preferred strategy is the recently developed voluntary code of practice, developed against the background of the ‘threat’ of possible regulation.

**New Zealand music quotas**

Alongside the deregulation of the New Zealand broadcasting industry, concerns about the level of local content on New Zealand radio gave rise to a proposal for a compulsory local music content quota. The quota proposal was first developed while New Zealand radio was still largely State-owned, and while the original Bill was defeated in Parliament in 1990, the issue has not gone away over the years of New Zealand radio’s expansion and more recent consolidation as private enterprise. In 1999 both Labour and National announced quota policies for the General Election, and discussions continued through 2001 over the potential form a quota may take. In March 2002, the Minister of Broadcasting announced a code of practice for
broadcasters with respect to New Zealand content on radio.\textsuperscript{33} This new initiative reflects ongoing ambivalence among politicians about voluntarism and compulsion in the field of airtime for New Zealand produced material. It also reflects the effectiveness of those lobbying for New Zealand content in broadcasting for several decades.

Ongoing campaigns for local content have been organised by groups such as the Green Ribbon Trust, who claim that proposals for local content quotas on radio and television began in the 1960s.\textsuperscript{34} In 1970, the New Zealand Broadcasting Authority issued rules for the New Zealand Broadcasting Commission - owners of most radio and all television broadcasting in the country - to broadcast “as far as possible,... programmes which have been produced in New Zealand, particularly those which are written, composed, or performed by New Zealanders.”\textsuperscript{35} However, the NZBA and a fledgling television quota disappeared with a change of government in 1975. The Green Ribbon Trust align levels of local content with the value of the Broadcasting License Fee, particularly in relation to television: “local content really flourished [in the mid 1970’s], helped by a boost in the license fee. What seems to have been an all-time record for local TV was reached in 1976 - 36% of the schedule. Then the proportion declined as inflation ate away at the license fee and the government refused to increase it.”\textsuperscript{36} In 1986 the Report of the Royal Commission into Broadcasting and Related Telecommunications in New Zealand “recommended a quota of 10 per cent of ‘music composed, arranged, performed or recorded and produced by New Zealand citizens or residents’ on radio.”\textsuperscript{37} Also in 1985, the NZ Music Promotion Committee began lobbying for a compulsory music quota,\textsuperscript{38} presenting to parliament “a well supported petition [which] called for ‘all New Zealand radio stations to be required by law to broadcast per day a minimum 20% quota of music recorded by New Zealand artists’.”\textsuperscript{39}

\textsuperscript{33} Hon. Marion Hobbs, Minister for Broadcasting, Press Release, ‘Commitment for more NZ music on radio’, March 26, 2002b. Available at: http://www.executive.govt.nz/speech.cfm?speechralph=37718&SR=0
\textsuperscript{34} The Green Ribbon Trust, The Campaign for Local Content Information Pack, 1997, p.7
\textsuperscript{35} Quoted in Ibid.
\textsuperscript{36} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{38} The Green Ribbon Trust, 1997, p.7.
\textsuperscript{39} Roy Shuker, 1994a, p.65.
Committee’s 1987 Kiwi Music Conference introduced a voluntary ten percent local music quota for radio. This did result in the internal monitoring of content at RNZ described by David Brice, however Pickering and Shuker claim it was barely implemented by private stations, and was really intended to “forestall legislation bringing in a mandatory quota.”

The quota proposal was brought to Parliament in 1989 as a private member’s bill, The Broadcasting (New Zealand Music Quota) Bill, by Labour MP Graham Kelly. When the Bill was referred to Select Committee in 1990, it received 342 submissions. Submissions in support were presented by musicians, producers, student radio stations and music critics as well as other groups and private individuals. The private radio sector, however, was strongly against it. The Bill was defeated on its return to Parliament in 1990 under the new National Government, which was “even more committed than its Labour predecessor to the ‘free market’.” Roy Shuker claims that the Quota Bill was primarily defeated by a belief that the State should not interfere in the market. The argument for State determined quotas was difficult to advance at a time of extensive state sector reform and the deregulation of the broadcasting industry itself.

The degree of regulation and control involved in a compulsory quota represented a major contradiction to the removal of broadcasting restrictions in the deregulation legislation. In its ongoing opposition to a compulsory quota, however, the radio industry has tended to focus on issues such as the amount of New Zealand music available to fit their formats, the unfairness of singling out radio over record companies for regulation, and the increasing availability of non-New Zealand based media through satellite television and the Internet which would not be subject to quotas, but would provide competition for New Zealand commercial broadcasters. At the heart of these arguments is the feeling that commercial radio has greatly increased the amount of New Zealand music they play without needing a quota, while
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there is not enough music being produced by the record companies to make up a quota with music of sufficient quality. According to David Brice:

Classic Hits went from 3 [percent NZ music] to 10 or a 12 or whatever it was, and are kind of consistently in that area. We don’t wanna go back to where we were, we want to go forward.... [But] if someone comes along and says ‘You’ve gotta play 20% [New Zealand music,’] well that’s a major impact on ZM [The Radio Network’s ‘Top 40’ brand]. When you’re playing 200 songs, that’s a lot of music, the number of songs that you need to have in there out of that 200 to meet [a 20% quota] and I just don’t know if NZ can actually produce that much of the right style, and with the right production values, to fulfil that.\(^{44}\)

Brice’s arguments are echoed by Rodger Clamp, Programmer for More FM and Channel Z:

I think it’s unfair to dictate to radio only that you have to play a certain amount of NZ music and not the record companies. Suppose Channel Z is playing 20% NZ music, and we look at the record companies, the amount of New Zealand rock they actually have signed up compared to the total pool of artists they have available to them. We’re probably looking at one or two percent out of the record companies and it doesn’t weigh up.\(^{45}\)

Both David Brice and Brad King stated they had begun to pay more attention to New Zealand music as the quota debate became more prominent. For Brad King at The Rock, this meant keeping records of how much New Zealand music he was playing, “since I’ve been on board we’ve always kept track of exactly how much [‘kiwi content’] we play.... Why did we do that? I suppose because the whole quota debate was [returning] then as well.”\(^{46}\) David Brice was more specific about why his radio stations had begun playing more New Zealand music: “I think that a very pragmatic response would be that we wanted to put more kiwi music on the radio primarily to avoid the compulsion of a quota.”\(^{47}\) The New Zealand Radio Broadcasters’ Association anticipated the code of practice by declaring itself officially in favour of ‘voluntary’ quotas, along with “other initiatives designed to continue to raise the percentage of New Zealand music broadcast.”\(^{48}\)


\(^{44}\) David Brice, interview, September 2000. The meaning and implications of ‘production values’ is explored in chapter five.

\(^{45}\) Rodger Clamp, interview, September 2000.


\(^{47}\) David Brice, interview, September 2000.

In March 2002, the government announced the introduction of just such a ‘voluntary’ quota, in the form of a Code of Practice to be observed by members of the Radio Broadcasters Association (RBA), who comprise some 90% of New Zealand radio stations.\textsuperscript{49} The code was the result of extensive negotiations between the two parties, in which the broadcasters commitment to a code was rewarded with concessions on frequency allocations, addressing a major commercial concern of broadcasters.\textsuperscript{50} The Code sets a local content target of “20% weighted average across all genre[s] playing contemporary music, by the end of 2006.”\textsuperscript{51} The specific targets vary between genres, and are set out on an incremental basis, increasing each year between 2002 and 2006, while failure to meet an annual target “will need to be balanced by over-achievement in succeeding periods, to ensure the 2006 target is met.”\textsuperscript{52} Adherence to the Code will be monitored by a specially created group, the New Zealand Music Performance Committee, comprising representatives of the RBA, Music Industry Commission, New Zealand on Air, the Musicians' Union and the recording industry. Radio stations are required to submit their playlists electronically to an independent auditor appointed by the RBA in consultation with the Committee, and will present the Committee with “[p]rocessed results, summarised by genre” on a quarterly basis.\textsuperscript{53} The New Zealand Music Performance Committee in turn will report quarterly to the RBA and the Minister of Broadcasting, emphasising the government’s commitment to ensuring the Code is fulfilled.

The code negotiations have also involved the recording industry and retailers, drawing together the significant players in the New Zealand music industry in recognition of the symbiotic relationship between them. It is recognised that for a greater amount of New Zealand music to be played on radio, there needs to be a relative increase in the number of local recordings released by the recording industry. As the record companies need to be assured that the public will purchase their

\textsuperscript{50} Hon. Marion Hobbs, 2002a.
\textsuperscript{52} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{53} Ibid.
product, retailers, specifically, The Warehouse chain, now New Zealand’s biggest music retailer, have undertaken to give priority to their New Zealand releases.\textsuperscript{54} The only aspect of the production chain seemingly not covered by the code are consumers themselves, on whose purchase of local product the whole system relies.

Although nominally voluntary, the code carries with it the threat of legislation if content targets are not met.\textsuperscript{55} The RBA reserves the right to renegotiate this if they can show the levels are unrealistic in relation to the investment of the recording industry, and has potentially left themselves considerable space to manoeuvre on this. Further, if the RBA had simply refused to commit to a code, the government may have faced great difficulty in introducing legislation that could potentially have been challenged on the basis of World Trade Organisation rulings.\textsuperscript{56} Legislation would have been rigorously opposed by broadcasters and defenders of an unregulated radio industry. Arguably, by avoiding legislation, the RBA has retained the possibility that the code’s restrictions may be relaxed under a government less firmly committed to local content, or more firmly committed to an entirely deregulated broadcasting industry. The Code itself also calls for a full review of the targets and process to be undertaken in 2006, at which point there may be greater flexibility to relax the requirements. In general, the Code approach seems to offer broadcasters considerable freedom to revise and review the restrictions, and renegotiate the process as the industry environment changes.

That the RBA have chosen to adopt this code after so many years of opposition to quotas, is, however, a reflection in part of the value of the concessions made by government, and also an example of what David Innes, the RBA’s Chief Executive, has called ‘good corporate citizenship.’ Speaking to National Radio’s Kim Hill, Innes explained:

\begin{quote}
It truly goes beyond just narrow business interests. [In] the radio industry, even though it may have overseas ownership, we’re all citizens of New Zealand, we’re all New Zealanders. Our kids are all New Zealanders, they listen to New Zealand music, a fair number of them play New Zealand music. So there is a significant element of good corporate citizenship in this
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{54} David Innes, Chief Executive, the Radio Broadcasters’ Association, interviewed by Kim Hill, National Radio, March 26, 2002, available at: http://xtransn.co.nz/musicandvideo/0,,6151,00.html
\textsuperscript{55} Hon. Marion Hobbs, 2002b.
thing. We all want to see New Zealand music do well. It’s a no brainer from our point of view.\textsuperscript{37}

Innes explicitly aligns local content with the national interest, emphasising the fact that radio industry is run by New Zealanders, even though New Zealand stations are predominantly owned by foreign corporations. The foreign owners of the RBA’s networks must have played a role in the negotiations, but in opting for a voluntary code, the association has been able to emphasise a commitment to the local despite its global ownership.

The Green Ribbon Trust argue that quotas are necessary for a number of reasons, both economic, in terms of the generation of jobs and potential export earnings from local culture; and social, “allowing the creative energies and talents of the community to be expressed.”\textsuperscript{58} They also argue that “our stories, faces, voices and music are an important part of our cultural identity. As New Zealanders we see less of ourselves on TV, and hear less of ourselves on radio, than other countries.”\textsuperscript{59} This particular language is echoed closely in the New Zealand Labour Party’s September 1999 broadcasting policy document entitled Broadcast - It’s About Us referred to in chapter one. Under the heading ‘Cultural Identity and Diversity’, the document asserts that:

\begin{quote}
In a global society it is important to recognise what makes us different from other peoples. Therefore we need to see and hear New Zealand stories and issues, New Zealand programmes for children, New Zealand faces and accents, New Zealand sport, New Zealand landscape and New Zealand music. Local content is an integral part of our cultural identity.\textsuperscript{60}
\end{quote}

The same policy document also sets out Labour’s position on local content quotas, with the statement that quotas “are the cost of doing business in New Zealand. They operate successfully in Australia, Canada and Ireland as a cultural protection mechanism.”\textsuperscript{61} By implementing the Code of Practice, New Zealand is now aligned with the voluntary model set out by Australia, rather than the legislative framework.

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext[36]{\textit{New Zealand Herald}, March 26, 2002.}
\footnotetext[37]{David Innes, 2002.}
\footnotetext[38]{The Green Ribbon Trust, 1997, p.6.}
\footnotetext[39]{Ibid., p.5.}
\footnotetext[41]{Ibid.}
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used in Canada. The content quotas illustrate a tension between the value of local content, and the desirability of legislating for cultural protection.

Keith Negus frames national quota policies in terms of a “struggle for cultural autonomy.” Focusing on New Zealand’s quota debate and its analysis by Pickering and Shuker, Negus identifies four important arguments in favour of quotas. Of the four, only one is substantially an argument for legislation as opposed to an expression of support for local content itself. These ‘local content is good’ arguments relate to the “nurturing of local talent”; the “promotion of local musical production”; and “national economic gains”. All of these are basically economic arguments, addressing the value of increasing sales and support for local musical production that could result from increased local music content on radio. The argument that offers a stronger call for a legislated quota is one that directly addresses the nature of radio programming in the kinds of market driven networks run by CanWest and Clear Channel. This is an argument for the “promotion of non-market-oriented aesthetic criteria”, on the basis that a quota “would force broadcasters to provide a national musical aesthetic”, while “quotas can encourage the programming of a greater range of musics and may lead to a broader array of aesthetic practices among musicians and more choice for audiences.” The extent to which a ‘national musical aesthetic’ exists, or is desirable, is addressed more fully in chapter six. The ‘promotion of non-market-oriented aesthetic criteria’, however, engages directly with the arguments against quotas put forward by the programmers I interviewed. They are very much concerned with a market-oriented aesthetic, which can be described as the ‘international sound’, and their primary objection to New Zealand music quotas relates to how well local music can fit this aesthetic. This argument will also be more extensively explored in chapter five. Under the voluntary code, it is unlikely that the market-oriented aesthetic will be strongly challenged, as broadcasters have retained significant freedom in defining this aesthetic, and will most likely revise the code rather than relinquish this control.
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Negus further identifies three primary reasons for opposing quota legislation. These are issues of “[q]uantity versus quality”, enforcement, and nationalism. The first two are familiar arguments from broadcasters and opponents of quotas in New Zealand. Playing music simply to fill a quota requirement rather than because it is good is a frequently cited argument against legislation, and is the argument used by David Brice in his questioning of how much New Zealand music is actually ‘good enough’ to make up 20% of the 200 songs on the ZM playlist. Enforcing quotas is another major issue, one that Negus observes would require state funding for policing and enforcement of sanctions, which appears to be carefully accounted for in the RBA’s Code. Asked about how his Clear Channel employed colleagues in Australia manage to fulfil their Australian music quotas, David Brice claimed “the programmers do things over there to meet the quotas. Rules are made to be broken. That’s the fact isn’t it? And it all depends on the sanctions they put in place and how they’re going to measure it and all that sort of stuff.”

The ‘nationalism’ argument is one which gets little attention from New Zealand critics, aside from the fundamental issue of “the need to define who is to be included in the quota.” Negus observes that Pickering and Shuker use similar language to that adopted in other countries, in defining New Zealand music as “music composed, arranged, performed or recorded and produced by New Zealand citizens.” This part of the argument relates to the issue of the ‘New Zealandness’ of New Zealand music, something that is discussed in more detail in the following chapter. Negus’ major concern however, is the requirement of quota legislation to identify what should be promoted as ‘ours’ and then to classify other musical sounds, or the people producing those sounds, according to the soil on which they were born, the language in which they sing or the ethnic category to which they ‘belong’. At the same time, foreign music (and its alien producers) are usually demonised as a ‘threat’ to the cultural life and economic well-being of the nation.

The dilemma potentially posed by people who actively choose to listen to foreign music, is an example of the possibility Negus identifies of protectionist quota policies.
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being easily accommodated to a nationalistic agenda. However, with cultural industries such as broadcasting and music production becoming increasingly controlled by large corporations based in a few powerful States, the nationalistic implications of quotas make them an appealing option for nations wishing to retain a sense of identity in their broadcasting. The national identity argument will be further explored in chapter six.

