



MIGRANT LANGUAGES
IN COMMUNITY RADIO

Recommendations towards
intercultural media



Contents

.....	1
PREAMBLE.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
FINDINGS	Error! Bookmark not defined.
RECOMMENDATIONS	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Governance.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Outreach and Access.....	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Training	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Programming	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Social Interaction	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Networking	12
RECOMMENDATIONS TO EXTERNAL AGENCIES	12
ANNEX 1.....	13
THE COMMUNITY RADIO CHARTER FOR EUROPE	13
ANNEX 2	17
SURVEY RESULTS (ORGANISATIONS)	17
ANNEX 3.....	23
SURVEY RESULTS (PRODUCERS).....	23
ANNEX 4.....	31
MIGRATION AND HUNGARY	31

VORWORT

“Tatsächlich fühlte ich mich nicht einfach nur unterstützt, sondern sogar ermutigt, Teil der Gemeinschaft zu sein und herauszufinden, welche Art von Sendungen ich machen möchte. Vom Entwickeln der Ideen bis zur Umsetzung im Studio wurde alles ermöglicht und problemlos unterstützt.“ (Befragter Teilnehmer)

Die Bedeutung der Freien Medien für die Förderung des sozialen Zusammenhalts und der Meinungsvielfalt war Gegenstand einer wissenschaftlichen Untersuchung. Diese Untersuchung erforschte den positiven Beitrag des dritten Mediensektors zur Konfliktlösung in afrikanischen und asiatischen Gesellschaften und für die Teilhabe migrantischer und ethnischer Minderheiten am öffentlichen Diskurs. Dieser Beitrag wurde auch in Europa auf internationaler Ebene durch die UNESCO, den Europarat und das Europäische Parlament anerkannt.

Die Resolution des Europäischen Parlaments vom 25. September 2008 (2008/2011(INI)) zu den Freien Medien

1. *Hält fest, dass Community Medien ein effektives Mittel sind, um kulturelle und sprachliche Vielfalt, gesellschaftliche Inklusion und lokale Identität zu stärken, was die Vielfalt dieses Dritten Mediensektors erklärt.*
2. *Verweist darauf, dass Community Medien dabei helfen, die Interessen von Randgruppen zu Gehör zu bringen und deren Mitglieder befähigen, sich mit anderen gesellschaftlichen Gruppen zu verständigen. Deshalb spielen sie eine wichtige Rolle bei der Förderung von Toleranz und Pluralismus in der Gesellschaft und tragen zur interkulturellen Verständigung bei.*
3. *Betont, dass Community Medien den interkulturellen Dialog fördern, indem sie die Öffentlichkeit unterrichten, negative Stereotypen bekämpfen, und die Darstellung der Massenmedien von gesellschaftlich ausgegrenzten Randgruppen wie Flüchtlingen, Migranten, Roma und anderen ethnischen und religiösen Minderheiten korrigieren; betont, dass die sozialen Medien eine der vorhandenen Möglichkeiten sind, um die Integration von Migranten zu erleichtern, und ebenso um benachteiligte Mitglieder der Gesellschaft zur aktiven Teilhabe am öffentlichen Diskurs zu befähigen.*

Die Erklärung des Ministerkomitees des Europarates zur Rolle der Community Medien bei der Förderung des sozialen Zusammenhalts und des interkulturellen Dialogs (verabschiedet durch das Ministerkomitee am 11. Februar 2009 auf dem 1048sten Treffen der Ständigen Vertreter der Minister/Ministerdelegierten) erkennt „den Beitrag der Community Medien zur Förderung des öffentlichen Diskurses, des politischen Pluralismus und der Wahrnehmung verschiedener Sichtweisen, insbesondere durch die Bereitstellung der Möglichkeit des Informationsaustausches und der Möglichkeit, sich darzustellen und Ideen auszutauschen, für verschiedene gesellschaftliche Gruppen einschließlich kultureller, sprachlicher, ethnischer, religiöser oder anderer Minderheiten“ an. Durch diese Dokumente erkennen das Europäische Parlament und der Europarat an, dass der Grundsatz der Teilhabe, der aktiven Bürgerbeteiligung und der demokratischen Medien ausschließlich von den Community Medien umgesetzt wird, indem sie trotz knapper Mittel für Individuen, Gruppen und die Gesellschaft eine Dienstleistung

erbringen, die von den wohlhabendsten Teilen des öffentlichen oder kommerziellen Mediensektors nicht gewährleistet wird.

Die "Community Radio Charta für Europa" von AMARC Europa (siehe [ANHANG 1](#)), die sich darum bemüht, die Diversität der Freien Radios in einem Dekalog zu beschreiben, stellt ausdrücklich fest, daß Freie Radios „das Recht auf Teilhabe/Zugangsrecht von Minderheiten und marginalisierten Gruppen einlösen/verfügbar machen/umsetzen und kulturelle und sprachliche Vielfalt sichern“ sollen, indem sie für die Möglichkeit migrantischer Selbstrepräsentation sorgen.