The protection of the nation state in the age of globalisation embodies some profound contradictions. In New Zealand, by deregulating the broadcasting industry so extensively, and removing all barriers to foreign ownership, the government relinquished the possibility of direct control over the content of New Zealand broadcasting. The New Zealand broadcasting industry has become firmly a part of the global communications industry, and control over the largest sections of the market lies in corporate boardrooms in Canada, Ireland and the US. Yet, playing local music is still regarded as a positive value by these broadcasters, and, as we have seen, the levels of local music on New Zealand radio have increased even as ownership of the industry became more consolidated offshore. In part, this could be related to the centralisation of control over programming that has come with the evolution of the networks, as it requires fewer people to decide to play more New Zealand music for the effects to be felt nationwide. A significant factor, however, seems to lie in a development that accompanied the deregulation of the industry. This was the establishment of New Zealand on Air, a proactive example of what Negus terms the “state as provider of local resources”.

New Zealand on Air

New Zealand on Air was established by the 1989 Broadcasting Act, to fulfil the social objectives in broadcasting previously met by “Government-owned radio and
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However, by not selling spectrum rights altogether, the New Zealand government retained the leverage to negotiate with the RBA for a music quota, using the rollover of frequency allocations to gain the broadcasters’ commitment to the code. Marion Hobbs, 2002a.
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television stations.” Its purpose was “to collect the Public Broadcasting Fee and disburse its proceeds in grants designed to achieve social objectives in broadcasting.” Amongst its objectives, New Zealand on Air is responsible for funding “the promotion of New Zealand music;” and more generally, broadcasting that will “reflect and develop New Zealand identity and culture (including the promotion of Maori language and culture).” In 1999 the then National Government abolished the broadcasting fee, providing instead for New Zealand on Air to be funded out of general taxation, effective in July 2000. Rather than reducing New Zealand on Air’s budget, the measure allowed it to be increased, which the Labour government did as part of their May 2000 arts funding package. The package allowed for an up to $27.909 million capital contribution in 99/00 and $7 million operating funding in 00/01 and ongoing. Launching the package, Prime Minister Helen Clark announced that:

The capital injection will enable NZ On Air to meet funding commitments entered into prior to the decision to abolish the Broadcasting Fee. It ensures that NZ On Air is not disadvantaged by the decision taken by the previous Government. The ongoing operating funding will be directed towards the support of New Zealand music ($2 million), radio, and television programmes ($5 million).

Removing New Zealand on Air’s reliance on the Broadcasting Fee and the budgetary uncertainty represented by declining rates of payment and the costs of collection, addressed one of the historical issues in relation to local broadcasting content. The Green Ribbon Trust’s assertion that New Zealand music levels declined in the late 1970s and early 1980s, in part “as inflation ate away at the license fee and the government refused to increase it,” implies that a non-license fee dependent funding system could more effectively maintain and increase levels of local content. It also leaves music funding more directly reliant on government budgets, and potentially more vulnerable to changes in policy and political direction in government. The initial funding increase has, however, allowed the expansion of programmes developed in
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the years immediately preceding it, and the introduction of new, more ambitious, schemes, all of which have made a significant impact on the levels of New Zealand music on radio.

New Zealand on Air’s funding for music videos and radio shows began in 1991, producing by July 2000, 778 music videos, and three thousand hours a year of local music radio shows on commercial radio and the b-net. In 1993, the ‘Radio Hits’ scheme was introduced, through which record companies could be refunded up to $5000 of costs involved in recording and releasing a song which gains ‘significant’ commercial radio airplay. This is measured by the airplay logs submitted to APRA by 110 commercial stations every quarter. In 1993 New Zealand on Air also developed ‘Hit Discs’ to address the radio programmers’ claims that they could not find enough local music to play. In 1998 New Zealand on Air began supplementing the Hit Disc by employing an independent promoter or ‘plugger’ to actively encourage stations to use the Hit Discs alongside a variety of other promotional activities. The so-called ‘Fourth Phase’ came in July 2000, with an almost doubling of New Zealand on Air’s music budget, and, amongst other initiatives, a whole new programme of funding for recording and promotion for musicians themselves.

The ‘Hit Discs’ are compilations of local music produced for a variety of radio formats - Kiwi Hit Disc for top 40 and rock radio, ‘Indie Hit Disc’ for alternative radio, ‘Kiwi Gold’ for classic hits formats, the ‘Iwi Hit Disc’ to represent Maori language and Kaupapa music, and the ‘AC Hit Disc’ for ‘Adult Contemporary’ radio, the format which has traditionally played the lowest levels of local music. Tracklisting for the Hit Discs - selecting the songs to be compiled - is done by New Zealand on Air “in consultation with record companies and radio programmers.” Tracks are chosen from applications by musicians and discussions with record companies, and are selected specifically for their potential to achieve commercial radio airplay. Airplay potential is judged by the characteristics of the song itself, but
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New Zealand on Air add that “[s]ometimes we will judge airplay potential from the artists' track record - what kind of airplay result have we got from that band in the past. And sometimes - especially with new bands - we will test the song out with commercial radio programmers to get a reading on its airplay potential.” As Brendan Smyth explains, for New Zealand on Air, “airplay is the end in itself,” so the CDs exist solely as a means to distribute music to programmers. This functions, in the words of the Hit Disc application guidelines, “to make sure that every radio station in the land has a good supply of New Zealand music that is suitable for airplay.”

The development of the ‘plugger’ role is considered to be key in the increase in airplay for local music, and represents a significant shift in how New Zealand on Air views its role in relation to getting local music on air. Brendan Smyth developed the role after realising that it was not enough to simply make the music available to the programmers:

When we started to employ a plugger things changed, they definitely changed... that was in 1998... and the reason why I did it was because we’d been producing the Kiwi Hit Disc for 5 years, and we were up to 30 or something volumes at the time. And people had said to me over the years ‘you need an independent music promotions team, that’s independent of the record companies,’ and I said ‘no no no, you don’t understand, we’re not in the promotions business, we are in the resourcing business.’ With Kiwi Hit Disc what we’re trying to do is ensure that every radio station in the country has a smorgasbord of good quality New Zealand music at their disposal, that’s suitable for the playlist. But it’s not our job to promote the airplay of those tracks, it’s our job to make sure they have the music, and then the owner of the track, the record company, it’s their job to promote the use of the track. And I’d always taken that view, until one day... Mike Regal said to me, ‘Look mate, I know what it’s like at the programming coalface, the record that gets added is the record that’s in your face.’ And I thought, ‘wait a minute, ok I can start to see what’s going wrong here.’

Because I suddenly had a different take on what was happening with Kiwi Hit Disc. Kiwi Hit Disc, I suddenly realised, was part of the problem, not part of the solution. In the sense that Kiwi Hit Disc was yet another CD that invaded Programme Directors’ offices every week, we were part of the CD clutter. I then had this image in my mind of a PD, and in comes the mail, in comes the NZ on Air envelope, and let’s say he opens it up and pulls it out and
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86 Mike Regal is the Chairman of the Kiwi Music Action Group (‘Kiwi MAG’), and a Radioworks executive.
says ‘Oh great there’s the Kiwi Hit Disc, I’ve got some time tomorrow, I’ll listen to that,’ puts it down on the desk [and] then in comes the Sony bag, [with] six CDs, ... in comes the BMG bag, in comes the EMI bag, suddenly ours is number 14 in the pile, and it never got listened to. Well ... there was a chance that it might never get listened to. It was buried, it was part of the CD clutter, unless we had somebody there who could go in and say ‘Let me help you here, let’s take it from the bottom of the pile, let’s put it in the CD player. Now there’s 17 tracks on this disc, and 13 of them are not right for you but 4 of them are, so let me help you find the 4 that are right for you.”

The process Brendan describes illustrates a greater understanding of the role of the programmer and the factors that influence their decision-making. As outlined in chapter three, radio programmers receive a great many CDs in the mail every day, accompanied by varying kinds of promotional effort by the record companies. In practice this could range from enthusiastic press releases to constant phone calls asking after the song, to small gifts. Incentives can be big however, the New Zealand Listener reported in March 2001 that Sony Music was flying programmers overseas to see Jennifer Lopez, quoting Sony New Zealand’s Managing Director Michael Glading’s explanation that “there are no strings attached: ‘Sure it generates goodwill, but it’s not, ‘hey pal, we want this and that.’ You can’t operate that way.’” Whatever the ultimate intention, there are some strong incentives for programmers to pay attention to the songs and artists regarded as priorities by the record labels. Record companies go to a lot of effort to ensure their products are the ones ‘in the programmers’ faces.’

In choosing not to promote their Hit Discs, simply regard them as source material, New Zealand on Air were allowing them to be swamped by the much more pro-active marketing of the record companies. To a degree, just as audience research tends to show that listeners like music that is familiar, the programmers are more likely to pay attention to acts they are familiar with, leaving the new, unpromoted material further down the pile. Record companies were not promoting their New Zealand material on
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the same level as their internationally successful hits, and while New Zealand on Air were leaving this role to those companies, the radio stations were not getting the help they needed to approach these often unfamiliar New Zealand acts. The Plugger was therefore simply a person to make the acts on the Hit Discs familiar, by talking the programmers through the contents of the Hit Discs, and finding the songs that most suited their formats. Perhaps most importantly, meeting with the plugger means creating a specific time when the programmer will sit down and actually listen to the disc.

In the two years after the first plugger was employed by New Zealand on Air in 1998, New Zealand music content on commercial radio more than doubled. As part of the ‘Phase Four’ schemes introduced in 2000, New Zealand on Air employed two more pluggers, forming a promotions team of three to work even more closely with programmers, record companies and bands themselves. The plugger role prompted an increase in awareness of local music by radio programmers, and gave them a relatively independent contact outside of the record companies. Record company support for the role was an important factor in its development, as promotion of the music they own is part of the record company’s job. For New Zealand record companies however, local music has frequently been a lower promotional priority than the international acts, and the industry was supportive of the increased promotional power offered by New Zealand on Air. According to Brendan Smyth:

It’s important... to make sure that we’re working in parallel, in tandem, with the record companies.... The plugger’s job is to maintain really close contact with the record companies, so that our priorities are theirs, and their priorities are ours. So we share strategies, we share information, we know when to pull back on a song, we know when to push on a song. We know that if there’s a delay on a video for a song, but the song’s out on Hit Disc, [the plugger] will pull back on pushing it because she knows the record company’s not ready yet, and then they’ll push it together. So it’s all a coordinated effort at the record company level. So it has changed things, it’s given Kiwi Hit Disc a reason for being, and it does coincide with the increase in New Zealand content on commercial radio.

The trick with the plugger job is not to be ‘everything’s fantastic,’ it’s actually a more subtle art than that. [The pluggers] are feisty, and they push and they push and then they pull back [when] they know that they’re jeopardising the relationship. It’s a very very skilful
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job, and to watch those pluggers working is a joy, because they actually know that if they
don’t have that respect for who they’re dealing with, they will not get respect back. What I
found with Nicole [Gilbert, the first plugger], and it happened over a period of just weeks
[was that] hard-bitten old commercial radio programmers that have been in it since 1900
started to trust her, and to actually seek her advice. So they would say to her, ‘look I’ve kind
of got a problem with this song, I’d like to play it but I’ve got a problem with it and it’s this,
its that.’ In other words, a dialogue started to appear between radio and the plugger because
they respected her and she respected them. She respected where they were coming from, and
she’s not the record company, that’s the brilliant thing, she’s not the record company.92

The importance of the plugger is as a fairly neutral middle person in the relationship
between bands, record companies, and programme directors. Being ‘not the record
company’ is fundamental, especially when combined with an apparently honest
attitude about the music. This approach allows programmers to feel open about
criticising the music or discussing their problems with it, in a way that is not possible
with the record company - which has already invested a huge amount of money in the
finished product - or the band themselves. As Brendan portrays it, the significant
breakthrough for New Zealand on Air’s promotion of New Zealand music was giving
programmers a vehicle to discuss their perceptions and problems with it with a
powerful but reasonably neutral intermediary.

Rodger Clamp, as programmer for Channel Z receives a particularly large number of
demo recordings from unsigned bands. He spoke about developing a particularly
important relationship with plugger Nicky Jarvis. Rodger found he did not have time
to listen to all the material sent directly to him, so he began sending it on to Nicky,
who could then work out which songs may be useful for Channel Z, or for The Rock,
or another station. Then she would go and market the songs to the appropriate
stations. An important part of this process is to give feedback to the bands: “it’s real
feedback. They get a letter or whatever saying that ‘this is the reason [your song isn’t
being playlisted], as we see it, and this is what you have to do to get commercial
success or radio airplay.”93 This kind of process illustrates how involved the plugger
role has become in the way radio deals with New Zealand music, making it more
accessible, providing assistance in choosing tracks for airplay, and also cultivating
bands that commercial radio is more likely to play.

92 Ibid. The first two pluggers, Nicole Gilbert and Nicky Jarvis, were female.
In 1998 New Zealand on Air introduced the ‘Double Digits’ plaques programme, a way of rewarding programmers whose local music content broke over the 10% level. The plaques are an attempt to dilute the sense of compulsion associated with playing New Zealand music through the ‘threat’ of quotas.

With that Double Digits plaque, what we’ve managed to do is change the attitude to New Zealand music from being an offensive to an affirmative thing.... The Double Digits plaque idea, which is so simple in its essence, has I think helped to change attitudes, so it’s a reward and an incentive rather than a stick. Because they’ve always been threatened with the stick, commercial radio, so... what I thought to myself was ‘well we’ll just turn that on its head, instead of just waving a stick at them and them becoming naturally defensive, we’ll actually offer them a reward.’ We can’t give them cash, but you know, a reward for rising to the challenge. And if you think about the commercial radio personality that is obvious. They do not respond well to restrictions, or to being told what to do, but they do respond well to rewards and incentives.  

The plaques themselves are nicely designed rectangles of clear Perspex with the ‘V’ victory two fingers sign and a message of congratulations to the programmer for breaking the 10% mark. The plaques are presented in a small informal ceremony at the radio station and the photos and story published in the New Zealand on Air magazine, ‘Fresh Air’, as a form of public acknowledgment. Programmers have responded well to the Plugger and plaque initiatives.

Brad King at The Rock regards the double digits plaque as “a good thing to strive towards,” explaining how the New Zealand on Air programmes have influenced his programming of local music:

The Rock was always, pretty much for about a year I think, tinkering around the 9 1/2 [% NZ music] and I probably could have thrown a few more in just to break the double digits thing. But I thought ‘well if it’s gonna come it’s gonna come because of the merits of the songs not because I really want this lovely plaque kind of thing.’ But it is a bit of a motivating factor... and it is good having them coming to see you and showing you the couple of good acts on the Kiwi Disc and the Indie Disc, whereas a couple or three years ago I’d have got the Indie disc and thrown it to the side thinking ‘it’s not commercial enough, I won’t touch it.’ But the last one, I’m playing three tracks off the Indie Hit Disc so it’s definitely working. 
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The three programmers I spoke to all had their plaques displayed on their desks, and were extremely conscious of the amount of local music they were programming. The promotion and the plaque have certainly increased programmers’ determination to reach and surpass the ten percent figure.

The ‘Phase Four’ funding programme has enabled New Zealand on Air to increase the number of pluggers to three, allowing one to concentrate on compiling the hit discs and mentoring new recording projects. It also provides a budget for the team to take bands around radio stations all over the country, and present showcases of local music for programmers to mark the release of the hit discs. The scheme also contains a range of funding opportunities for musicians, and draws the record companies further into the relationship. Under Phase Four, record companies are supported to create and market the ‘hit’ records that radio will play. Phase Four also marks the first time New Zealand on Air has looked at international promotion for New Zealand musicians. There are eight particular strategies under the scheme, which significantly expand the available funding for musicians and increase the promotional focus of New Zealand on Air itself.

Phase Four contains three levels of ‘Making and Marketing’ initiatives and a ‘remixing for radio’ programme, all aimed at working with artists, record companies and radio to cultivate ‘hits’. ‘Making and Marketing’ encompasses funding schemes aimed at new recording artists for singles and EPs, more established artists for albums, and for four artists a year, funding for international promotion. New Zealand on Air regard the New Recording Artists scheme as a type of ‘Research and development fund’, developing the artists who will go on to make albums and eventually to make it to the international stage. Brendan Smyth describes this as “the bedroom to Billboard progression” - from dreaming in bedrooms to making the front cover of *Billboard* magazine. This marks the first time New Zealand on Air has invested in recording music, but also strengthens the partnership with record companies begun by the plugger. The top two levels of funding - for albums and international promotion - provide up to $50 000, to be matched by record company investment. This method increases the funding available for recording and marketing.
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New Zealand music but also provides an incentive for record companies to invest in local music themselves. The ‘remixing for radio’ programme is regarded as a ‘contingency fund’ - an easily accessed source of funding to re-work a song to make it more suitable for radio airplay.

Aspects of the Phase Four funding strategy have been controversial, with fears that the programmes give too much power to commercial radio programmers to mould the sound of New Zealand music. By aiming for the development of commercially viable New Zealand music, the strategies do not challenge the market-oriented aesthetic applied by programmers, or necessarily encourage the inclusion of more local sounding music on commercial radio playlists. It is argued that music that emerges from this kind of situation will not be ‘authentic’, as an expression of artistic intent, or of a New Zealand identity. New Zealand on Air’s response to this would be to emphasise their responsibility solely for increasing the amount of local music on local radio.

New Zealand on Air’s Phase Four strategy is aimed directly at making New Zealand music successful - internationally in the top level of its marketing programmes, but also locally, through acceptance and promotion in the internationally-informed space of New Zealand radio. Aspects of the strategy explicitly involve commercial radio programmers in the shaping of New Zealand music, through the ‘remix’ scheme, where songs that are not quite ‘right’ can be reworked for acceptance by radio. Radio, however, is dominated by ‘international’ factors, from its ownership, to its programming and formatting theories, and of course, the emphasis on international repertoire. These factors have lead to criticism of aspects of the Phase Four programme, with the charge that funding decisions taken by New Zealand on Air are leading to a ‘homogenising’ of New Zealand music. There are concerns that the funding criteria themselves lead to the development of music that panders to the taste of ‘mainstream’ radio, and will simply replicate “MOR American or English sounds - and unfairly disadvantage the more ‘artistically’ valid bands.”97 The ‘remixing’

scheme has been called “fundamentally, ethically, philosophically wrong - that artists’ work should be sent back for repackaging.”

The remixing scheme undermines the potential for non-market-oriented, or non-international, aesthetics to be supported by commercial radio. If a not-quite-market-oriented song can be sent back for reworking, there is a strong possibility of programmers getting to dictate what they want in New Zealand music. However, as Brad King points out, programmers have always done that to a certain extent, the difference now is that there is funding available for it. In my own programming work, I was often asked how a band could change their song to make it have a better chance of playlisting. Despite feeling uncomfortable about having such a degree of influence, it is hard not to offer an opinion and advice. Sometimes bands will follow this advice, and sometimes not. Rodger Clamp has also been in the position of being asked for advice on making songs more airplay-worthy - for example in the feedback system he has worked out with the New Zealand on Air plugger - and considers that:

that is a decision that the artist has to go and make themselves. I mean all we can do is make suggestions.... It’s up to the artist whether they feel that they can do that or not, and if you put it on the table and say this is what is wrong with this song and if you change that and that and then there’s a 90% chance we’ll play it, then it’s their choice.

Despite having used this argument myself, it is a little disingenuous of programmers to assert that a band has a real choice to change their music or not. If a band wants radio play, the programmer holds all the power in terms of whether that can happen or not. In some cases there may be other radio stations a band can try, for example, a song that is too ‘pop oriented’ for The Rock, may fit well on Channel Z. Often however, the argument comes down to bands who are willing to make any changes that will guarantee airplay, versus bands who would rather hold on to their ‘artistic credibility’ or ‘authenticity’ and only make the changes they want to make.

The definition of ‘authenticity’ is complex, and is one that Brendan Smyth challenges in relation to criticism of the Phase Four funding programme:
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Challenging notions of authenticity in this statement, Brendan Smyth highlights a very diverse range of acts, all of which have received a substantial degree of critical acclaim and even commercial success in the late 1990s and beginning of the new decade. His argument is that New Zealand on Air’s funding is not restricted to certain styles, and has helped a huge range of artists, both those that have become commercially successful and those who have not. Smyth is highly critical in return of what he calls ‘the commissars of cool’ who dismiss bands simply for being popular, and who want to make a distinction between the ‘right’ kind of New Zealand music and the ‘wrong’ kind of New Zealand music where ‘right’ is Concord Dawn [an ‘underground’ drum and bass electronic act] and ‘wrong’ is Zed [a hugely popular pop/rock band]. He suggests that there is a tendency “for the commissars of cool to diss the music of young New Zealanders and middle New Zealand, to sneer at the likes of Zed.”\footnote{Ibid.}

The same legislation that deregulated the New Zealand broadcasting industry and positioned it in the global entertainment industry established New Zealand on Air. This allowed the development of a range of funded mechanisms for facilitating the playing of New Zealand popular music. The legislative goal of separating the social responsibilities of broadcasting from the State and from State controlled broadcasters allows New Zealand on Air to act autonomously in its development of local content schemes. The increasing amount of New Zealand music on New Zealand radio can be traced to the development of a range of New Zealand on Air schemes, and the programmers interviewed credited these schemes with raising their own consciousness of local music and encouraging them to play more.
Conclusion

Airplay levels for New Zealand music can be closely linked to government policy, from the deregulation of the industry in 1989, to the debate over local content quotas, and the establishment of New Zealand on Air. Policy issues reflect a tension between the drive towards a free market economy begun by the Labour Government in 1984, characterised by deregulation, and calls for a degree of regulation in the industry to protect New Zealand music. The deregulation of the industry led to a more than threefold increase in the number of radio stations in New Zealand between 1987 and 2000. The removal of restrictions on foreign ownership by the Government in 1991 means that the New Zealand radio industry is now overwhelmingly foreign owned, with stations becoming part of large transnational conglomerates. The commercial radio industry has in the past opposed any level of re-regulation, such as quotas. Levels of New Zealand music have increased partly in an effort to avoid quotas, but largely as result of initiatives by New Zealand on Air directed at increasing the airtime for New Zealand music and investing in strategies that connect local musicians with major commercial actors in the industry. The establishment of New Zealand on Air alongside deregulation represented an attempt to encourage support for New Zealand music without regulation or control by Government. A large increase in funding for New Zealand on Air in 2000 by the Labour Government has led to the expansion of programmes aimed at increasing the ‘commercial viability’ of New Zealand music. The resulting Phase 4 programme has been supported by the radio industry, and many musicians, but has lead to fears that New Zealand music may become more homogenised and controlled by radio programmers.

There have been other factors that have influenced the amount of New Zealand music on New Zealand radio over the late 1990s. Brendan Smyth points to a range of organisations such as the Kiwi Music Action Group, and their now regular New Zealand Music Weeks on commercial radio. The individuals in the industry are also an important factor, particularly the rise of a new generation of radio programmers who are more open to New Zealand music than in the past.102 The programmers also claim there is a new attitude from musicians, who are more willing to take a
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commercial approach to their music. The work of New Zealand on Air and ongoing debate over regulation in the form of quotas have, however, had a considerable influence over these factors themselves.

In convincing the Radio Broadcasters’ Association to implement a voluntary Code of Practice for local music content on radio, the government has found a middle way between re-regulating the industry with quota legislation, and simply encouraging local content through New Zealand on Air. The success of New Zealand on Air’s programmes in support of local music, particularly the dialogue begun with radio programmers, has significantly prepared the way for the introduction of the voluntary quota. By concentrating on making New Zealand music a positive thing, and making it more accessible to the methods and processes of commercial radio, New Zealand on Air have played a major role in the increase in local content since 1997. While the Code allows government to stay removed from the business of broadcasting, the campaign to establish it is something of an acknowledgment that the ‘social objectives’ of broadcasting have not been sufficiently met by a pure market model. The pressures for quotas, of whatever kind, are informed by social objectives, ideas about the positive value of local content, and efforts to ensure a local identity is retained within the internationally owned space of New Zealand radio.

New Zealand music is now experiencing considerably higher levels of radio play than when deregulation began, despite the concentration of radio station ownership in the hands of large transnational corporations. Even with a quota, however, New Zealand music is still ‘competing’ against the cultural products of the US and Britain, and programmers are looking for an ‘international sound’ that makes New Zealand music ‘fit’ with the music of these dominant cultures. Concerns about homogeneity and a lack of ‘authenticity’ in New Zealand music arise from this situation, and raise the question of what constitutes ‘New Zealand’ music? The next chapters address to these issues, first through an exploration of the ‘international’ sound, and finally in a discussion of what constitutes a ‘New Zealand’ sound.
Deregulation of the New Zealand broadcasting industry has resulted in a few large corporations owning a significant proportion of New Zealand commercial broadcasters, so that local networks are increasingly branches of international businesses. While still run as local broadcasters, their operation is determined by international investments and the need to make a return to their owners. Broadcasting ownership is not the only way in which the New Zealand music industry is influenced by international patterns. The record companies too are part of major international conglomerates. New Zealand is just a small part of their ‘Asia-Pacific’ business arm, or ‘territory’ - a term that evokes an imperialist view of the world. The effects of this dominance of international corporations are various. One of the most significant consequences in the New Zealand context is what is referred to as the ‘international sound’ and its impact on local music airplay and production. This is the ‘dominant particular’ of the international recording industry,¹ against which New Zealand music must compete for airplay on New Zealand radio, and for success in the international market.

This chapter explores the relationship between the local and the global in the New Zealand music industry, the construction of the ‘international sound’ as a global dominant particular, and its implications for New Zealand music. Having explored the international ownership patterns of New Zealand radio in chapter four, I will outline some of the ways in which international trends influence the programming and structure of radio stations, and discuss the ownership patterns of the major record companies. The cultural expression of these forces will then be explored in terms of the concept of ‘international sound’ and its impact on programming decisions for New Zealand music. New Zealand on Air’s Phase Four strategy expands their traditional focus on airplay and moves into support for international promotion for the first time. Attention to this outward focus will form the last part of the chapter, which examines

how the processes of globalisation can be exploited to the advantage of New Zealand music, the reasons why international success may be desirable, and the relationship between New Zealand music and the ‘international sound’. In various ways this chapter explores the impact of globalisation on a small music industry, and attempts by a small nation to harness the resources of globalisation to give voice to the local.

**Music, broadcasting and the global market**

The New Zealand popular music industry has traditionally been dominated by US and British products. Most obviously since the arrival of rock and roll, but even before then, Geoff Lealand claims that New Zealand popular music was dominated by Tin Pan Alley and Hollywood musicals, “with lingering traces of the British music hall tradition.”

In his study of the content of New Zealand radio between 1957 and 1984, Lealand concludes that “overseas artists have always been the most popular in New Zealand, with usually at least half of these from the United States.” The New Zealand singles charts of a similar period seem to confirm the dominance of overseas artists in the sale of popular music in New Zealand. Considering the size of the country this is hardly surprising, and New Zealand’s situation is not unusual - Wallis and Malm illustrate that most of the world is dominated by music from Britain and the United States.

The radio industry itself has been heavily influenced by US approaches and presentation. The arrival of rock and roll radio in New Zealand in the 1960s for example, heralded a shift towards ‘American’ announcing styles and formats. American rock and roll radio provided the model for Radio Hauraki, New Zealand’s first ‘pirate’ rock and roll station, and also for the rebranding of local New Zealand Broadcasting Corporation stations. Stations began borrowing station identification tags from US sources, while DJs developed a “much more informal persona on air than the previous British-derived ‘announcer’ model favoured by the NZBC.
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Personality radio had arrived.” More recently, Michael Pickering and Roy Shuker argue that, with commercialisation in the 1980s and early 1990s, programming was increasingly done with the help of US publications, and playlisting undertaken with reference to US industry standards and institutions such as Billboard magazine. This influence has even included stations bringing in programmers from Australia or the US, whose international expertise does not necessarily include a cultural appreciation of, or orientation towards, New Zealand music. New Zealand radio has therefore always been influenced by foreign trends, from the BBC-styled NZBC to the US rock radio-style adopted by Radio Hauraki. The impact of overseas models and expertise on programming intensified as New Zealand broadcasting became more commercial. By 2002, that influence has extended to significant foreign ownership, with the concentration of most stations into just two networks, and the imperative to make substantial financial returns to radio networks’ parent corporations.

The ‘major record labels’ are also all wholly overseas companies with small branches in New Zealand. Ownership is consolidated into a few transnational corporations whose financial interests are spread over a range of industries. As Keith Negus explains, “Since the beginning of the 1990s, six major recording companies have controlled the means by which approximately 80 to 85 per cent of recordings sold in the world are produced, manufactured, and distributed.” In 1996 when Negus’ Popular Music in Theory, An Introduction was published, these six companies were “Sony music entertainment, Electrical and Musical Industries (EMI), the Music Corporation of America (MCA), Polygram Music Entertainment, the Bertelsman Music Group (BMG), and Warner Music International.” In 1998/99 MCA (by then known as Universal Records) merged with Polygram records to form the Universal
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Music Group,\textsuperscript{11} consolidating power over the world’s music market in the hands of only five major recording companies. In 2000, this was prevented from becoming only four companies when the proposed merger between Time Warner and the EMI group was called off after opposition from European regulatory bodies. These mergers and attempted mergers are an apt illustration of Negus’ claim that:

> While the continual merger and acquisition activity that has characterized the entertainment industry since the end of the 1980s would suggest that the company names that occupy this line-up may change during future years, there is unlikely to be a significant rise in the number of major companies which are competing over this market share.\textsuperscript{12}

Negus further relates this activity to the process of capitalist imperialism, and Lenin’s discussion of the expansion of capitalism. Lenin argued that corporations were forced to “seek profits from overseas territories” in order to “maintain their dominance in a home region.”\textsuperscript{13} The expansion and consolidation of major record labels and broadcasting corporations, for whom the world is divided into ‘territories’, is aimed at strengthening their central power bases, while Negus reminds us that the struggles within this process “may lead to a variety of types of imperialism.”\textsuperscript{14} In intent, these corporations are focussed simply on increasing profits and maintaining their positions of economic power, rather than the direct domination of nations. The multinational structure of the five major recording companies map the relationships and power of capitalist globalisation. In effect, however, the processes of capitalism can indeed produce a variety of forms of imperialism, illustrating the blurring of the lines between imperialism and globalisation in the music industry.

The patterns of ownership within the broadcasting and recording companies in New Zealand describe what Negus calls a ‘structure of dominance’ in terms of the ownership of the means of production for both recorded music and radio.\textsuperscript{15} The impact of this dominance is less straightforward to measure, although the concept of ‘international sound’ could represent a form of imperialism, a way in which the cultural dominance of the capitalist western powers is maintained and communicated.

\textsuperscript{12} Keith Negus, 1996, p51.
\textsuperscript{13} Ibid., p167.
\textsuperscript{14} Ibid.
The international sound

Negus regards the ‘international sound’ or ‘international repertoire’ as representing a “way in which patterns of dominance are maintained... through the organization of working practices and repertoires”. The ‘international repertoire’ is privileged by these organisational patterns, and is itself a music business euphemism for the recordings of Anglo-American artists singing conventional rock/pop songs in English (the occasional non-Anglo artist is admitted to this category, provided they sing in English). This dominant particular has been inscribed into and constituted within what Schiller has referred to as a dominant ‘transnational corporate culture’, a term which refers to ways of working that have been increasingly adopted and advocated by all of the major entertainment corporations.

International repertoire is therefore a significant part of the global corporate culture that dominates the recording and broadcasting industries in New Zealand, and the industries are committed to maintaining it as a standard. But what, in practice, constitutes the international sound? Most commonly it is associated with the quality of production in a song, while David Brice also emphasises the need to be up with, if not slightly ahead of, the contemporary trends in musical style.