Das InclusionDes Projekt, gefördert von Erwachsenenbildungsprogramm von Erasmus + hat zum Ziel auszuwerten, welche Faktoren die Teilhabe von MigrantInnen in Freien Radios ermöglichen. Dabei werden die Regionen und Länder ausgewertet, in welchen die Projektpartner angesiedelt sind (Irland, Frankreich, Deutschland, Ungarn und Spanien). Außerdem wird eine Liste von von "Best Practice"-Beispielen erstellt, welche von anderen Freien Radios genutzt werden kann, um ihre Partizipations- und Zugangsmöglichkeiten zu überprüfen, damit sie so den Zugang für MigrantInnen zu den Medienquellen erleichtern können. (Um dieses Dokument und um die Recherche für das Projekt zu erleichtern, haben wir entschieden den Begriff "MigrantIn" zu verwenden, um Personen einzubeziehen, die in einem Land leben, welches nicht ihr Herkunftsland ist, unabhängig von ihrem legalen Status oder davon warum sie sich dort niedergelassen haben.) Der Projekt-Koordinator ist [Radio Kultura](#) (Bayonne, Baskenland), die Partnerorganisationen sind [Civil Radio](#) (Budapest, Ungarn), [Radio Wüste Welle](#) (Tübingen, Deutschland) [Radio Enlace](#) (Madrid, Spanien) und [Near FM](#) (Dublin, Irland).

Die Anfangsrecherchen wurden in Form zweier Umfragebögen (angehängt als [ANNEX 2 und 3](#)) ausgeführt. Einer der Fragebögen wurde an Organisationen verschickt, welche einen hohen Anteil migrantischer Teilhabe im Sendeschema ausweisen. Der zweite Fragebogen richtete sich an migrantische Sendungsmachende direkt. In diesem Fragebogen sollten die Sendungsmachenden ihre Erfahrungen mit der Ausbildung, der Entscheidungsfindung und mit den Kommunikationsprozessen in den Freien Radios, für welche sie Sendungen gestalten, überdenken.

Insgesamt 15 Freie Radios haben an der Umfrage teilgenommen. Diese Organisationen haben ihren Sitz in Deutschland (6), Österreich (1), Schweiz (1), Frankreich (2), Irland (3) und Spanien (2). Diese Organisationen senden insgesamt 143 Sendungen in 43 Sprachen, welche von Migranten aus 64 Ländern produziert werden.

44 MigrantInnen nahmen an der Umfrage teil. Diese gaben 24 Herkunftsländer an.

Kein einziger TeilnehmerIn kam aus Ungarn. Dies erklärt sich durch das scharfe Vorgehen der ungarischen "2010 Rundfunk-Gesetzgebung und Regulierung" gegen die Arbeit von Community Medien und durch den harten Umgang mit MigrantInnen in diesem Land.

Spezielle Informationen über die Situation in Ungarn finden Sie in [ANNEX 4](#).

INC
LUS
ION
DES



CIVILRÁDIÓ FM98



MIGRANT LANGUAGES
IN COMMUNITY RADIO



ERGEBNISSE

- Die Mehrzahl der befragten migrantischen Sendungsmachenden stimmte darin überein, dass ihre Teilhabe in den lokalen Freien Radios einen sehr positiven Einfluss auf ihr Leben hat und ihnen die Entwicklung neuer Fähigkeiten ermöglicht: verbesserte kommunikative Fähigkeiten (29%), verbesserte technische (ICT) Fähigkeiten (19%), Stärkung des Selbstvertrauens (21.3%) sowie die Erweiterung des sozialen Umfelds und Netzwerks (25.7%).
- Das Ziel der Sendungsmachenden ist vor allem, die Zuhörer_innen über die eigene Kultur und Gesellschaft zu informieren (25%), jedoch auch Unterhaltung (22.7%), Information der eigenen Community (21%) und die Bekämpfung von Vorurteilen (16.5%).
- Die meisten der von ihnen produzierten Sendungen bedienen sich der Landessprache (41%) oder sind mehrsprachig (40%) während nur 19% der Sendungen ausschließlich in der jeweiligen Muttersprache ausgestrahlt werden.
- Die meisten der migrantischen Sendungsmachenden zeigen sich zufrieden mit den bereit gestellten Mitteln und Schulungen (Inhalt, Verfügbarkeit, Ort, etc.). Acht von zehn Punkten. (8/10).
- Während es den betreffenden Sendungsmachenden weniger wichtig ist, dass Schulungen in einer anderen als der jeweiligen Landessprache abgehalten werden, würden sie es begrüßen, wenn sie von migrantischen Lehrenden durchgeführt würden (7 /10).
- Die Sendungsmachenden kennen die Prozesse der Entscheidungsfindung und Verständigung innerhalb ihrer Organisationen (8.5/10) und wissen, wie sie daran teilnehmen können (33 der 44 Befragten). Als besonders wichtig stufen sie ein, dass ihre Ansichten Gehör finden (31 der 44 Teilnehmer stimmten diesem Gesichtspunkt zu).
- Die migrantischen Sendungsmachenden sind daran interessiert, ein Feedback zum Inhalt ihrer Sendungen und zu ihren technischen Fähigkeiten zu bekommen, sowie an spezifischen und weiterführenden Schulungen (7/10 in beiden Fällen). Allerdings ist es für die Freien Radios schwierig, den Inhalt von Sendungen in einer Minderheitensprache zu überwachen. Sie müssen sich auf die Zuhörer_innen, Mitglieder ihrer Organisation und auf entsprechende Schulungen verlassen, um sicherzustellen, dass der Inhalt der produzierten Sendungen den Kriterien der Organisationen entspricht.
- Freie Radiostationen mit einer größeren Anzahl von migrantischen Sendungsmachenden praktizieren eine aktive Annäherung an die migrantischen Communities, entweder indem sie spezifische Veranstaltungen und Schulungen organisieren oder durch Öffentlichkeitsarbeit vor Ort. Sie sind ebenso in einer Position, die ihnen Möglichkeiten zur Unterstützung der spezifischen Bedürfnisse migrantischer Sendungsmachender eröffnet: für diesen Bereich zuständiges Personal, Mentoren, finanzielle Unterstützung und Hilfe bei der Mitwirkung an Entscheidungsprozessen.