The commercial radio critique of ‘production values’ was a central aspect of opposition to the 1989 New Zealand music quota bill, as Pickering and Shuker illustrate. Echoing the submissions of many quota supporters, they dispute the apparently strict definition of ‘production values’ employed by commercial programmers, and question whether listeners believe technical quality is more important for a song than its content and music. Pickering and Shuker further suggest that emphasis on issues of technical excellence “has obscured the avoidance of any explicit discussion of aesthetic value”. The implication is that technical excellence, as an example of international quality, has been an easy way for commercial radio to explain a lack of openness to New Zealand music along

15 Ibid., p169.
16 Ibid., p.173-4.
17 Ibid., p.174.
19 Ibid., p.82.
20 Ibid., p.84.
apparently measurable lines. Evidence is provided by ‘scientific’ audience surveys -
the telephone and auditorium testing described in chapter three. As Lealand observes,
this measure of quality implies a standard “bestowed after rigorous testing against set
criteria and the expectations of the record-buying public.”21

Focusing on an ‘international quality’ of production represents a significant financial
barrier for New Zealand acts. The kinds of production equipment used by big
overseas acts are extremely expensive and there is often not enough money in New
Zealand studios to buy that kind of technical equipment, or upgrade it as often as
necessary to keep up with changes. Local producers also often simply do not get
enough practice recording bands in such a relatively small industry, and do not have
easy access to the expertise of ‘big name’ overseas producers. Brad King at The Rock
credits some of the increase in ‘commercially’ viable New Zealand music to the
increasing experience of New Zealand producers.22 David Brice also focussed on the
experience of the producer in relation to producing sound of an international quality:
“I’m not saying that just because somebody’s a producer from the States or Britain or
any where like that, that they’re better, they’re just more at the cutting edge of where
it’s at. And that’s an area where I perceive we have a lack of skill base.”23 The
producer acts as the intermediary between the musician and the technology, shaping
the overall structure of the song as well as its aural quality. David Brice explains how
this works in relation to what he looks for in a song:

Musically obviously it’s tight, the playing, the mixing, all those sorts of things are done really
well. And the song goes somewhere. And the producer determines that. The band goes to the
producer and they go ‘right that goes there, this goes here, we’ll change that.’ You look at the
really successful songs at the moment in the pop genre, they get to the chorus pretty damn
quickly, some of them almost even start with the chorus these days - people’s attention is
limited, and I can understand why, we’ve got so many things bombarding us, we’ve got all
these things coming at us, you don’t want to have to wait a minute and a half like with so
many of these Kiwi songs. It’s the first thing I say if somebody flicks me a CD and asks what
I think, ‘get to the chorus quicker.’24

21 Geoff Lealand, 1988, p.74.
23 David Brice, Director of Programming and Marketing, The Radio Network, interview, TRN Head
24 Ibid.
The international sound is achieved through a combination of technical equipment and an experienced producer who knows how to mediate between the band and the equipment to achieve the right, ‘cutting edge’ sound. The cutting edge is still set by the centres of the music industry, most commonly referenced in regard to the US. Emphasis on this confirms the degree of cultural imperialism still at work in the industry. Through the international sound or ‘repertoire’, the standards for success are set by the centre of cultural production and those industries on the periphery such as New Zealand must conform to these standards in order to compete even at home.

International quality’s ‘cutting edge’ does not just rest on the production levels, it also requires meeting the current styles and shifts in popular music. These changing genres are also invariably set by the ‘centres’ of the global music industry. David Brice’s main concern is how well New Zealand artists can keep up with this, how well they compare to the big international acts with whom they are competing for space on his playlist:

Well, I suppose you just consciously benchmark every song you hear, be it Kiwi or from Australia or whatever against the prevailing standard of what is happening. So at the moment you’re judging songs against Madonna, Backstreet Boys, N Sync through to the Red Hot Chilli Peppers. If you’re talking girl groups, how does Deep Obsession really compare to Bewitched? Do they sound way better? About the same? Or even worse?25

Like the question of technical quality, the need to keep up with shifts in overseas styles is one that has been with the New Zealand music industry for some time. In the 1960s the local industry was centred on recording covers of overseas hits, and a rather conservative approach to musical trends, as illustrated by Michael Flint in his discussion of ‘What the Air was Like up There: Overseas Music and Local Reception in the 1960s.’26 New Zealand bands of the era that adopted more up to date styles after travelling to England often found their New Zealand fans alienated by the change in their music.27 At the same time, English critics found New Zealand styles somewhat ‘old fashioned’:

Right at the end of the 1960s the conservative face of New Zealand popular music was presented in the live package concert Superpop 70, hosted by Pete Sinclair, which was chosen

25 Ibid.
27 Ibid., pp.11-12
to entertain the visiting young royals, Charles and Anne in Auckland. Their comments on the show were not made public, but those of the British press contingent were, and they were overtly derogatory. Their comments were reported in the local press at the time, and it was clear that one of the main causes for their derision was what they perceived as the basically old-fashioned nature of the show and its participants. In particular, they ridiculed what they referred to as the “Early Elvis” names of a number of the performers. Clearly, the mainstream public face of New Zealand popular music in 1970 was, to these British observers, firmly set in the past of the early and mid 1960s.... To the jaded British press covering the event, the performers would have seemed woefully dated, and completely out of step with the rock music being produced in Britain at the same time, and, more to the point, out of step with much of the music then being produced in New Zealand. They were judging the local product at its most commercial and most public.28

While Flint acknowledges that there were several New Zealand acts who “had already found their own voices” at the time,29 the example illustrates the perceived disjuncture between the ‘most commercial and most public’ face of music in New Zealand and the international benchmarks of production and style.

The implication of these international benchmarks is that in order to become successful internationally, or on the internationally defined spaces of New Zealand radio, New Zealand music must conform to styles, technologies, and values set by the powerful centres of musical production. Globalisation has been identified as creating a climate in which New Zealand music production is overwhelmed by international dominant particulars of production. In the late 1990s however, the manifestations of globalisation have produced avenues that potentially make it easier for New Zealand music to not just incorporate world trends, but to play a more active role in the international music industry.

**Using globalisation**

Attempts to stimulate the production of commercial New Zealand music, such as the strategies of New Zealand on Air, are aimed at New Zealand radio, and, through the Phase Four strategy, at international markets as well. To some extent, these are not

---
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significantly different strategies - the global ownership and influence in New Zealand radio mean it can be seen as an internationally defined local space. Whether struggling for airtime on New Zealand radio or for sales outside New Zealand, becoming successful means being able to compete with the products of far larger and wealthier music industries. Shifts in the late 1990s have potentially made it easier for New Zealanders to even the balance however, with lower airfares to Australia, the development of high quality home computer based recording facilities, the development of the internet, and an apparent shift in attitudes from record companies themselves.

New Zealand acts face limited budgets and fewer opportunities for access to the advanced production equipment or experience available to overseas acts. This can be a barrier to success within New Zealand, in terms of achieving the ‘international sound’ necessary for airplay on major radio networks. It is also a barrier to success overseas, with little money being available for the kind of promotion needed to break into big markets like the US. New Zealand on Air’s Phase Four strategy includes grants for international promotion of successful local acts, to be matched dollar for dollar by the record company responsible. This doubles the record company’s promotional budget for the act, and makes it far more possible for New Zealand acts to be promoted overseas. The costs are still very high, however, particularly if a band stays in the US to record with an American producer.

The relationship between local musical culture and the global industry entails a balance between local values and the requirements of the global culture industry. It can be expressed in the balance between the international sound and the local musical elements that make a piece of music stand out. The local music industry in turn is strongly influenced by shifts in the policies of the international music industry, making it vulnerable to decisions made at distant corporate levels. However, with intensifying globalisation has also come a proliferation of new opportunities for local music producers. Waves of cheap recording and playback technologies have hugely aided the dissemination and preservation of musical traditions, of which the Internet

---

The Internet is also having a major and still evolving impact on the global music industry. The rise of peer to peer music swapping systems like Napster has prompted the major labels to seek ways to limit, control, and profit from the alternative distribution lines offered by the Internet. New Zealand musicians have used the Internet as a means of circumventing the traditional channels of distribution through a host of individual band and general interest New Zealand music websites. However there is still very little money to be made through these channels for the artists, and international commercial success is still linked to the five major recording companies. The Internet has the potential to make a greater impact on global radio, as Brad King points out:

Now mostly if there are two bands on my desk I’ll definitely go for the kiwi one over the other one... why? Well, I suppose with the age of technology, we’re networking around the country, and it’s not going to be long I guess before some of the American stations are piped into New Zealand on the net. I mean the net’s playing a part in that now, if you get something like K-Rock coming into New Zealand in say five years’ time, a huge station coming out of...

the states coming over here, you’ve gotta have some sort of identity of your own and obviously New Zealand music is a biggie in that respect.  

Brad King identifies the need for broadcasters to differentiate themselves within a market that is also becoming more global. New Zealand music in this context becomes a means, not just for the country to express itself internationally, but for local radio stations competing within New Zealand to differentiate themselves from international competitors. In both cases, the processes and systems of globalisation are also the channels through which local cultural production is a necessary means of differentiation.

Globalisation can have positive implications for New Zealand music. Warner Music has demonstrated the ways in which they can operate locally and globally in New Zealand. For example, they have signed several local acts to labels in other countries that are part of the Warner stable. This allows the local branch to promote and ‘work’ the band as a local band, while taking advantage of the larger budgets and connections of bigger countries:

[Shihad and HLAH are] signed directly to Warner Music Australia so we still get to [handle] it but they get the bigger budget to [work with], which at this stage in their career makes sense. And the same with Anika Moa. James [Southgate, Managing Director, Warner Music New Zealand,] flew with Anika Moa as soon as he discovered her, straight to Atlantic Records, which is one of our labels and she’s signed direct there - it’s still one of our labels and we still get to work it.... Apart from OMC  

This process uses the transnational nature of the recording industry to increase chances of international success for local acts. At the same time, these strategies could undermine the ‘New Zealandness’ of those acts, their relationship with New Zealand, and reduce the possible influence of this context on the music. More measurably, this approach shifts not only the costs, but also the profits, of New Zealand music offshore.

---
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An alternative to releasing New Zealand acts on overseas subsidiaries of major labels is for those labels to invest more directly in local music. The proportion of New Zealand music on the airwaves is likely to be a reflection of the investment in New Zealand music by the international recording industry itself. The lack of airplay figures before 1997 and information on record company signings and investments means the relationship between the two are hard to quantify. Anecdotally, there seems to have been an increase in the numbers of local bands signing to major record companies alongside the increase in local music on the radio. Brendan Smyth of New Zealand on Air told the Listener in December 2001, that there was then “more investment by major record companies in New Zealand music than at any time I can remember in the 20 years I’ve worked in the industry.”

For Warner Music at least, this is a result of a shift in corporate policy deliberately aimed at ‘growing local repertoire’, elaborated by Grant Hislop:

The directive from Roger Ames [Chairman and CEO of the Warner Music Group] is that we need to stop relying on the US repertoire and the UK repertoire, it’s like a directive to find repertoire from elsewhere and it’s the first time there has been a directive like that in our company, which is very exciting for all.... I think also a realisation from a [artists and repertoire] perspective a year or two ago that they had to move forward and not rely on, continue to rely on the Eric Claptons of this world.

The reasoning behind in such a move is to source new global stars and trends, while recognising that local stars can be a sound investment: “the first Feelers record [Supersystem] sold 80 thousand units and the last Madonna record [Ray of Light] sold 32 thousand.” The Listener reports this as a trend across the industry, where New Zealand music has in general been selling better than the international repertoire, showing that the drive to stop relying on the US and UK could pay off for the major labels. The Listener quotes Sony Records New Zealand CEO Michael Glading: “We’re in a business which is probably in a considerable state of decline, and yet the one shining light is the fact that local repertoire - this is not just Sony but all companies - is showing some really good numbers.” The numbers suggest there is a strong desire within New Zealand to buy local music, and that investment in it by the recording industry can be successful.
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Described by Grant Hislop, the Warners tactic is to empower local A&R to create local stars rather than act purely as marketing for the products of the UK and US music industries. An emphasis on supporting the local rather than imposing the product of the UK or US appears to be a shift to the local rather than the global. However, the actual music supported still fits the ‘international sound’, which means there is a limited range of styles being promoted even locally in different territories. Grant Hislop agrees this limits the possibility of promoting New Zealand bands overseas, “at the current stage I think ... every territory has got their version of The Feelers, every territory has got their version of Stellar.”

Taking New Zealand bands into new territories means having to compete against the ‘local’ bands in those areas. David Brice illustrates this with regard to the US:

I think you could take Stellar into America and they’d be huge. But the point I think everybody misses is that it’s no easy entry into America. We think that’s the goal, to get a song there, but there’s how many other hundreds and thousands of Americans trying to do exactly the same thing and command attention. Which is so hard.

Competing in the international market requires a huge amount of money, facilities, skill, and influence, and the ultimate goal is to become successful in the US. However, a band has to have some special new quality to get noticed amongst the ‘hundreds and thousands’ of similar bands within a huge market like the US. From a promotional point of view a solution may be to create a sound that is unique, but has the kinds of production values that make it acceptable for international repertoire.

---
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The search for an internationally acceptable yet unique sound

Internationally, the most successful New Zealand song in recent years has been the Otara Millionaire’s Club single ‘How Bizarre’ - a Pacific flavoured slightly hip hop track that reached number one in several countries around the world and was very successful in the US in 1996. Obviously, the production quality met the requirements for commercial radio, and the single was well promoted internationally by its record company. Neither of these factors could fully explain its success, however, as they could apply to any number of singles. ‘How Bizarre’ was particularly successful because of its blending of hip hop and Pacific styles, producing a sound that was internationally recognisable and up to date, yet different and exotic enough to stand out and be interesting. The issue for New Zealand music in terms of international success seems to be to find a point of differentiation while conforming to ‘acceptable’ levels of production and style and not being simply a novelty act.

Developing local musics for an international market carries with it the danger of what Wallis and Malm term ‘mediatisation.’ This is characterised by the removal of local references from lyrics, and increasingly complex technology undermining the traditional live elements of the music. The de-politicisation of calypso lyrics in Trinidad and the elision of the difference between a DJ and a musician in reggae are examples of this process. In New Zealand, commercially successful bands may be criticised for sounding too ‘American’, for example, The Feelers. Brad King explains The Feelers’ success in terms of their production quality and style: “The whole thing with the Feelers when that [album] came out, was the American sound. It wasn’t the traditional kiwi thing, and they got bagged for it, by lots of people” The apparently ‘American’ sound displayed by The Feelers is difficult to quantify, but Brad King believes it lies in the production:

I think because production is a whole lot better these days, it’s really beefed up. I think that you could play some of these big bands that we’re playing in Australia or the States and the punters over there wouldn’t know the difference between an American band and the latest Zed

---

43 Ibid., p.242-3
44 Brad King, interview, September 2000.
King claims that The Feelers were thought to have an ‘American’ and ‘un-New Zealand’ sound, the ‘beefed up’ production style is more commonly associated with American rock bands than New Zealand acts, who continued to be associated with the ‘lo fidelity’ sound of the ‘Dunedin sound’. King believes this bigger ‘American’ sound to be a positive thing in terms of gaining airplay and recognition in the US or Australia, and certainly more representative of the international sound. He is careful however, to assert that there is still a local feel to the music - the differentiating, or Americanising, factor is the ‘quality.’ The balance is also recognised by Roy Shuker, who writes that “there may be a chicken and egg argument at work here, with New Zealand bands historically recognising that they will not gain airplay unless they sound like their overseas counterparts, and imitation stifling the development of a more distinctively local sound.”46 While straightforward imitation may prevent a distinctive local sound emerging, the patterns of hybridisation in much New Zealand music retain the possibility of a local sound emerging.

The secret to international, or even local, success as illustrated by the Otara Millionaires’ Club is to be similar but different. In the local industry too, local versions of overseas trends can be successful, where their localness provides the point of difference that marks them out from the rest. Grant Hislop suggests that for record companies, the local angle can be an important selling point:

> We’re in marketing, that’s what we do, we’re a marketing company and if you’re in marketing and somebody comes out with something that fills a spot in the market then you’ll try and match that. If there’s a market there you’ll try and find something that fits it. But you’ll also want to be the person that comes out with that first.... [Like,] there’s no male pop act at the moment, there’s no guy doing it here, and really we’re being furnished with stuff from overseas in that genre, and I think there’s no angle on [international male pop acts], cause we’re up against Ronan Keating and all that ... and there’s guys, I’ve had three guys last week who all fit the bill, they’ve got a bit of Robbie [Williams], they’ve all written songs that could stack up... [and] I’d rather do that than import one.47

As Grant Hislop describes it, the music industry is built on ‘versions’ of acts - a system whereby there are acts that are acceptable yet unique enough to be different
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and successful, and then there are the acts that follow on and cash in on that success. He also shows that record companies can actively seek out artists who fit within a certain genre to fill a gap in their market share.

It is not enough to simply copy other acts. As a radio programmer, David Brice indicates people are wary of New Zealand acts sounding too much like copies of overseas ones, pointing out that to be successful means having an unique variation on the current theme:

It’s having your own unique style that doesn’t sound too much like anybody else. And that’s an issue I think a lot of our South Auckland music has, they’re just copying LA hip hop. They haven’t really begun to overlay a unique NZ flavour to it.\(^{48}\)

While many would take issue with the claim that South Auckland hip hoppers have not yet found their own voice, David Brice is echoed by Martin Durrant of the Ministry for Culture and Heritage:

Certainly at the critical, the music journalism level, it’s hard to get much attention if you sound exactly like the local product.... I mean that the people who arouse interest in new bands and so forth are looking for something that does have a different identity, that isn’t just coals to Newcastle.\(^{49}\)

Campbell Smith, manager of successful New Zealand pop singer Bic Runga reinforces this view, pointing out that in the week in which Columbia Records released Runga’s album *Drive* in the US, “they also released seven other records... and they do that every week. It’s very easy to fall through the cracks.”\(^{50}\) Smith believes the way to avoid falling through those cracks is to invest heavily in “international quality” production, “making the product as good as it possibly can be”, while ensuring the music still stands out from the rest of the global industry. Smith says New Zealand must avoid making “music that the rest of the world is making because we think that is what works. The rest of the world has that covered. We have a point of difference and we should work that.”\(^{51}\)
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The important balance seems to be between the internationally accepted style and production standard, and a unique sound that arouses interest and has an interesting angle for marketing by the record company.

**Conclusion**

New Zealand music is strongly influenced by the international music industry, from the ownership structures of the major broadcasting and recording corporations, to the production qualities privileged for radio airplay. Becoming successful locally or internationally requires musicians to fulfil some of the expectations of the international music industry. The process of globalisation has, on the one hand, led to this overwhelming dominance of international standards and influences in musical production. It has also, however, opened up possibilities for New Zealand music to step out into the world industry, taking advantage of cheap airfares, recording technologies, and the multinational structure of the record companies themselves.

Access to international expertise and production technology means New Zealand music can better compete with the international repertoire set by the centres of musical production. Achieving this, however, risks undermining the distinctive qualities in locally produced music, and make radio airplay a very token gesture. The sophisticated production techniques demanded by the international sound represent a very different approach to music making than the one that defined the ‘lo-tech’ Dunedin sound, one which can be thought of as a more ‘American’ style of production - epitomised by the ‘beefed up’ sound of the Feelers. This perception echoes Negus’ description of the international sound as defined by ‘Anglo-American’ artists. As the expression of the music industry’s ‘dominant particular’ it is perhaps inevitable that it will be associated with an ‘American’ style. This does imply a culturally imperialist structure within the industry, however, the broader flows of information, people, technology and influences seems to be offering New Zealand music a chance to utilise globalisation and balance out its relationship with the global industry.
The dominance of the international sound leaves the New Zealand music industry with little choice but to favour this kind of style over the ‘traditional’ New Zealand approach, if international success is to be achieved. However, it seems clear that while New Zealand versions of internationally successful acts may be successful within New Zealand, to ‘make it’ internationally requires being different from the mass of other acts attempting the same thing. The marketing edge will be achieved by standing apart from the crowd. New Zealand’s attempt to develop a local musical style that conforms to the international sound enough to be accepted, but maintains an element of ‘localness’, could represent a significant level of resistance to the potentially homogenising tendencies of globalisation. The next chapter will explore the extent to which the ‘local’ is expressed in New Zealand music, and the relationship it may have to national identity. The question is, what is the ‘point of difference’ Campbell Smith refers to in New Zealand music, and how does it relate to or express ‘New Zealand’?
Chapter 6
People and Place

Economic policies of the late 1980s and 1990s have intensified New Zealand’s exposure to globalisation, and, as in other countries, this has prompted concerns about protecting national cultural identity. Chapters four and five outlined the influence of global forces in the New Zealand music and broadcasting industries, and discussed the way government policy both encouraged and mediated these influences. Broadcasting is a site of particular tensions between the global and the local, as an internationally defined industry operating in relationship with local communities. This chapter explores the broadcasting of New Zealand popular music, and the role local music on radio may play in relation to New Zealand cultural identity. It also draws together a number of themes pursued in this thesis particularly issues relating to the interaction between broadcasting, the music industry and the State in the support and promotion of music that is both local and global.

Measures of support for local content in broadcasting are often framed in terms of their benefits for national identities. Quotas have been adopted with the declared intention of developing and promoting cultural identity by several countries including Australia, South Africa and Canada. Canada has been restricting foreign programmes since 1959, guarding against the cultural impact of the neighbouring United States through a broadcasting culture charged with promoting Canadian identity.¹ The Australian Broadcasters’ Association Code of Practice describes fulfilling their quota as promoting “the role of broadcasting services in developing and reflecting a sense of Australian identity, character and cultural diversity, by prescribing minimum content levels of Australian music.”² The code of practice approach followed by Australia and now New Zealand forms a kind of middle way between voicing support and actually legislating for local content - it avoids legislation but establishes a commitment to increased local production in broadcasting. The national identity argument informs

both the Canadian and Australian examples. It is also contained in the language used to explain the need for local content in New Zealand broadcasting, and the promotion of local musical and cultural production.

The dominance on commercial radio of ‘international repertoire’ as the standard against which local music is measured generates questions about whether commercially successful New Zealand music can be a truly ‘local’ music. It seems that success - even getting airplay on New Zealand radio - requires having a sound that is consistent with international trends. However, New Zealand popular music can be read as a process of negotiating the global and the local, particularly if we take into account Shuker and Pickering’s observation that “[p]opular culture in any localised sense is today a hybridisation of symbolic forms and practices.” The symbolic forms and practices of popular music largely consist of the global trends and influences embodied in the international repertoire, but there is scope for local influences, and the emergence of hybrid forms that span both the global and the local. As described in chapter five, New Zealand music’s strongest chance of achieving international, and even local, success rests on creating a sound that conforms sufficiently to international norms of production and style to receive airplay and support, but cultivates enough ‘difference’ to stand out from other musical products. That point of difference retains a discourse of national identity even within an international style. This process illustrates a practical engagement with the issues of localisation as a response to globalisation, and the ways in which a hybrid identity can seek to resolve the global-local dialectic.

Analysing the relationship between music and place, Keith Negus rejects the idea that music acts as a ‘mirror’ of society. Negus locates music instead in the network of relationships and meanings that arise from its origin in a society: “music is created, circulated, recognised and responded to according to a range of conceptual assumptions and analytical activities that are grounded in quite particular processes.

---

and cultural activities.” As an analysis of music’s role in national identity, this allows for more than the examination of style and lyric content, and avoids essentialist definitions of musical styles and national character. Essentialism is a difficult thing to avoid entirely however - even as Brendan Smyth of New Zealand on Air celebrates the hybridity of New Zealand music, he identifies its peculiarly New Zealand character: “It will always be New Zealand music because it is filtered through New Zealand experiences.” To attempt to define New Zealand experiences could risk essentialism, however the concept broadly reflects Keith Negus’ idea of music’s creation, circulation, recognition and response. Smyth’s definition ultimately locates the local characteristics of New Zealand music in the social processes that surround its creation and consumption. At base, this kind of definition is shared by official discussions of New Zealand identity, rejecting essentialism, and allowing for change and growth in recognition of the hybridity of identity.

This chapter argues that New Zealand music is an inherently hybrid form, developed from a continual interplay of influences from within New Zealand, with globalising and imperialist forces. Official attempts to define New Zealand music tend to recognise this, avoiding definitions of New Zealand music based on stylistic considerations, or an expression of ‘New Zealandness’. In the course of this chapter, discourses of national identity that are deployed in arguments for music quotas and the necessity of increasing government support for local music in other ways, will be examined. The possibilities for national identity that emerge from this will return to the work of Benedict Anderson to explore the role of local popular music and in particular, radio, in the national community. The chapter begins with an attempt to answer two questions: how ‘New Zealand’ is New Zealand popular music, and what claims to local identity can coexist with the ‘international sound’?

---

Roy Shuker contends that New Zealand pop music contains few markers of New Zealand identity, with local groups simply producing their own versions of overseas styles. He questions the ‘New Zealandness’ of this music, and, along with Geoff Lealand, regards New Zealand popular music as simply derivative. Brendan Smyth at New Zealand on Air however, celebrates this derivativeness, regarding the New Zealand music industry as a creative scene of hybridity and openness, out of which uniquely New Zealand sounds emerge. The March 2002 Code Of Practice for New Zealand Music Content in Radio Broadcasting has chosen not to define the essential elements of New Zealand music, regarding it instead as music made by “artists who would normally be regarded as "New Zealanders"”.6 By choosing not to define New Zealand music as any particular style, rather as the product of ‘New Zealanders’ (including “non-New Zealand born artists who could reasonably be described as New Zealand based and whose music plays regularly in New Zealand”),7 the Code avoids imposing a preconceived stylistic notion of what New Zealand music is. In this way the Code provides a strategy for continuing to incorporate acts that succeed outside New Zealand in the category of New Zealand music, regardless of whether there is any explicit connection between their music and this particular national context.

A search for direct representations of place through music informs Roy Shuker’s attempt to define the ways in which national identity may be expressed in popular music. With Michael Pickering, he concludes there is little specifically ‘New Zealand’ about locally produced pop music under this framework:

Firstly, there may be an immediate local association through the band’s name, and the band’s or performer’s song lyrics content; this association may extend to a distinctively local vocabulary. Secondly, there may be a specifically local accent or vocal inflection in the pronunciation of the words of a song. Finally, the general style or idiom of the music may be locally based, as has been claimed for the so-called ‘Dunedin sound’ associated with the Flying Nun record label.8
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Shuker and Pickering consider that few New Zealand bands or performers fulfil these criteria, concluding that even “stylistically, it is often a case of New Zealand performers producing local versions of overseas genres and idioms.” Shuker and Pickering regard the Dunedin sound for example, as simply a version of English alternative bands and the Velvet Underground, an association discussed in chapter two. That New Zealand music is ‘derivative’ is Geoff Lealand’s central argument in discussing the relationship between New Zealand popular culture and American popular culture:

Simply put, all New Zealand music (from classical to country and western) is derivative. It borrows from abroad; expanding on imported influences, denying them, and then re-embracing them. Styles, themes and sounds are all borrowed; consequently New Zealand-produced music is governed by universal, or international sounds and rhythms.

Borrowed styles, themes and sounds are necessary if New Zealand music is to be successful within the ‘international repertoire’ that governs the global recording and broadcasting industries. However, Brendan Smyth at New Zealand on Air is careful to emphasise the view that in choosing music to fund and support, the issue is not where influences come from, but what musicians do with them.

As a funding body, New Zealand on Air pragmatically tries to avoid becoming too involved in attempting to define an essential New Zealand flavour in locally produced music. Brendan Smyth describes the agency’s attitude as ‘very utilitarian’ in defining what constitutes ‘New Zealand music’ and its implications for musicians:

I go back to what I consider to be a very empowering definition of New Zealand music which is that New Zealand music is music made by New Zealanders, which means that the artist will choose, basically, and the music that they make will inevitably have a New Zealand complexion to it, because of the way it is processed internally. I guess you could say on a continuum that there are degrees of authenticity, or actually I’d put it a different way, I wouldn’t say degrees of authenticity, I’d say degrees of borrowing, or reflection and it may be that at one extreme is Deep Obsession sounding very Europop, and at the other degree is the Verlaines sounding very Velvet Underground.
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Smyth considers all pop music to be derivative, and that this in part is where the creativity and dynamic nature of popular music comes from:

I go back to 1964 when we all listened to the Beatles, and we all combed our hair down [like them], and it’s the same today - we are part of a global village and New Zealand music is as susceptible to fashion and trends as it was in 1964. It hasn’t changed; like Murray Cammick says, Dunedin in 1980 was The Velvet Underground. So you know, [you’ve got to] choose your influences from the galaxy of influences out there - the Beatles were a covers band, they played old Tamla Motown songs. The Rolling Stones were a covers band - they played old Muddy Waters songs, and so on. Most bands are a product of a complex mesh of influences, and that’s what’s so wonderful about pop music I think is that it’s constantly borrowing, constantly inventing and so on.  

This definition of New Zealand music is very accepting of borrowing and derivation as aspects of a ‘national’ sound. Picking and choosing influences can be a creative process in itself, and borrowing and inventing are not seen as mutually exclusive.

Brendan Smyth celebrates the idea that overseas influences can be adopted by New Zealanders and turned into something unique:

There’s a great story about I think it was ‘Hip Hop Holiday’, one of those songs, where people were like, ‘it’s a clone, its straight off the streets of New York, but wait a minute, what’s that? It’s a ukulele; wait a minute, where did that come from? It could never have come off the streets of New York.’ And that’s the wonderful thing about merging and melding and recreating and so on. Smyth describes a process whereby a hip hop sound, which emerged on the streets of New York, was turned into something closer to a New Zealand sound. The song itself was a hip hop reworking of an 1978 reggae song by 10cc, ‘Dreadlock Holiday’, which South Auckland group Three the Hard Way turned into a celebration of a very Pacific and reggae-influenced hip hop. The ukulele sound Brendan notes may have been in a different song, but ‘Hip Hop Holiday’ is interesting for not containing even that degree of direct Pacific reference. 10cc were a white rock band from Manchester, England, singing a reggae-influenced song about holidaying in Jamaica. Three the Hard Way’s version represents an intersection of New Zealand’s white English rock tradition, with the New York sound of hip hop, and a reggae inspired style with a ‘ragamuffin’ vocal break, all sung (or rapped) in very strongly New Zealand accents. The apparently American genre was embraced by the joyful chorus “we don’t like
Hip Hop, we love it”. It was possibly the first New Zealand produced hip hop track to reach number one in the singles charts, where it remained for three weeks in 1993, also charting in Australia. The level of borrowing involved in a song like ‘Hip Hop Holiday’ demonstrates New Zealand on Air’s belief in this hybridisation as a valid expression of New Zealand identity in music, representing a creative dialogue between international styles and genres and features which are very much a part of New Zealand culture.

The process of borrowing and hybridisation can be traced back to the very early days of colonisation, and the meeting of the musical cultures of Maori and Pakeha. According to Gordon Spittle, the first hymn books with Maori lyrics were published in Sydney in 1827, while music was widely used by missionaries as part of the conversion ritual, so that “‘Maori began to familiarise themselves with Western music, principally from psalms and hymn tunes.’”17 Settlers brought with them a huge array of instruments, and by the first world war Maori composers were using European tunes as the basis for song writing: “Several influential Maori songs would emerge in the new century, as part of a wartime ‘action song’ vogue for adopting foreign melodies from dance hall polkas and waltzes, and adapting Maori lyrics about traditional themes such as love, lullabies, and marae life.”18 European instruments were also adopted quickly by Maori concert groups.

Princess Te Puea’s forty-four-member troupe and concert party in 1923 included a string band with steel guitars, mandolins, banjos and ukuleles. Inspired by Pacific Island performers visiting Ngaruawahia, the first half of their programme introduced Maori haka and poi items followed after the interval by instrumentals, comedy and Hawaiian dancing…. By the late 1940s, guitars accompanied the more mobile Maori concert parties, reaching audiences in hotels and tourist centres. Hoopii [native American]-inspired homemade lapsteels appeared from Auckland to Dunedin.19

The adoption of European-style instruments, the cross pollination of lyric-themes and tunes between Maori and settler song writing, and musical traditions from across the
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Pacific, and the adoption of concert styles from Pacific Island groups are representative of the processes of hybridisation and adaptation within New Zealand musical development. These are also the processes apparent in the Velvet Underground influenced ‘Dunedin sound’ of the early 1980s, in contemporary hip hop, and in more directly chart oriented ‘hit’ groups. Hybridisation is therefore a somewhat ‘traditional’ aspect of New Zealand popular music, one that has fed into the development of uniquely New Zealand styles such as the Maori concert party, and ‘Dunedin music’. These local forms are hybrids that have emerged out of interactions with ‘foreign’ influences, whose arrival is a result of globalisation.