EMPFEHLUNGEN

Verwaltung

- Die Organisationen sollten ihre interne Kommunikation überprüfen, um sicherzustellen, dass ihre Organisationsstrukturen und Verwaltungsprozesse transparent sind.
- Räume schaffen, um eine offene Beratung der Sendungsmachenden zu erleichtern. In diesem Sinne wurde von einem Teilnehmer der Umfrage betont: „Ich denke, das Verfahren, die Strukturen und die Teilhabe sind gut umgesetzt. Bei unseren monatlichen Treffen haben wir immer die oben erwähnten Punkte besprochen. So sind wir stets darüber auf dem Laufenden, was gemacht werden muss und so verbessert sich die Leistung und die Effizienz.“
- Das Feedback über die Entscheidungen und Vorgänge in der Organisation könnte verbessert werden, indem Sendungsmachende regelmäßig Rückmeldebögen ausfüllen.
- Mechanismen entwickeln, die es migrantischen Sendungsmachenden erleichtern, bei den Entscheidungsprozessen mitzuwirken.

Kontakt und Zugang

- Die Organisationen sollten aktiv außerhalb anwerben, um es den migrantischen Sendungsmachenden zu erleichtern, teilzunehmen.
- Die Community Radios sollten spezielle Kampagnen erarbeiten, die sich an migrantische Gruppen wenden und dort über die Möglichkeit des Zugangs zum Radio und über die Aus- und Fortbildungskurse informieren.

Aus- und Fortbildung

- Bereitstellen von Informationen über interne Strukturen, Entscheidungsprozesse und Teilhabe bereits in den Einführungskursen. Dennoch gibt es viele Radiomacher_innen, die lediglich die Fähigkeiten zum Auf-Sendung-Gehen erwerben wollen. Der Wunsch zur Teilhabe an den Entscheidungsprozessen entwickelt sich häufig erst später.
- Bereitstellen von Online-Selbstlern-Modulen, die es den RadiomacherInnen ermöglichen ihre Fähigkeiten zu verbessern (Videos zu technischen Fragen etc.)
- Organisationen sollten erwägen, migrantische Sendungsmachende fortzubilden, damit sie diese später als Workshopleiter_innen (Multiplikatoren_innen) in anderen Sprachen einsetzen können.
- Fördern von Wissensaustausch durch Meetings, die mehr Wissenstransfer zwischen erfahreneren Kolleg_innen und Ehrenamtlichen und den Ehrenamtlichen untereinander ermöglichen.

Auf Sendung gehen

- Organisationen sollten aktiv Individuen und Gruppen einladen, um den multikulturellen und fremdsprachigen Sendeanteil im Programm zu erhöhen.
- Community Radios sollten sicherstellen, dass die Sendezeit unter allen Sendungsmachenden gerecht aufgeteilt wird, um mehr Sendungsmachenden den aktiven Zugang zum Programmgestalten zu ermöglichen. *„Der Sendeplan sollte erweitert werden, damit mehr Sendungsmachende ihr eigenes Radioprogramm gestalten können.“*

Soziales Miteinander

- Organisationen sollten gemeinsame Räumlichkeiten zum Austausch zur Verfügung stellen, welche den Austausch zwischen der Mehrheit der Sendungsmachenden und den migrantischen Ehrenamtlichen erleichtern. *„Ich meine durch die Unterstützung der migrantischen Sendungsmachenden lernen wir mehr über sie. So ist dies eine Win-win-Situation, bei welcher wir alle voneinander lernen.“*

Vernetzung

- Die Organisationen sollten die Vernetzung der migrantischen Sendungsmachenden zu anderen Community Radios fördern. *„Es wäre sehr wichtig ein europäisches oder weltweites Netzwerk zu gründen.“*

RECOMMENDATIONS TO EXTERNAL AGENCIES

Funding lines aimed to facilitate and encourage the employment of migrants as staff, but also to ensure that community media organisations have the staff and financial resources required to further migrant participation and training in media.

ANNEX 1
THE COMMUNITY RADIO CHARTER FOR EUROPE

Recognising that community radio is an ideal means of fostering freedom of expression and information, the development of culture, the freedom of form and confront opinions and active participation in local life; noting that different cultures and traditions lead to diversity of forms of community radio; this Charter identifies objectives which community radio stations share and should strive to achieve.

Community radio stations:

1. promote the right to communicate, assist the free flow of information and opinions, encourage creative expression and contribute to the democratic process and a pluralist society;
2. provide access to training, production and distribution facilities; encourage local creative talent and foster local traditions; and provide programmes for the benefit, entertainment, education and development of their listeners;
3. seek to have their ownership representative of local geographically recognisable communities or of communities of common interest;
4. are editorially independent of government, commercial and religious institutions and political parties in determining their programme policy;
5. provide a right of access to minority and marginalised groups and promote and protect cultural and linguistic diversity;
6. seek to honestly inform their listeners on the basis of information drawn from a diversity of sources and provide a right of reply to any person or organisation subject to serious misrepresentation;
7. are established as organisations which are not run with a view to profit and ensure their independence by being financed from a variety of sources;
8. recognise and respect the contribution of volunteers, recognise the right of paid workers to join trade unions and provide satisfactory working conditions for both;
9. operate management, programming and employment practices which oppose discriminations and which are open and accountable to all supporters, staff and volunteers;
10. foster exchange between community radio broadcasters using communications to develop greater understanding in support of peace, tolerance, democracy and development.