The argument that New Zealand music is derivative is not inconsistent with the possibility of a distinctly New Zealand sound being the hybrid product that Shuker and Pickering observe comprises local popular cultures today. The only way for New Zealand music to become successful internationally and on New Zealand radio is to embrace the absorption of foreign musical styles, but create something new and unique from them. For debates about music quotas and local content, it is New Zealand music on radio that plays the important role in national identity.

**Discourses of national identity**

The Radio Broadcasters’ Association March 2002 Code Of Practice For New Zealand Music Content in Radio Broadcasting defines New Zealand music as basically just music made by New Zealanders. Brendan Smyth at New Zealand on Air shares this view in allocating funding and support to musicians, judging songs on their likelihood of achieving radio airplay rather than any stylistic references to New Zealand. Creative New Zealand, on the other hand, focuses specifically on the local when allocating funding for more ‘artistic’ oriented music. CNZ’s music funding guidelines require that work submitted for consideration “‘speaks of this country and is not
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highly derivative of USA and European ‘sounds’.” This funding programme is not focused on commercial radio airplay, and music submitted under these guidelines is not aimed at the global music industry (at least, the five multinational recording companies), or its New Zealand branches. New Zealand on Air’s funding programme does engage directly with the demands of the global music industry, and so focuses on music that will be accepted by the industry, regardless of its relationship with New Zealand, or its level of ‘derivativeness’. However, one of New Zealand on Air’s primary functions is “to reflect and develop New Zealand identity and culture”; it simply does not do this through the cultivation of local music itself. The aim of the agency is specifically to get more New Zealand content, including music, ‘on air’, so it is in the act of broadcasting local content that the commitment to ‘New Zealand identity and culture’ lies. For discussion of local content then, the question is not how New Zealand music reflects a sense of New Zealand identity, rather it is, how does broadcasting New Zealand music locate it in “particular processes and cultural activities” that are themselves engaged with New Zealand identity?

Like the need for differentiation within the scope of the international sound, discussion of national identity inevitably involves attention to what differentiates national communities. The role of globalisation and its associated degree of exposure to other cultures, even the threat of homogeneity it carries, can be used specifically to emphasise the importance of the national community. The Ministry for Culture and Heritage’s 1999 document Government’s Role in the Cultural Sector: a survey of the issues examines this:

> Whether in trade, tourism or in everyday life, it is those things in which we excel, or which are uniquely of New Zealand, that set us apart from other countries and make us what we are. Much of what makes us unique comes from our cultural heritage and our achievement in the arts. In the information age and the global economy, where so much of our life is dominated by influences from outside New Zealand, the need to nurture and maintain our own cultural
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heritage and realise our potential is becoming increasingly important. From this activity, distinct forms of identity are preserved, and new ones allowed to develop. Globalisation is constructed here as a threat to national identity, bringing influences from ‘outside’. But it seems as though the process of recognising what ‘sets us apart’ requires engaging with outside influences in order to differentiate between them, and us. The regard for ‘our own cultural heritage’ refers us to the past and tradition, while ‘realising our potential’ and allowing new forms of identity to develop engages with the future. By referring at the start to trade and tourism, the Ministry also implies that there is economic advantage in excelling and being ‘unique.’

Government’s Role in the Cultural Sector acknowledges the impact of external influences on New Zealand culture in the ‘information age and global economy’, while asserting the possibility of the local distinctiveness. The agendas of the paper are similar to those discussed by John Tomlinson in his reflections on Martin Jacques’ expression of the drive to localisation discussed in chapter three. Jacques identified that as “Power” becomes more diffuse and operates at a level beyond that of the nation state, “so there is a countervailing pressure, whose roots are various, for it to move downwards”. This is the articulation of a new search for "identity and difference in the face of impersonal global forces, which is leading to the emergence of new national and ethnic demands.” Tomlinson’s discussion of this search for identity resonates with the desire for community expressed in government efforts to increase support for the arts, and in the Ministry’s paper. He articulates the scope of these initiatives directed at promoting local cultural production:

These demands seem to be occurring everywhere: in the First, Second and Third Worlds. Though expressed in the language of nationalism and ethnicity, these may be seen as simply the available categories in which people articulate a more general need. This is the need for viable communities of cultural judgement: for communities on a scale to which individuals can relate, and which can provide satisfying accounts of how and why we live as we live.

The national community expressed through cultural production, one that allows engagement with others and negotiation of the terms and values of the community
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seems to be the kind of community Tomlinson describes. It can allow individuals to relate through active engagement in its production, as well as through consumption of local products. It also seeks to represent and celebrate different life styles and patterns of behaviour.

New Zealand on Air’s slogan is “Promoting New Zealand culture and identity through broadcasting. Seeing ourselves, hearing ourselves.” The statement links broadcasting, culture and identity, and implies there is an ‘ourselves’ that may be seen and heard. Many similar statements may be found in the discussion over quotas, and in government arts funding announcements. These have been quoted elsewhere in this thesis, but it is worthwhile to remember them again here. The Green Ribbon Trust argues, “our stories, faces, voices and music are an important part of our cultural identity.” The New Zealand Labour Party used similar language in their September 1999 Broadcasting policy document Broadcasting - it’s about us. This document stresses the importance of children and adults hearing New Zealand stories and faces and engaging with voices that speak with New Zealand accents. Broadcasting ‘the local’ was seen as integral to sustaining a distinctive ‘cultural identity’. Touching on the impact of globalisation, this document explicitly links local content and cultural identity, reflecting Negus’ claim that local content represents a “struggle for cultural autonomy.” The importance of New Zealand faces, stories and voices is claimed again, and the argument is focused on recognition. The relationship between local content and identity posited in these statements is based on seeing and hearing familiar kinds of people with whom New Zealanders may identify.

There is a danger in governments attempting to define the ingredients of national identity. Indeed, the idea of ‘seeing ourselves, hearing ourselves’ communicates a sense of similarities that could erode the actual differences within New Zealand. This has been articulated in terms of the development of ‘social cohesion’ through cultural production, as suggested in the Government’s Role in the Cultural Sector:
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Government’s investment in cultural activity contributes to its goal of achieving social cohesion in the fullest sense, not simply by binding the nation together, but by ensuring that it has the capacity to examine its past, to grow and to change.34 This statement constructs a fictive unity of ‘social cohesion’ recalling Claudia Bell’s warning of the regressive and repressive possibilities of concepts of ‘national identity’ discussed in chapter two.35 Government involvement with definitions of national culture is fraught with possibilities for political manipulation, in deciding who is to be bound together within the nation, and with what kinds of controls and restrictions on dissidence. However, the Ministry of Culture and Heritage’s concept of social cohesion attempts to recognise that nationhood and national identity are not fixed, but constantly in flux. At the least, this concept of the role of cultural production in shaping national identities attempts to avoid imposing a rigid definition of national identity. It echoes the refusal by New Zealand on Air, and the Radio Broadcasters Association code of practice for local music broadcasting, to define New Zealand music stylistically, and leaves room for development and discussion - “the capacity to examine its past, to grow and to change”36

‘Seeing ourselves’ and ‘hearing ourselves’ through broadcasting requires a sense of recognition. There are many grounds on which one could identify with another person (their face, voice, story) in the media, based on similarities in appearance, a way of speaking, or aspects of life history. The discourses used by New Zealand on Air, the Green Ribbon Trust and the Labour Party privilege this sense, framing cultural and national identity as a result of shared experiences, accents, facial features, and a landscape that is familiar to all. New Zealanders represented in the media are assumed to be at least partially familiar in this way to each New Zealander watching or listening. For each person in this audience, imagined fellow audience members constitute a community, a relationship that is consistent with Benedict Anderson’s notion of the imagined national community discussed in chapter two. Anderson argues that national communities are inevitably imagined because their members will never meet yet are sure of each other’s existence, while believing themselves to be

linked and bounded within specific borders. Anderson addresses the role of novels in particular in the formulation of imagined national communities, and cultural products more generally are considered in this sense in *Government’s Role in the Cultural Sector*:

The creative and intellectual potential released by cultural activity produces resources enjoyed by the nation as a whole: its stock of ideas, its ability to examine itself critically, the images and narratives that it holds and enjoys in common, the material and intangible riches that make up its cultural heritage. Cultural activity is regarded here as supplying the tools required for imagining the national community, a source of recognition and a vehicle for questioning and engaging with New Zealand society.

This stock of tools needs to be accessible to the people however, if it is to be a useful part of the national community. This is where the mass media become important. Consideration of local content levels on television has led New Zealand on Air to conduct research into the role of local content. Aspects of this research are important here, such as a viewer survey carried out by CM Research in 1998, the *Radio and Television Programming Market Research Report*. New Zealand on Air concluded from this report that:

Radio and television both play important roles in New Zealanders’ lives. They provide people with entertainment, a sense of connection with others, distraction, and the ability to keep informed about national and international news and share in historical moments and events. The survey’s findings suggest that, apart from the obvious roles of entertainment and information (and distraction), radio and television are important for providing a ‘sense of connection with others’, and the ability for viewers/listeners to ‘share in historical moments and events’. Both of these roles are identified as necessary for creating a sense of community between members of the audience, separate from the content itself. The community evoked is very much an imagined one, particularly in the case of radio, where there are no visual cues to the identity of the presenter.
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Connecting people

Radio is often characterised as an ‘intimate’ medium, as this observation from Jenny Abramsky, the BBC’s director of radio and music, illustrates. Commenting on the increase in radio audience figures in the UK by the beginning of 2002, Abramsky attributes the continued popularity of radio to its intimate relationship with the listener. “It is a very personal relationship, it gets under your skin. I’ve always believed that people feel quite passionate about radio in a way they don't feel about television.”

The process of listening itself is explored by David Hendy, whose research supports the claim that radio ‘gets under your skin’. Hendy cites Susan Douglas’ work on the auditory power of radio and her arguments about the three ways that radio’s aurality works. First, Douglas identifies the ways in which radio stimulates the imagination, as its lack of pictures engenders a strong emotional attachment to the medium. Secondly, Douglas considers the connection between listening to music and the stimulation of the limbic system, “the part of the brain from which we derive emotions and memory.” Pleasure is derived from the associations and mental states stimulated by hearing certain pieces or types of music. Douglas argues that this pleasure is increased by the familiarity of music, and so radio’s tendency to programme familiar music itself stimulates this effect. Thirdly, Douglas focuses on the social aspects of listening and asserts that sound “envelopes us, pouring into us, whether we want it to or not, including us, involving us”. Hendy suggests that this makes listening “a more inherently sociable act than reading about others, or even watching others”, especially if this involves listening together with others at the same time.

The intimacy of radio lies in the power of sound to ‘get under your skin’, or pour into, include, involve or envelope us - Douglas’ description is very personally involving. The important difference between radio and other sources of sound, such as one’s
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own private music collection, lies in the temporal space of radio itself. David Hendy points out that people tend to listen to the radio alone, but

we are also somehow aware of others elsewhere, listening to the same words or music at precisely the same time as us. Since this auditory experience is live - and therefore fleeting, perishable, immediate, it encourages a concentration on the present… Radio thus ties together utterly diverse and unknown people ‘by the most gossamer connections’, to create not just a mass of individual listeners, but an audience with some sense of community.\(^45\)

The simultaneity of listeners’ experiences of radio, the shared experience of something at the moment it existed, in a medium that is completely temporal, is enough to create a community of listeners, an audience who can feel they shared something. This audience community can only ever be imagined, as Hendy points out, “[s]hared experience can, of course, be more illusory than real: other listeners, like the radio presenters themselves... have to be imagined into being.”\(^46\)

Hendy supports the view that radio is an intimate medium, citing Douglas’ work to illustrate how active and internal the act of listening is - reaching into the listener’s head and stimulating the brain’s emotions and associations. Hendy also points to the paradox of radio in combining the intensely personal, internal experience of listening, with the external experience of opening a ‘window’ on the world ‘outside’ and the construction of an imagined community of listeners: “It prompts us to explore our innermost thoughts and memories, but it also takes us out of ourselves.”\(^47\) Stating that “the overriding characteristic of radio seems to be its ability to make us aware of other listeners”\(^48\), Hendy considers this community to relate not so much to the nation or a locality, but simply the community of other radio listeners. Format radio’s fragmentation and globalisation means these listening communities will have less to do with geographical areas, and instead comprise geographically dispersed interest groups. Depending on the radio station in New Zealand, this community of listeners may be very localised (in the case of low powered transmitter community radio, or b.net radio) or spread over considerable amounts of the country in the case of increasingly networked commercial stations, or even very nearly the whole country in the case of the public AM networks (like the National Programme). Claudia Bell has

\(^{45}\) Ibid., pp.120-1. Italics in original.  
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suggested that the development of radio in New Zealand fostered “the idea of an identity as a shared set of values and our individual part in something larger, the national community”. Surveying the issues surrounding local content, predominantly on television, the Ministry for Culture and Heritage also recognise this role of broadcasting, which they describe as television and radio’s “infrastructural ability to embrace the nation”.

The networking of commercial stations is changing the New Zealand radio environment from one based on predominantly local stations (both before and immediately after deregulation), to one of national broadcasters. In effect, this trend means shifting the New Zealand radio listener’s community of fellow listeners from a local to a national community. The impact of local content in this context can only reinforce the sense of a national community. Brad King reflects on this, noting the response to local bands from both concertgoers and radio listeners:

It certainly gives people warm fuzzies to know that a band is from New Zealand or they grew up with a band and it’s from their particular area. I know Zed did that gig in Christchurch recently and got six thousand people, because they come from Christchurch and everyone does go out and supports them and everyone gets that warm fuzzy feeling. Same with, we play bands from New Plymouth, give them spot plays and that, and you get a lot of people from Taranaki ringing up and saying ‘oh its about time you guys started playing that, they’re one of my favourite bands and we go and see them every Friday night.’

Brad King’s observation conflates the experience of seeing a local band play live with hearing them on the radio, as a shared listening experience. His account also highlights the ways in which listeners may make connections between the local and the national.

Radio is able to facilitate a sense of community amongst its listeners, through the awareness on the part of each that there are others listening. As commercial radio stations become increasingly networked, this community of listeners is for many people shifting from a regional or local community to a national one. In this context, the broadcasting of local content increases in significance, as listeners’ sense of
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community expands to incorporate the musicians themselves, and the recognition of a shared cultural identity.

**Conclusion**

New Zealand music is a product of globalisation and hybridity, conforming to trends in the international music industry, and containing few specific markers of New Zealand identity. While seemingly undermining the claims to localness and calls for increasing local music content on radio, this fact is seen as ‘liberating’ by New Zealand on Air. Defining New Zealand music as music made by New Zealanders recognises the inherently hybrid nature of pop music. New Zealand on Air chooses to allow New Zealand music to embrace this hybridity rather than seek to control the style of music they fund. Of course, the music is controlled by the commercial radio programmers who assess it for airplay, and the global music industry within which local music must compete. Styles of music that are to be successful within New Zealand or the global music industry are therefore highly controlled by the global industry and its ‘international repertoire’.

The hybridity and vulnerability of New Zealand music reflects the country’s position in the world market. National identity is considered by theorists like Benedict Anderson and Edward Said as a fluid process, a constantly shifting and evolving concept. In not pinning New Zealand music down to any particular styles or approaches, New Zealand on Air and the Radio Broadcasters Association effectively allow the music to evolve in the fluid and hybrid way Anderson and others suggest is characteristic of ‘the nation’. Brendan Smyth uses the phrase ‘New Zealand experiences’, reflecting an assumption that there are specifically ‘New Zealand’ experiences through which music may be filtered. This belief that there are experiences common, or at least recognisable, to New Zealanders informs other phrases used by New Zealand on Air, the Green Ribbon Trust, and the New Zealand Labour Party. It is implied in statements about *our* faces, voices, selves and stories. Fundamentally these concepts demonstrate a role for New Zealand content in  
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providing the tools used to imagine the national community, communicated through the media, and in particular through radio.