Adopted on 18 September 1994 in Ljubljana, Slovenia at the first AMARC Pan-European Conference of Community Radio Broadcasters

ANNEX 2
SURVEY RESULTS (ORGANISATIONS)

Organisations that took part in the survey: 15 organisations: (6 Germany, 1 Austrian, 1 Switzerland, 2 French, 3 Irish, 2 Spanish)

Wüste Welle	Freies Radio Stuttgart	Radio Vallekas
Radio Dreyeckland	Radio Flora	Radio Enlace (Spain)
Radio Z,	Near FM	Radio FRO (Austria)
Radio F.R.E.I.	Liffey Sound	Hauts de Radio
Radio X	Raidió na Life (Ireland)	Radio Plus

Radio shows are produced by people with migrant background: 143

Freies Radio Stuttgart	(19)
Radio Dreyeckland	(21)
Wüste Welle	(15)
Radio Z	(12)
Radio Flora	(5)
Radio F.R.E.I	(4)
Radio X	(11)
Nearfm	(7)
Liffey Sound	(4)
Raidió na Life	(5)
Radio Vallekas	(4)
Radio FRO	(24)
Radio enlace	(2)
Hauts de Radio	(8)
Radio Plus	(2)

Countries of Origin of the programme producers: 64

Afghanistan	Congo Kinshasa	Jamaica	Russia,
Algeria	Croatia	Kazakhstan	Senegal
Angola	Cuba	Kosovo	Singapore
Argentina	Ecuador	Kurdistan	South Africa
Austria	Egypt	Lebanon	Spain
Azerbaijan	England	Lithuania	Sri Lanka
Basque Country	Eritrea	Mexico	Sudan
Bolivia	Ethiopia	Morocco	Switzerland
Bosnia	France	Mozambique	Syria
Brazil	Gabon	Netherlands	Togo
Bulgaria	Gambia	Nigeria	Tunisia
Cameroon	Ghana	Peru	Turkey
Catalonia	Hungary	Poland	Ukraine
Chile	India	Portugal	Uruguay
China	Iran	República Dominicana	USA
Colombia	Italy	Rumania	Venezuela

Languages used in the programmes: 43 languages

3 Chinese languages	Dari	Italian	Serbian
Akan	Several Creole languages from Jamaica and South America	Kurmanci,	Sorani
Albanian	English,	Latin,	Spanish
Amharic	Esperanto	Malayalam	Tamil
Arabic	Fanti	Nigerian languages	Tigrinya
Azerbaijani	Farsi	Persian,	Turkish
Basque	French	Polish	Ukrainian
Bosnian	Ga (dialects from Ghana)	Portuguese	Wolof
Bulgarian	German	Portuguese-Brazilian	Zazaki
Catalan	Ghanaian languages	Rumanian	
Croatian	Hungarian	Russian	

Monolingual vs. Multilingual

The most of the migrant producers are broadcasting in a mix of languages (40%) or the majority language (41 %), while a number of migrant producers is just broadcasting in their mother tongue 19%.

Monitoring and Feedback for migrant languages programmes

- All German stations except Bavaria don't do any active monitoring (in Bavaria, radio programmes are surveyed by the Bavarian state). They have basic rules which have to be accepted by every producer. But there is a certain feedback of the audience and other producers. Radio F.R.E.I. even has developed regular feedbacks (one show a week).
- In Switzerland, there is an evaluation after 18 months for each show.
- NEAR fm: Spanish, Portuguese and Italian can be monitored by staff. Polish content was monitored by approaching members of the Polish community for feedback. Croatian programme is bilingual.
- Radio FRO: contact with the radio producers, feedback from the listeners
- Liffey Sound: Running orders are monitored. Overall, it is difficult to fully monitor programmes broadcast in migrant languages.
- Raidio Na Life: Some station staff have a certain level of basic fluency in Spanish, Catalan and Portuguese and can therefore have at least some understanding of the content produced in these languages. We do not however currently have the capacity to monitor Polish, Fanti and Ga and, following initial induction and training of volunteers producing content in languages which we do not speak or understand we simply hope for the best.
- Radio Vallekas: Con seguimiento y apoyo formativo
- Radio Enlace: All programmes are broadcast in Spanish language.

Strategies to involve migrant communities in media production

- The radio stations offer special lectures, workshops and meetings in the radio stations itself (39.5 %).
- In some cases the radio stations have outreach strategies to engage with migrant communities (19.5 %)

- Organisations also are open to migrant producers to participate in the regular volunteer induction workshops. 24 %

Strategies for the integration of migrant producers into internal structures

- Radio Dreyeckland (Freiburg) has special Coordinators for the migrant producers.
- Radio Z in Nürnberg has a migrant editorial group which is allowed to make own decisions and has a voice in the Plenum of the radio station. This group is also member of the managing committee.
- Radio F.R.E.I: There are tutors for all of the newcomers. The location of Radio F.R.E.I seems to be a meeting point for migrant communities in Erfurt.
- Radio Wüste Welle in Tübingen offers special projects and is inviting to the regular Plenum.
- Freies Radio Stuttgart and Radio Flora in Hannover also offer the regular Plena für migrant producers.
- Near fm: After training, integration of new volunteers is an individual process, so any specific need is catered for.
- Radio Fro: individual training, refugee radio workshops, specific support in the beginning, mentors speaking the migrants' mother tongue
- Liffey Sound: Currently, through the same channels as other new volunteers.
- Raidio Na Life: they are a unique community radio station due to the fact that they operate almost entirely through the medium of Irish and this is their entire raison d'être - i.e. to provide a specific community-of-interest radio service to Irish speakers, they give priority, in terms of scheduling, training, monitoring, general assistance etc. to our core body of volunteers who broadcast through Irish. It is station policy that at least 90% of programming be produced exclusively through Irish, and therefore there is a certain practical limit to the number of migrant producers whom the station can accept as volunteers. Notwithstanding that, within that context, they welcome migrant producers with open arms as we would any of our non-migrant producers. They provide English translations of our induction materials (welcome letter, volunteer contracts, station rules etc.) for their migrant producers in order to facilitate their initial induction and their understanding of the station's overall ethos etc. After that, there is very much a "go-with-the-flow" attitude at all levels and they treat their migrant producers completely equally in all levels of day-to-day operation.
- Radio Vallekas: The charter of the organization includes the principle of equality that guarantees the use and enjoyment of all the organisation resources on equal terms. The flexibility of the norms, when referring to financial support, allows the facilitation of people in situations of exclusion or vulnerability.
- Radio Enlace: As with all volunteers the organisation encourages migrant producers to participate in the organization not only by doing programs but by participating in more activities. They offer technical and one to one support in specific events, and they facilitate the production of radio jingles, presence in the organisation website, etc.

ANNEX 3
SURVEY RESULTS (PRODUCERS)

Number of producers that took part in the survey: 43

Organisations they are working with:

02 Radio	Oman Ghana Radio	Radio Plus
Antxeta Irratia	Radio Dreyeckland	Radio X
Athlone Community Radio (Ireland)	Radio Enlace	RDL
Frs Stuttgart und Rum Marburg	Radio F.R.E.I.	RNL
Hungaromedia	Radio fora	Wüste welle
Near FM (Ireland)	Radio Fro (Austria)	

Country of Origin:

Afghanistan	Colombia	Hungary	Russia,	Venezuela
Algeria	Croatia	Iran,	Serbia	
Australia	Egypt	Italy	Switzerland	
Basque Country	Gabon,	Lebanon	Turkey	
Bolivia	Germany	Mexico	UK	
Brazil	Ghana	Poland	USA	

Communication Languages

Most of the producers use their mother tongue in communication with family. However, when it comes to communication with Friends and Co-workers we found the mother tongue is often supplemented (or substituted) all together by the country of resident majority language, however, in Austria and Germany, migrants producers share multicultural workplaces that allow for the use of languages other than German. The communication with friends is often multicultural, not only in their mother tongue, but also in the majority language, and also other main European languages, such as English and French.

It seems that people with migrant background tend to have multicultural friendships.

Why radio in migrant languages?

In the answers, the producers adopt the role of listeners, and in doing so justify in certain measure their decision to become communicators. There is an emphasis in the connection and preservation of their original culture and to provide information which is not available in the host country, as through the language we enact cultural traditions and worldview representation -" Acquisition of our mother tongue provides language not only as a "neutral" system but also as a medium (or paradigm) that directly influences our entire lives"¹

¹ Fantini, Alvino E., *Language and Worldview*. Published in the Journal of Bahá'í Studies Vol. 2, number 2 (1989)

Some of the respondents also believe that multilingual programming is an expression of the multicultural reality of societies and that it favours the understanding of the need for inclusion of migrant communities.

For Il me semble important de pouvoir travailler et écouter des émissions radios dans plusieurs langues dans une même radio, afin de favoriser l'inclusion et l'intégration de tous les habitants du bassin d'écoute de la radio. La radio communautaire es un instrument pour cela

Communication in the mother tongue is also an expression of the home away from the home, but also plays a role in the provision of information for newcomers that might haven't master their new country majority language. It also serves to create links with members of their community or origin in the host country.

Escuchar programas en mi lengua nativa reafirma y reconoce mi identidad y mis raíces históricas, al mismo tiempo que conocemos al mundo, ese nos conoce.

Listening to programmes in my native language affirms and recognises my identity and Historical my roots, at the same time that we know the world, the world knows us.

However, there is also a clear interest in getting informed of the reality of the host country and migrant producers will also listening to radio in the majority language, as well as producing bilingual programmes with a view on facilitating information

What language do producers use in their programmes?

There is a clear tendency by producers to approach radio as an extension of their communication needs, as it shows their programmes are broadcast in their own mother tongue, though in most cases we can see that the content is bilingual or trilingual, in an effort to approach listeners of the host community and in doing so create an intercultural virtual space that represents their wider community or even the composition of the editorial/production team.

The aims of the producers

We cannot dismiss the entertaining value of media, and this is clearly understood by radio producers. An entertaining content is a way to attract and retain listeners, who are then exposed to "higher aims" such as to provide information to people from their own community, or to inform the broader community of issues affecting their own community or their country of origin, and more importantly, as a way to challenge stereotypes that are promoted by public figures and mainstream media and in doing so, promoting intercultural integration. Some migrants find that through their radio programmes they can also voice alternative political views to those that are usually associated to their country of origin and aspires to create or reinforce the global link.

Access to media is also understood as an opportunity for development education for the audiences. This can be achieved through the presenters sharing their own experience or by introducing the experience of individuals of the host community that have experience other cultures and traditions.

In the responses to the questionnaire it was evident that producers feel there is insufficient in-depth coverage of international affairs and news in mainstream media, and that when the coverage happens, there is a lack of diversity in the views presented by these media. Community Media producers have taken upon themselves to supply this lack through their participation in media.

Some producers consider that their programmes can become hubs for cultural events and the promotion of activities that bring their community together.

How media training and participation benefits producers in their daily life

The benefits of media involvement to producers are clearly spelt in their responses to the questionnaire. Some skills acquired are measurable (Improve technical ICT Skills score higher than any for the English and German questionnaires), while others, that score higher or the same, are more qualitative, (Improve communication Skills and Broadening of Social circle and network). The impact of the exposure to media and the acquisition of the skills is also recognised on increasing confidence levels, which was recognised by all participants, but particularly by migrant producers answering the German questionnaire.