The issue with respect to local content on radio is not simply how the music itself communicates a sense of the local, but how hearing it on the radio contributes to listeners’ sense of place. Following David Hendy, I have argued that radio is both an internal and an external mechanism. It combines the intimacy of sound itself with the possible construction of a sense of community (connection, shared experiences) among listeners. Local content can stimulate this sense of connection. The recognition of a voice, face (through knowledge of what the person singing or playing looks like), hybrid style, or some other marker of New Zealandness may be extended to a sense that the pleasures of recognition are shared with a listening community. It is radio’s ability to facilitate this sense of shared (imagined) community that makes the broadcasting of local content on commercial radio significant. Ensuring airtime for the local in the globally influenced spaces of New Zealand radio bridges the global and local, and facilitates connections between local audiences and communities. New Zealand broadcasting is embarking on the implementation of a Code of Practice that should result in some improvement in airtime on commercial radio of New Zealand music. This voluntary code is an assertion of the significance of place and it draws broadcasters into the agenda of tackling important social issues through engagement with issues of national identity.
Chapter 7
Conclusion

The process of deregulation, and the discussion of airplay for New Zealand music, illustrate a debate over government control in the broadcasting industry that mirrors broader political and economic issues in New Zealand as a whole. Since the late 1980s there has been an active campaign calling for the government to ensure local content through establishing the regulatory framework for a compulsory quota. The nonregulatory path chosen by the State until very recently has been to fund New Zealand on Air and in this way have an influence on the local content of radio through non-legislative means. Charged with increasing local content in broadcasting, New Zealand on Air has developed a variety of funding schemes for local musicians, and promotion and encouragement schemes for commercial radio broadcasters themselves. I have argued that the strategies of New Zealand on Air and the ongoing debate over local content quotas have significantly contributed to the increase in New Zealand content on commercial radio that has occurred between 1997 and the beginning of 2002. The deregulation of the industry is an aspect of New Zealand’s transition into the increasingly globalised world economy, while the work of New Zealand on Air, and the new Code of Practice for New Zealand Content in Broadcasting it has facilitated, represent State efforts to maintain a degree of autonomy in the global culture industry.

The global nature of the broadcasting and recording industries is illustrated by the extensive concentration of ownership of local record companies and radio stations in the hands of just a few multinational corporations. In New Zealand, the five major record companies are simply branch offices within larger ‘territories’ for their parent corporations. For radio, the removal of restrictions on overseas ownership has lead to a huge consolidation of stations and the domination of just two internationally owned major networks. The music industry in New Zealand is effectively controlled by global interests and this creates a highly international space within which local music must compete. In order to receive airplay in this environment, local music has needed
to fulfil certain requirements. Of particular importance that been the need to conform to the ‘international sound’ that shapes the global hits on New Zealand radio. This is a sound shaped by sophisticated recording techniques and an awareness of international trends and current styles. For some people this represents a challenge to ‘traditional’ New Zealand music. Conformity with these requirements has brought accusations of an ‘American’ sound, which Brad King indicated was the response to the Feelers when they first became successful.¹ Their success with this sound, receiving significant airplay on commercial radio as well as sales,² implies that this form of internationalism is well received by a public and a music industry familiar with the standards of global artists.

Success in the global music industry, including the internationally shaped space of New Zealand commercial radio, requires embracing this international sound, at least to some degree, risking what poet Allen Curnow, describing early New Zealand literature, regarded as an ‘arid internationalism’.³ Curnow called for the development of a ‘New Zealand referent’ through which local literature could express its own identity, one that is separate and different from the English tradition from which it emerged.⁴ These sentiments are relevant in commercially oriented music and radio, however, the structure of the industry means that ‘arid internationalism’ cannot be rejected outright. The New Zealand referent in pop music needs to sit alongside, or be integrated into, the international, in fact, this is essential to create the kind of market differentiation needed to achieve significant success. Arguably, the development of a successful local industry that is able to invest in the kinds of technology and expertise demanded by the international sound, could itself help to foster a New Zealand referent. Having money, support and the knowledge of possible success may allow enough growth in the industry to develop something unique. New Zealand remains isolated from the global industry, despite developments in communications technology and the flows of globalisation, an isolation that can itself contribute to the
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development of the ‘local’ as demonstrated in Jamaica and Dunedin.\(^5\) Defining ‘local’ New Zealand music is, however, problematic. Since the arrival of Europeans, music in New Zealand has been a product of hybridity,\(^6\) much like the nation itself.\(^7\) This makes the idea of an authenticity in the local misleading, disguising the extent to which cultures grow and develop out of interaction and engagement with each other.\(^8\)

New Zealand is a young and geographically dispersed country, and is still concerned with issues of identity, reflected in the discourses surrounding cultural production and local content used by the Green Ribbon Trust, the Labour Party, the Ministry for Culture and Heritage, and New Zealand on Air.\(^9\) Central to this argument for airtime is the contention that New Zealanders need to ‘see ourselves, and hear ourselves’ on television and radio,\(^10\) and that national identity is enhanced by being able to recognise New Zealand ‘faces, stories, landscapes’ through the media.\(^11\) In many ways, this is an argument for the kind of active audience Keith Negus and Colleen Roach describe:\(^12\) an audience actively engaging with the material and recognising local elements. Some of these may relate to lyrical content, accents, and musical referents,\(^13\) however in a small country like New Zealand, local knowledge may be a factor in itself - personal connections with musicians, or knowledge of their connections to specific locations. The greater accessibility of local performers compared with international acts is another important way in which local content may contribute to local identities.
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Local content plays a similar role in relation to national identities to that identified by Benedict Anderson for the novel and newspapers, in evoking and creating a sense of the imagined national community. Thomas Norcliffe and Claudia Bell have expanded on this in relation to the telegraph and media in New Zealand, where Bell asks of the media, “How else can a widely flung population have a sense of connectedness; of all being part of one whole, the nation?” Obviously, television is an important resource, but radio has specific characteristics that may exercise the active national audience in the imagining of community. The distinctive qualities of sound identified by Susan Douglas, and hence radio’s intimate, personal, imagination stimulating quality, may encourage and allow the development of a different kind of local than that evoked so easily on television by a few iconic and clichéd images. The community connected by radio is far more actively imagined than that of television. The structure of New Zealand radio is heavily influenced by globalisation, with the consolidation of previously local stations into national networks, as the global media corporations rationalise their assets. This process is turning people’s broadcasting communities from local into ‘national’ ones, while internet radio and other technologies may well expand this trend beyond national borders. Within this process, local content may play an important role as a tool for imagining, and a means of defining, the national within expanding media horizons.

Setting quotas for local content represents a “struggle for cultural autonomy” for national governments, an attempt to reduce the influence of globalisation on national cultures, and an attempt to reverse, or at least reduce, the flow of cultural material into the country from outside. There are mechanisms of globalisation that could make this difficult, however, as the global music corporations continue to set the standards local music must match in order to compete. Extra-national bodies, subscribed to by
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national governments themselves, could also obstruct this desire. New Zealand’s code of practice may or may not breach World Trade Organisation rulings, but it is conceivable that international trade agreements could ultimately have a significant effect on governments’ ability to protect local content. That governments should wish to protect local cultures however, illustrates the degree of imperialism remaining in the music industry, with its unequal access to the means of production and distribution of music.\textsuperscript{19} The State may respond to this with subsidies and quotas, while the consumer may respond in turn by choosing to purchase local products. Exerting choice at a consumer level however, presupposes that the local is operating on a level playing field with the global in terms of access to distribution and retail outlets. This is an interesting aspect of New Zealand’s Code of Practice, which has been developed in consultation between government, broadcasters, the recording industry, and also The Warehouse, New Zealand’s largest music retailer.\textsuperscript{20} The success of the scheme relies on a sufficient quantity of suitable, international quality music being produced by the record companies to be played on radio, and also on consumers choosing to purchase it. The consumer element is the part that cannot be legislated for, and while there will be significant forces of marketing and promotion encouraging the purchase of local musical products, it implies that to be bought by New Zealanders, the music must speak to the New Zealand public. This retains the possibility of a local referent, and of the consumer actively choosing music that relates to New Zealand identities and culture over others. Michael Glading, CEO of Sony Music New Zealand, suggests that this has been happening.\textsuperscript{21}

Pop music’s location in the global culture industry, largely controlled by multinational corporations in both its recording and distribution, and its transmission in the media, makes it an interesting vehicle for New Zealand cultural identity. Using popular music as a means of asserting local cultural autonomy in a global economy requires utilising the processes and mechanisms of that economy; popular music thus represents a means by which New Zealand may assert itself on the global stage, while using the processes of global production that prompt desires to express cultural
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autonomy. At a State level, not requiring popular music to speak of, or to, the nation may allow musicians to find their own voices, and for a greater variety of representations of New Zealand to emerge than that forced by a need to immediately reflect a national identity. The question is whether the commercial agendas of international broadcasting and recording corporations can allow for the sustainable development of a successful local music practice, or would themselves allow for a variety of New Zealand identities to be expressed. The March 2002 announcement of a voluntary quota for commercial radio provides an extra level of protection for New Zealand music, reducing its vulnerability to shifts in international trends and in the ownership of New Zealand radio. While the quota itself is nominally voluntary, it is a site of tension between the government’s desire to protect local cultural production, and the broadcasting industry’s desire to avoid legislation. There is still the possibility of legislation for local content, however, the Radio Broadcasters Association have retained a degree of freedom and the possibility of the requirements being relaxed in the future.22

Monitoring the success of the Code of Practice will be undertaken by a specially appointed industry body.23 However, it would be appropriate and useful to support this with more extensive research that measures the effect of the quota on the consumption and broadcasting of New Zealand music, not simply in numbers, but in terms of its reception by audiences. The response of New Zealanders to local music, the extent to which they regard it as local and how they judge this would provide a basis for understanding the relationship between the international music industry and local cultural identity. It is possible that this area of the music industry is not an appropriate vehicle for considerations of identity, in which case the kinds of support that is available for other styles and avenues of music could be examined more closely. There is a potential for a huge range of music to slip between the funding gap, between New Zealand on Air’s focus on commercial radio play, and Creative New Zealand’s demand for non-derivative styles.24 These are quite extreme positions, and

do not necessarily create the most productive environment for a diverse exploration and development of New Zealand identities in music. Finally, to address the quantitative gaps in New Zealand music history, it could be extremely valuable to attempt to compile radio playlists and record company sales and signings over a longer period of time, to contextualise any claims as to local music’s status between 1997 and 2002. Obviously, it would be a great shame not to begin compiling this material now for future reference in relation to the beginning of the new period in New Zealand music history heralded by the quota Code of Practice.

New Zealand identity is already a product of globalisation and the interaction of cultures. ‘New Zealandness’ itself is necessarily the outcome of an ongoing interplay of images and information, cultural diversity and attempts at ‘inclusion’, political power and economic integration. Programmes and strategies for increasing local music radio play utilise aspects of globalisation - the global music industry, ease of travel, and access to new and affordable production technology, while maintaining a discourse of the importance of having a unique identity in a globalising world. Strategies to improve the airtime for local music on New Zealand radio can be interpreted as a drive for localisation that is opposed to globalisation. However, it is better conceptualised as a localisation that is open to global influences, and contributes to the construction of a national identity that is highly fluid and often contested. Maintaining a successful popular music industry is one way in which New Zealand may avoid being just an importer of culture, while at the same time enhancing its potential to generate significant export value and employment opportunities. Popular music itself is part of a dialogue about what being a New Zealander means, allowing an active audience to create its own associations with local identities, and adding a deeper dimension to the role of radio in facilitating community connections.
Appendix 1: Research participants

Radio:
David Brice, Director of Programming and Marketing, The Radio Network
Rodger Clamp, Programmer More FM and Channel Z
Brad King, Programmer, The Rock

New Zealand on Air:
Brendan Smyth, Music Manager
Nicky Jarvis, Plugger

Record companies:
Grant Hislop, Artists and Repertoire, Warner Music New Zealand

Ministry for Culture and Heritage:
Martin Durrant, Policy Analyst

Music Industry Commission, Green Ribbon Trust, APRA:
Arthur Baysting

Recording Industry Association of New Zealand:
Jennie Allen

Median Strip:
Paul Kennedy
Appendix 2:
Access: Interview Information

Thank you for agreeing to take part in my research into the New Zealand music industry. This research will form the basis of my MA Thesis in the department of Sociology, University of Canterbury. I appreciate the time and energy you have agreed to give me, and would like to take the opportunity to outline the background and purpose of the research.

Primarily I'm looking at the increase in the amount of local music being played on radio in New Zealand over the past couple of years and seeking to explore the processes behind that. There are two levels to this task. One is to gain an insight into the decisions and policies of the major companies involved in the New Zealand music industry - in both recording and broadcasting. Alongside this lie the efforts by government and other groups to increase support for New Zealand music by both the industry and the New Zealand public. Closely linked with these efforts is the notion that increasing the visibility of local music will have positive effects on the development of national and cultural identity in New Zealand. This then is the theoretical level of the project, to reach an understanding of what is meant by national and cultural identities, the role that music plays in this, what makes local music ‘New Zealand’ music, and the ways in which the debate over local music reflects deeper issues about New Zealand’s location in the world.

My own background in this issue lies in my eight-year involvement with the b.net, as a volunteer, and, between October 1997 and May 2000 as the Programme Director of rdu in Christchurch. Within this context I have been a passionate supporter of alternative local music. At the same time, however, I have been interested in the apparent growth in more commercially oriented local bands and the increase in local music on other radio stations, approaching the traditional level of student radio. I am approaching this project from an interest in exploring this more commercial side of New Zealand music, and the shift in local music from a niche alternative market to a greater visibility and acceptability.

In general, I would like to find out how much local music is being made and played, how it's being encouraged, and why the industry supports particular acts over others. In speaking with you I hope to find out about your organisation’s role in the New Zealand music industry, the kinds of decisions you make, the reasons behind them, and their outcomes for the industry. I am also interested in the relationship between your organisation and its international counterparts or parent companies, and the potential for New Zealand music in the world.

I don’t want this project to be a challenge for you; I hope you will be able to speak freely about your role in New Zealand music and that that the project will make a useful contribution to the debate on local music.

Thank you again,
Zita Joyce, 24/8/00
Consent Form:

Pop music and New Zealand identity

I agree to participate in the above-named project in my professional capacity, and I consent to the results of the interview being used in Zita Joyce’s MA thesis. I understand that I may withdraw at any time from the project, including withdrawal of any information I have provided.

Please tick the appropriate boxes:

- I agree to the use of my name in the above project.
- I agree to the use of my position in the above project.
- I agree to the use of my organisation’s name in the above project.

Name:

Position:

Organisation:

Date:
Introductory email for radio:

[Note: Organising the interviews with radio involved the most information and explanation of the research and my intentions.]

To: x
From: Zita Joyce <zcj10@canterbury.ac.nz>
Subject: New Zealand music study
Cc:
Bcc:
X-Attachments:

Hi ------------,

I'm working on a master's thesis in sociology exploring the increase in support for local music in the New Zealand music industry over the past few years.

An important part of this support, as you know, is the increase in airplay across commercial radio formats. I was Programmer for Christchurch b.net station rdu from October 1997 to May 2000, and was pleased to see other networks beginning to embrace New Zealand music and local music become more visible in the media.

I know you must be very busy, but I would very much like to talk with you about your programming of New Zealand music, why you think the airplay rates have increased across formats, and whether you think it's important or relevant in any way to play New Zealand music at all.

I'm not approaching this from any kind of anti-commercial 'student radio' perspective rather, as a long time supporter of local music, I am genuinely interested and encouraged by its current strength and popularity in New Zealand. As a former programme director myself, i have something of a professional interest in the issues surrounding playing nz music on 'commercial' radio.

I really hope you will be able to spare the time to talk with me. I will be in Auckland next week from Wednesday 6 - Friday 8, and it would be fantastic to meet with you in person sometime then. However I realise this is very short notice, so I would be happy to arrange to speak by phone or email if this timeframe doesn't suit you.

If you think you may be interested in speaking with me I would obviously like to settle on a time as soon as possible, obviously I can send you more information if you need it.

I look forward to hearing from you,

Zita Joyce
Appendix 3:
Interview Questions

Radio stations:
David Brice, Director of Programming and Marketing, The Radio Network;
Rodger Clamp, Programmer More FM and Channel Z;
Brad King, Programmer, The Rock.

1. Corporate structure:
   How many New Zealand radio stations are in your network? How does the
   network operate in terms of decision-making in the separate stations? How
   many stations’ programming do you control? What is your parent company?
   Do they have offshore broadcasting interests? What kinds of corporate policy
   do you have to consider when making programming decisions?

2. Airplay rates:
   Do you keep a record of how much New Zealand music you playlist? Are
   you aware of the amount of music shifting over time? Do you believe the
   amount of New Zealand music you play is increasing? Did the beginning of
   APRA records of NZ content and the Median Strip charts influence your NZ
   content?