The involvement in media has also being recognised as beneficial in improved majority language skills, open up information sharing channels, bring the community together, and create a new focus to the producers' week.

Access to resources (7 over 10)

Most producers are satisfied they have everything they need to produce their own programmes. However, there is room for improvement.

Knowledge of Internal procedures (average 7/10)

Most producers are satisfied they know the organisation internal procedures. However, there responses quite differ, with some of the producers scoring really low in this particular area.

Training delivery (average 7/10)

Most producers seem satisfied with training content and delivery.

Training language (average 3.58/10)

Most producers don't feel it would be overly beneficial to receive the training in their own language.

Training days and times (average 8.23/10)

Most producers feel training was accessible from the point of view of times and dates.

Training on technical skills (average 7.54/10)

Most producers feel training provide them with the necessary technical skills to produce their programmes.

Training on journalistic skills (average 6.08/10)

Most producers feel training provide them with the necessary technical skills to produce their programmes.

Communicating problems (average 8.38/10)

Most producers know the mechanisms to communicate difficulties associated to their programme production.

Meetings days and topics are well known in advance (7.85/10)

Most producers consider that information pertaining organisation meetings are well communicated.

Participation in decision making (83.3 % know how to take part)

Most producers know the decision making processes and how to participate in them.

Opinions have an impact at governance level (61.5% consider that their opinions are not considered)

However, some consider that their opinions have not the desire impact within the organisation.

Feedback on their programme (97.7 % would like further feedback and training)

There is a clear desire for producers to receive feedback on their programme. However, though technical delivery feedback is possible for all programmes, formal feedback and evaluation on the content might be difficult when the programme is broadcast in a migrant language.

Recommendations of migrant producers on how to improve organisational processes at all levels

Governance level:

- Improve communications to ensure transparency regarding organisation structures and governance processes.
- Open consultation with programme producers. As highlighted by one of the questionnaire responses *"I think the procedures, structures and participation are all well placed. Through our monthly plenum Meetings, we used to discuss the above mentioned Points. In this way, we are always on course of what is needed to be done and to improve performance and efficiency."*
- Feedback could be improved by asking producers to complete questionnaires on a regular basis to allow constructive feedback on the workings of the organisation.

Training:

- Provide information on structures, decision making procedures and participation as part of the induction training. However, some producers are initially focused on getting the skills needed to get on air, and the desire to participate in decision making processes only develops later.
- Provide on line self-learning resources that might facilitate producers to improve their skills (videos of technical issues, etc)
- "Training radio skills in their native language and English."

Programming:

- Involving more people in producing the multicultural and foreign language programmes
- Ensure that the broadcasting time is fairly shared among all producers, to allow for more producers to access the schedule.
- “Programming schedule could be broadened so that more producers would do their own radio programme.”

Interest on more specific/advanced training

- How to report international affairs
- Technical training
- Journalistic skills
- Production values.
- Online training resources

Support for Migrant Trainers delivering training. Yes (100%)

Migrant producers’ recommendations on increasing support for migrant participation in media

- Funding. “Connecting with financial supporting bodies for radio volunteers so that their programme could be sustainable over time.”
- Ongoing training on Technical skills, Journalistic skills, Production values and Online training resources
- Ensure migrants participation in the governance structures. *“Je participe aux conseils d’administration ce qui es parfait”*
 - Outreach actions aimed to facilitate the participation of migrant communities.
 - Funding lines aimed to facilitate and encourage the employment of migrants as staff.
 - I think through supporting the Migrant Producers, we will also learn more about them. It will be win-win Situation where we will be sharing ideas and Information. The Migrant have also rich cultural heritage which can be be propagated by us all. It will also help them to be fast integrated in the German Culture.
- More exchanges possibilities between more experienced staff and volunteers, and volunteers themselves to facilitate transfer of skills and best practices. Some of the meetings could be thematic, so broadcasters with the same interests or needs can get together.
- Regular campaigns among the community groups where migrants are more likely to be involved inviting to be part of the radio.
- “Engaging more with migrant communities s and proposing programmes for different groups such as news, needs they can have, etc.”
- To be honest, I always felt not just supported but also encouraged to be part of the community and think about the shows I might be interested in producing. From talking about ideas, to having studio time and more of one on one time, it was all possible and easily provided. Having migrant person delivering training would not change that, I just think it is good to see that all parts of community are represented in the station (as they are at the moment)

- create space for share ideas, issues and achievements
- “Sería muy importante crear una red a nivel europeo y quizás mundial”

Other recommendations:

- Our experience is that migrant producers are not staying too long at the community radio as they are looking for paid job but they are still open to help maybe once in two months. People involved were highly skilled (went through level 5 radio production training) and educated and it is a shame that they have to leave.
 - Workshop to be delivered in the language the migrants speaks or as a second language through the courses provided
 - I have looked before into the use of different language into community radios. It is something that in principle I am totally in favour but I am a little apprehensive about it. Programmes produced in "majority" languages are kept within the station guidelines and regularly check so the products are kept within the margins of balance and fairness. While programmes produced in other languages regularly escape this kind of regular checks and balances, something I think needs to be look into before lands one in the stations into trouble.
 - Nothing in particular that said, we must be careful that these programs are only accessible to those who master the spoken language! This is a call for bilingualism in programme, so content is accessible to everyone.
 - Facilitate migrant networking national and international networking.

ANNEX 4
MIGRATION AND MEDIA IN HUNGARY

In 2015 the number of refugees and migrants surpassed all previous calculations and seemingly took the citizens of Hungary by surprise. It was like we had been sleeping for centuries. In response, Hungary built a fence at the Southern border to prevent refugees to step into the country's territory and the government launched a political campaign against migrants reinforcing its own bad reputation in the EU. The campaign not only tolerated but successfully generated hate speech and manipulated public opinion – and it was an “exceptional” situation in Europe, as it was not an extremist, radical party or community, but the government itself, that started a hate campaign.

If someone relied only on the news of the governmental official media it seemed that Hungary's biggest problem **in 2015-16** was migration, and that millions of people were threatening our borders waiting for the right moment to invade. This is rather peculiar if we consider that **in fact no migrants would have liked to stay in Hungary** – they used the country as a transit country in order to move further to Western-European countries but actually none of the refugees planned to settle down in Hungary.

According to the latest statistics, more than 90% of Hungary's population is Hungarian, the biggest minority is the Romani (3%), then the historical minorities – Slovakian, Romanian, Serbian, German or Russian – which together made for 2% of the total population, while the “new minorities”, like Chinese or Vietnamese, do not even reach 1%.

It was not always like this. At the beginning of the 20th only 46% of the population was Hungarian, 54% belonged to other minorities – so in fact Hungarian was the largest minority in the country. Hungary was a multicultural, multilingual state – the Carpathian basin was considered as the melting pot of nations. Then what led to the happenings of 2016, when a referendum was held about migration and migrants?

History, the two world wars and the socialist era formed and shaped Hungary. After the fall of the iron curtain, when our borders opened up, migrants did not choose Hungary as a target country to settle down, probably for economic reasons, as very simply, Western-European countries' life quality was better.

Immigration was not a recognizable issue for the majority of the society, honestly we did not know too much about refugee camps, regulations or about our refugee policy – Hungary was not affected by the migration.

In past years, the Hungarian asylum policy has been characterized by a strict regime of detention and systematic escapes. The regime of detention was briefly interrupted only in January 2013, after criticism from the European Commission, the Hungarian Helsinki Committee (HHC) and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). For a short while, notorious detention centers such as Nyírbátor in north-eastern Hungary were turned into open camps. However, in the spring of 2013, the number of people seeking protection in Hungary increased sharply. As a result, detention for first-time asylum-seekers was reintroduced in July 2013. The HHC reports that over 40 percent of adult male first-time asylum-seekers were detained by April of 2014. Reception conditions in both open and closed camps have been known to be scandalously inadequate.

Only nine percent of asylum-seekers were granted some form of protection in 2014, the lowest recognition rate in all of the EU. This low recognition rate was partly due to the fact that 80 to 90 percent of all the people coming to Hungary absconded and left to the west within a few days. Their reasons for leaving Hungary were certainly manifold: integration policies that work on paper but not in practice, symptomatic homelessness (which is criminalized in the Hungarian constitution) and poor employment prospects to name but a few.

While the Dublin Regulation has dramatic consequences for people seeking protection, regardless of whether they are deported or not, it has been largely ineffective with regard to Hungary. In 2014, Hungary received 7,961 requests for deportation, out of which only 827 resulted in a transfer, and between January 2014 and June 2015 only three to four percent of those originally registered here were sent back. The fact that the number of people crossing through Hungary continued to rise in 2015 made it ever more unrealistic to uphold the Dublin Regulation.

Immigration, was not a big issue in Hungarian politics until the end of 2014. Yet, by this time, the Fidesz-government faced a loss of popularity as corruption scandals, plans to introduce a tax on internet-traffic and other issues led to anti-government protests of different forms and sizes. While most of the civil opposition to Fidesz remained divided, the ultra-nationalist Jobbik party challenged the government from the far-right. By using the forged link between terrorism and migration, ever since the Charlie Hebdo attacks in France in January 2015, the government therefore started to distract public attention from internal policy failures and the ensuing emigration and brain drain of Hungarian youth. As a result, the official discourse on migration became markedly more hostile.

The **prime minister started linking “mass immigration” to terrorism** and repeatedly called migrants a threat to Christianity and to “western civilization and culture” in his speeches. In April, the government went one step further and announced a national consultation on “immigration and terrorism”. This “consultation” was not actually an opinion poll. Instead, it was clearly designed to incite xenophobic sentiments, juxtaposing migrants against “traditional” Hungarian families. **Only ten percent of the Hungarian population participated in the national consultation.** Yet, the authorities instrumentalised the results and stated that an “overwhelming majority” of respondents “agreed” on “the need for stricter border controls”. An equally xenophobic poster-campaign warning immigrants not to come to Hungary was launched in May. However, as the posters were in Hungarian, they were primarily supposed to appeal to domestic voters.

Despite the hostile political environment more and more people seeking international protection were arriving in Hungary: in March 2016, an average of about 200 people were registered per day; this number rose to about 400 in May and to 500 by June of that year. On the latter date, and again using the results of the national consultation as a pretext, the government announced that it would declare Serbia a safe third country and fence off the Hungarian border. What followed, nevertheless, was an increase in the number of people trying to reach Hungary before the fence was put in place. By the end of June, the daily number of people that were registered had risen to about 1000, and in the months that followed this number steadily increased to multiple thousands.

The absolute majority of people seeking international protection crossed into Hungary via Serbia were usually caught by the police in and around the southern city of Szeged, and sent to a closed detention center or an open reception center (to which we refer as a refugee camp). Until a closed registration center was opened in Röszke (which is close to Szeged), those who were not detained received free train tickets to travel to the open camps in Bicske, Debrecen or Vámosszabadi.