3. Playlist decisions:
   What factors do you take into consideration when deciding to playlist a
   song?

4. New Zealand Playlisting:
   Do you take the New Zealand origin of a song into consideration when
   considering it for airplay? Do you feel that you are more likely to give a New
   Zealand song the benefit of the doubt and take a risk with it? Do you feel like
   you treat New Zealand songs differently than you have done in the past? Do
   you think that attitudes towards New Zealand music have changed in the
   broadcasting industry over the past fifteen years?

5. Quota debate:
   Do you think a quota is a good idea? Does your network/company operate in
   other countries with quotas? How do broadcasters there manage? The
   government promises that quotas will happen; do you think it will change the
   broadcasting industry much? Do you think the industry has been increasing
   its support for New Zealand music in preparation for quotas? Or to make
   them seem redundant?
6. New Zealand music:
Do you think New Zealand music has become more radio oriented over the past few years? Do you think it is important for a New Zealand song to sound like it’s from New Zealand? Or do you look for a more ‘international’ sound? What does the industry mean by an ‘international sound’? Do you think such an aim erases local cultures? Do you think local culture is important on the radio?

New Zealand on Air:
Brendan Smyth, Music Manager.

1. Strategies:
What strategies do you employ to encourage support for New Zealand music within the broadcasting industry? Have you taken any steps to encourage the recording industry? How has the response from the industry changed over the life of New Zealand on Air? What kinds of changes in approach have you made in response to those responses?

2. New Zealand music support:
Why does NZ on Air think it is important for radio to play more New Zealand music? Why do you give money to bands for recording and video making? What do you hope to achieve with the new funding initiatives?

3. "Our voices, our stories, ourselves”:
What does the NZ on Air slogan mean? Do you think this adds up to a definition of culture? Is it a matter of expressing New Zealand stories? Creating them? or providing a space for New Zealand stories to develop? Do you think NZ on Air and the music industry share a view about the importance of New Zealand music?

4. New Zealandness:
How do you think music can convey a sense of place? Do you think Pakeha, Maori and Pacific Island music differs in this respect? Do you think its is possible to cultivate a uniquely New Zealand form of music? DO you think the recording industry is interested in this? Do they want an ‘international’ sound? What do you think this phrase really means? Does striving for an ‘international’ sound restrict the ability of a truly New Zealand music to develop? Or should we just concentrate on establishing ourselves and then see about New Zealandness?
5. Other countries:
Are there bodies like NZ on Air in other countries? Do you have contact with such bodies? What kinds of strategies and approaches do they use? How does the situation in New Zealand differ from other countries you know of?

6. Pop music:
Is there room for pop music under NZonAir schemes that is critical of the establishment? Is there a risk of turning pop music into a tool of the dominant culture? Or has it always been like that? Is it enough to enable bands to make the kinds of music commercial radio will play? Is there room for changing the approach and attitudes of commercial radio? Has that already been tried and failed? Is it ironic that a potentially powerful tool for the expression and exploration of New Zealand culture should be so heavily influenced by the needs of multinational broadcasting corporations? Is there room under the NZ on Air charter to be concerned about that?

Record companies:
Grant Hislop, Artists and Repertoire, Warner Music New Zealand.

1. Corporate structure:
What labels do you own or distribute in New Zealand? Who is your parent company? How many labels do they own and distribute worldwide? Is it possible to get a list or diagram of that corporate structure?

2. NZ acts:
What New Zealand acts are signed to your label or do you distribute? What is the difference between signing an act and distributing them? How do you decide who to sign? Can you give me an idea of how your New Zealand acts sell alongside your overseas acts? Is it possible to have access to sales figures?

3. Change:
Do you have more or less New Zealand acts on your books now than in the past? Do you have records of who has been handled by your company in the past? Would it be possible for me to have access to any of these records?

4. Intentions:
Are you actively seeking local artists at the moment? Do you have a strategy for your support for local acts? Do you intend to increase the number of local acts you support or do you assess the situation as you go?

5. Impression:
Do you think it is important for a major label to be seen to support local artists, and do you think this has changed? Is local music financially viable? Are there other reasons to support it?
6. Global position:
   Do you have autonomy as a New Zealand company to make decisions about signing artists? Are there internationally applied policies for the kinds of music your company supports? Is it important for you to have local business within your worldwide company structure? Is this seen as important to the overall status of the company? Or is it a purely local matter?

7. New Zealand Culture:
   Do you believe there is anything unique about New Zealand music? Would you encourage this in your acts? Would you seek it out? Do you aim for an ‘international’ sound? How would you define that? How is such a standard set? Do you hope to break a New Zealand act on the world market? Do you believe success is more likely with a ‘New Zealand’ sound or an ‘international’ sound?

8. Influences:
   Is your current position on New Zealand music a response to consumer demand? Broadcast demand? Talented acts? The moves of other record companies? Policy from overseas? A belief in the possibility of making it overseas with a New Zealand act?

Ministry for Culture and Heritage:
Martin Durrant, Policy Analyst.

1. National Identity:
   Is national or cultural identity an important issue for the ministry? Is there a difference between the two concepts? What is the difference? Does New Zealand need to develop this? Express it? Or open a space to explore it? What role does the cultural sector play in this task? Do you see this as a need for a single unifying identity or is there space for the negotiation of separate identities? Do you think different ethnic groups have different identity needs? Is there room for these?

2. Types of culture:
   Do you see pop music as playing a different role in this than more ‘high’ cultural forms? Do you think it’s possible for an industry like the recording industry to fulfil this kind of task? Do you think its possible to separate cultural needs from economic imperatives?

3. Past needs:
   Is the current government’s use of the concept of cultural identity a new thing or has it been expressed by governments before? Why is it being expressed now? What role have the arts been seen to play in the country before? Is the strength of national/cultural identity in NZ related to our sense of social and economic wellbeing? Do you think that the cultural sector is in a way being
asked to pick up the pieces and cheer New Zealanders up? Or is it a case of stimulating growth in an untapped part of the economy?

4. Other countries:
Are there other countries whose approach to the arts you think we should follow? What are these strategies? How applicable are other countries’ models to New Zealand?

5. New Zealandness:
Is it important for pop music to express some specific kind of New Zealandness? Or is it enough for music to be made here? Do you feel you could influence the industry to produce local music that fulfils some broader agenda than just making music here? Would you consider doing so? Do you expect local music idioms to emerge from an industry more receptive to local music? Or do you think local product will end up sounding the same as the music made anywhere else in the world? Does it matter?

6. Quotas:
Marian Hobbs promises that quotas will be put in place, what kind of feedback are you getting from the industry about this? Are you concerned by arguments that suggest the quality of New Zealand music would suffer under a quota system? Do we have a big enough population to support a quota? Do you believe the industry is increasing its support for New Zealand music in order to make a quota seem redundant? Are you concerned that the industry may have different intentions for local pop music than the ministry does?

Music Industry Commission, Green Ribbon Trust, APRA:
Arthur Baysting.

1. MIC, History:
The commission is a new initiative, what is its role and purpose? How were the members appointed? Who is on the commission and what are their individual involvements and possible agendas?

2. MIC, Intentions:
Is the commission intended to bridge the gap between the industry and the government? Who is it primarily a voice for?

3. GRT, History of Trust:
When was the trust set up? What is its aim? Do you feel instrumental in the announcement of quota policies by Labour and National last year?

4. GRT, Quotas:
Why do you support local music quotas? Do you think it’s a matter of expressing New Zealandness on the radio, or an opportunity to develop more jobs in the music industry?
5. APRA, data:
   Why have specific breakdowns of New Zealand content on radio only been collected since 1997? Why was that not done earlier, eg when the quota debate first started? The figures for the past two years show an increase in NZ content across the formats, do you think this may be partly a result of there finally being reliable figures so that everyone can see what the true levels are?
Appendix 4:
New Zealand content


There is more New Zealand music on commercial radio now than at any time in the last three years. How can we say that?

Since June 1997, the Kiwi Music Action Group (which is a collaboration between the Radio Broadcasters Association, the Recording Industry Association, APRA and NZ On Air) has been monitoring local music content levels on commercial radio. The Kiwi Music Action Group gets its figures from the airplay logs provided to APRA (the Australasian Performing Right Association) by more than 110 commercial radio stations every quarter. The figures are grouped by the four main commercial radio formats - Adult Contemporary (A/C); Pop; Rock; and Alternative (Alt) - and are published in the radio industry trade journal Median Strip.

Here are the quarterly figures for each of the four formats since June 1997. These figures measure absolute New Zealand content, station-by-station, averaged across the formats. There are no weightings - a small station with a small audience is measured the same as a big station with a big audience. The radio industry trade journal, Median Strip, also measures New Zealand music content on commercial radio via its weekly RadioScope airplay charts. RadioScope takes only stations' top 30 most-played songs and it does weight stations according to audience or market share. Thus, New Zealand content on a station with a big audience is given a weighting to reflect the extra value or penetration of the airplay.

So - the APRA measure is a historic quarterly measure while the RadioScope measure is a weekly current measure.

According to the RadioScope methodology, New Zealand content on commercial radio over the last 26 weeks (from the beginning of June 2001 to the end of November 2001) has ranged from a low of 9.51% to a high of 15.14% and has averaged 11.75% over the period.

And finally, here is another way of looking at the figures. Based on the APRA logging method, New Zealand content on stations that are targeting the youth audience or are popular with the youth audience in the September 2001 quarter was 13.27% and in the June 2001 quarter, it was 13.34%. This compares with the 10.81% and 10.77% average for all commercial radio in the same quarters.

There is more New Zealand music on commercial radio now than at any time in the last three years. In the December 1999 quarter, for the first time, the overall figure (for all commercial radio) went into double digits and it has remained in double digits in the eight quarters since then. At the moment, it is 11.24%. That compares with the
nadir of 5.26% in December 1997 and with APRA's 2% estimate two years before that.

Is there enough NZ music on commercial radio...? No. Not yet. And NZ On Air will not let up its efforts until there is more, more and still more yet.

**New Zealand content levels:**  
**June 1997 – September 2001**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter</th>
<th>A/C</th>
<th>Pop</th>
<th>Rock</th>
<th>Alt</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jun-97</td>
<td>3.62%</td>
<td>4.42%</td>
<td>4.05%</td>
<td></td>
<td>[6.01%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-97</td>
<td>2.41%</td>
<td>5.95%</td>
<td>5.33%</td>
<td>22.33%</td>
<td>[5.90%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-97</td>
<td>2.89%</td>
<td>3.79%</td>
<td>5.44%</td>
<td>18.96%</td>
<td>[5.26%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-98</td>
<td>2.78%</td>
<td>4.18%</td>
<td>5.01%</td>
<td>21.81%</td>
<td>[5.27%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-98</td>
<td>4.16%</td>
<td>5.60%</td>
<td>6.85%</td>
<td>22.53%</td>
<td>[7.14%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-98</td>
<td>5.17%</td>
<td>7.19%</td>
<td>8.83%</td>
<td>22.23%</td>
<td>[7.56%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-98</td>
<td>4.78%</td>
<td>7.17%</td>
<td>9.26%</td>
<td>22.78%</td>
<td>[7.49%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-99</td>
<td>3.67%</td>
<td>6.65%</td>
<td>9.06%</td>
<td>23.41%</td>
<td>[6.67%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-99</td>
<td>5.96%</td>
<td>8.61%</td>
<td>10.53%</td>
<td>24.33%</td>
<td>[8.68%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-99</td>
<td>6.01%</td>
<td>8.55%</td>
<td>10.07%</td>
<td>25.58%</td>
<td>[9.01%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-99</td>
<td>7.55%</td>
<td>10.34%</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>28.13%</td>
<td>[10.48%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-00</td>
<td>8.37%</td>
<td>9.30%</td>
<td>11.61%</td>
<td>28.69%</td>
<td>[10.47%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-00</td>
<td>8.75%</td>
<td>9.17%</td>
<td>10.45%</td>
<td>29.37%</td>
<td>[10.42%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-00</td>
<td>8.23%</td>
<td>9.19%</td>
<td>11.89%</td>
<td>29.17%</td>
<td>[10.36%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec-00</td>
<td>8.29%</td>
<td>8.77%</td>
<td>13.70%</td>
<td>29.08%</td>
<td>[10.54%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar-01</td>
<td>8.58%</td>
<td>9.05%</td>
<td>13.10%</td>
<td>29.08%</td>
<td>[10.70%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun-01</td>
<td>7.35%</td>
<td>9.77%</td>
<td>13.69%</td>
<td>32.35%</td>
<td>[10.77%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept-01</td>
<td>7.68%</td>
<td>9.19%</td>
<td>14.11%</td>
<td>32.82%</td>
<td>[10.81%]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5:
Code of Practice for New Zealand Music Content in Radio Broadcasting

1. Introduction

In a discussion document dated 14 August 2001 the Minister of Broadcasting outlined the Government’s objectives for promoting increased levels of New Zealand popular music on commercial radio. The Code has been established as the RBA’s response to this goal, and as part of a partnership with the Minister, assisted by relevant government departments, to support New Zealand music. The RBA notes that an accelerated rate of growth will only be achieved by concerted action on the part of all sectors of the music industry: the recording companies, retailers, all broadcasters of popular New Zealand music (not confined to membership of the RBA), and relevant Ministries and agencies such as NZ On Air.

The RBA undertakes to make every reasonable effort to achieve compliance with the Code, but notes that it is a voluntary organisation that cannot force actions on its members.

2. Definitions

The term "New Zealand music" shall apply to all music performed by artists who would normally be regarded as "New Zealanders". This would include the significant number of New Zealand artists performing in Australia and other countries (e.g. Shihad, John Rowles, Jon Stevens). It will not include artists that have been resident outside New Zealand for many years who would not normally be known as New Zealanders (e.g. Thompson Twins). However, it would also include non-New Zealand born artists who could reasonably be described as New Zealand based and whose music plays regularly in New Zealand.

In the event of a dispute over eligibility, this will be resolved by the Music Performance Committee (see 6).

New Zealand music in commercials, station promotions, station identification and the like is not eligible for inclusion.

3. Targets

The agreed target is 20% weighted average across all genre playing contemporary music, by the end of 2006, as the central goal of the Code.

Attached as Appendix A is a year-by-year extrapolation of the targets to achieve 20% at the end of five years.
It is possible that there will not be even growth across all genres on a year-by-year basis. However, all broadcasters subscribing to the Code will be expected to make every reasonable effort to meet the annual targets.

Shortfalls will need to be balanced by over-achievement in succeeding periods, to ensure the 2006 target is met.

Genre Definition

Genre definition and classification of stations will be undertaken by the RBA in consultation with the Music Performance Committee. RBA member stations will not be restricted in their ability to change formats, but will be required to negotiate re-classification (if necessary) with the RBA within one month of any such change.

5. Performance Monitoring and Measurement

RBA members will submit their playlists in electronic format to an independent auditor appointed by the RBA in consultation with the Committee.

Processed results, summarised by genre, will be supplied to the Committee and the RBA on a quarterly basis.

6. New Zealand Music Performance Committee

An independent committee will be established to monitor the Code, and the measurement system.

Membership of the Committee will comprise bodies with a major influence on development of New Zealand contemporary popular music including the Music Industry Commission, RIANZ, IMNZ, the Musicians’ Union, RBA and NZ On Air. An independent Chairperson appointed by the RBA will chair the group.

The Committee will meet at least four times per year and provide a report to the RBA and the Minister on a quarterly basis. It will also prepare an Annual Report, available to the public, outlining the weighted average of New Zealand music played, a breakdown of progress towards the targets for the respective formats and a summary of activities undertaken in support of the targets.

The Committee will also act as a liaison point for non-RBA members who are subscribing to the Code.

Reviews and Revisions of the Code

Upon evidence being produced of audience and/or economic loss caused by operation of this Code to an RBA member, or groups of members, or other subscribing broadcasters, the Code may be modified to correct any such loss. Significant changes in the quantity of New Zealand music being produced, a format change by a major network or a significant reduction in retail support for New Zealand music are also
factors that would be taken into account in reviewing the targets. Any review of targets would be undertaken in consultation with the RBA, the Minister and relevant Government departments. In 2006 a full review of the Code will be undertaken.

8. Broadcast Hours of Application of the Code

6am - midnight.
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