The number of people entering the country in 2015 completely overwhelmed the already badly equipped Hungarian asylum system. The camps, set up to process asylum applications in accordance with the Dublin Regulations, were overcrowded to such an extent that the police often did not even attempt to bring people there anymore.

Hungary was hard-pressed throughout the summer to uphold its obligations as part of the Dublin Regulation. This means that, mostly because of international pressure, the government actively prevented people from leaving the country while it was clearly both unable and unwilling to provide people with any

protection. **A lot of migrants were being stuck at Budapest's train stations** – thousands of people were sleeping outdoors on the floor, while food and water were only being provided by volunteers and the very few sanitary facilities set up by the municipalities were vastly insufficient.

In response to the mounting pressure in Keleti, the government allowed hundreds of people onto trains. This prompted many more to spend hundreds of euro on train tickets. Then, under international pressure, the train-station was completely closed to new arrivals in August.

Moreover, as protests continued and the number of people trapped at the train station steadily rose, the police and some like-minded volunteers attempted to “persuade” people to go to the camps – but in vain.

In September, when over 1,200 people left the train station on foot to walk along the M1 highway in the direction of Austria. Hungarian police and authorities just stood by so as to finally rid themselves of any responsibility towards them. This powerful initiative of people to move on, even by foot, was a strong symbolic act, which was also supported by many Hungarian and foreign volunteers who provided food and water for the people walking. The march, however, proved physically excruciating, and in order to avoid yet another humanitarian crisis, the Hungarian government sent more than 40 buses to evacuate the marchers as well as those left in Keleti. The station became empty, marking the beginning of the period of organized state transit of people to Austria.

The state-orchestrated transit from the Hungarian-Croatian border to the Hungarian-Austrian border overburdened the crossing-point to the west. In Hegyeshalom, a town next to the Austrian border, the needs of several thousands of people could not be met even though the government-supported Red Cross worked there alongside countless volunteers.

In August and September 2015, it also implemented a number of changes to the Hungarian asylum law that have effectively, made it impossible to apply for asylum in Hungary. The decision to declare Serbia a safe third country is of extreme importance in this context: from August 2015 onwards, people that had travelled through Serbia could be sent back there to apply for asylum, while Hungary sought to further close itself off. Neither UNHCR nor any other EU country considers it a safe third country.

In the beginning of September, the Hungarian parliament accepted amendments to the national criminal code. This time, the amendments made “illegal border crossing” a criminal offense punishable by three years in prison. Also, damaging a border fence is now punishable by five years in prison.

Now, people who cross the Hungarian border without documents can either be detained until their deportation, or imprisoned – all “in accordance with the law”.

The quota referendum

On the 2nd of October 2016 Hungarian citizens could practice the greatest invention of democracy – in normal case we would have voted about something that have influence on our lives. In fact, we had the chance to vote about something that was out of our competency according to the country's EU obligations, and vote about an issue that never made sense in our context.

On 24 February 2016, Prime Minister Viktor Orbán announced that the Hungarian government would hold a referendum on whether to accept the European Union's proposed mandatory quotas for relocating migrants. The referendum on the “migrant issue” became the unique topic in public life – the government had spent at least 34 million euro on an “information campaign” in which they conveyed messages such

as: “Did you know than more than 300 people were killed in terrorist attacks in Europe since the start of the migrant crisis”, or “Did you know that the Paris terrorist attacks were carried out by immigrants”.

Since the question of the referendum did not make sense and the half-year long campaign was so inhuman, a lot of voters decided to stay away from voting and effectively boycott participation.

As expected, only 44% percentage of the people voted – 98% voted against the “migrant-quota” but the voting was invalid according to the low participation.

And again, as expected, the government evaluated the migrant quota as “an overwhelming victory”, regardless of the low turnout. In their official communique stated: “we consider the decision of the voters as compulsory on our part” and called the even then very likely legally invalid referendum as “valid in political terms”...

Media in Hungary

All public service radio stations in Hungary have become (fully or partly) the bullhorn of the government currently in power.

However, public service radio continue to broadcast in all ethnic minority languages existing in Hungary, though many believe that nowadays the political interest prevails over cultural reasons: looking for easy future votes of Hungarian citizens that are entitled to double nationality and recognised as a minority in neighbouring countries. It does so through an separate Ethnic Radio ([Nemzetiségi Rádió](#), public radio channel 4) which has been on air since 2007 and broadcast daily from 8 to 20h and repeat shows during night time.

The station broadcast daily two hour programmes in Croatian, Serbian, Romanian and in Slovak languages. There is a weekly 30 minutes programme for the following minorities: Ukrainian, Armenian, Bulgarian, German, Greek. Slovenian, Ruthenian and Polish. They also broadcast one hour show five days a week in Roma language.

The number of community radios in Hungary have been fallen drastically due to the unfavourable regulations and programme quotas introduced by the new Media Law in 2010.

From minority point of view, the saddest episode was the closure of Triangulum Radio, our tri-border station (Austrian, Slovenian, Hungarian) in the western part of Hungary in 2012 (after 7 years of operation) due to bad tender practice of the media authority.

Few community radio stations continue to broadcast programmes in ethnic or minority languages:

[TILOS RÁDIÓ](#) in Budapest broadcast programmes in four languages (Serbian, Chinese, French, English and German) and also cultural shows about India and the Roma minority.

As far as [CIVIL RADIO](#) is concerned: we used to have two English language programmes, now we have only one. We used to have a German language show. We still have a Chinese-Hungarian bilingual radio show and occasionally a Spanish language programme. Furthermore, we have regular radio shows on Russian, Indian and Roma culture, plus programmes on women issues and people with disabilities.



For further information, visit <http://inclusiondes.eu/>