

Alasuutari, Pertti: Why Does the Radio Go Unnoticed? *The Nordicom Review of Nordic Research on Media and Communication, a Special issue on Radio Research in Denmark, Finland, Norway and Sweden*. No. 1/1997, 161-172.

Why Does the Radio Go Unnoticed?

PERTTI ALASUUTARI

When people are asked how much they listen to the radio, many of them say that they listen to it reasonably little.

Q: How much do you usually listen to the radio?

A: Well every now and then, it depends. When I'm for instance driving my car I listen to it. And, erm, sometimes, when I happen to be at home then I also listen. But not very much anyway.

Q: How much do you usually listen to the radio?

A: Well, in the morning ... as I'm coming to school and ... That's about it, and always when I'm driving a car.

Q: How many radios do you have at home?

A: ... Four.

Q: Is there a ... do you have a room of your own?

A: Yeab, yeab.

Q: Is there a radio?

A: Yes.

Q: Well you have a radio in the car as you said. Do you have a car of your own?

A: Yeab.

Q: Does it contain a cassette player as well?

A: Yeab.

The radio often goes unnoticed, which does not necessarily mean that it has a minor role in everyday life. Finns listen to the radio almost four hours a day on the average (Sarkkinen 1992), but nevertheless it seems that the radio is particularly important to nobody. In many interviews made for this study people at first said that they hardly ever listen to the radio, but when the subject was discussed in more detail it

turned out that there are several daily occasions in their everyday life when the radio is to be heard.

The unnoticed role of the radio in everyday life is an apparent fact; a fact that explains why there has been so little sociological radio research since the 1950s. Social scientists usually study significant and somehow problematic phenomena, and the radio is (no longer) such a thing. To use Paul Willis' (1978) term, the radio does not belong to the cultural field of ordinary people; it is not one of the objects or artifacts that have particular symbolic meaning and significance for them. Listening to the radio mostly goes routinely unnoticed.

Instead of looking for the exceptions, the people for whom, cases in which, or points of view from which, the radio is important, I will problematize the mundane everyday life in which the radio has little significance. Why is it, after all, that the radio goes unnoticed; that is the question answered in this article.

The Method and Data

The analysis is based on 48 thematic interviews, which have been transcribed. In text files the research material is 2.9 megabytes. Measured by the number of interviewees, the data is relatively small, but in terms of text pages or amount of information it is extensive. It is comprehensive especially in

portraying the diversity of radio use of an individual, although the respondents are not a representative sample of the Finnish population. In this respect the situation differs from social surveys where the sample represents well the population of an area but badly the diversity of individual behaviour or – in fact – ways of speaking about a subject. Bad representativeness of the individual does not matter as long as the objective of the study is, for instance, to find out what parties individuals are going to vote in the next elections, and how this depends on the background variables, such as age, sex, or educational level. Instead, when studying such a many-faceted phenomenon as radio listening, a bad representativeness of the individual is a serious deficiency. In general, the survey research setting presupposes that individuals are able to assess how, what channel, what programmes, and how much they "usually" listen to. It has already, in the beginning of this article become clear how difficult it is for individuals to make such assessments. It is only after careful scrutiny of the details of their everyday life that individuals come to realize the great number of occasions on which the radio is a part of. The first impression fits badly together with reality.

The objective of this study was to get a picture of the role of the radio in everyday life; a more detailed and comprehensive picture than that obtained through individuals' general impressions. That is why the idea of one part of these interviews was to "collect" detailed descriptions of individuals' radio listening situations. The interviewees were asked to tell what time it was; where was it; what else were they doing; were there others present; did they listen to it, too – that is, did anyone comment on anything on the radio; did their other activities disturb their concentration on

what was on; do they remember what the program was and what was said or what records they were playing; what channel it was etc. At this stage of analysis, descriptions of the situations were used as observational units. As people recalled approximately ten recent radio, record or tape listening situations, the data amounted to 489 observational units, of which 404 dealt with radio listening. Therefore, there is enough of them even for statistical analysis of relations between different variables. This means, first of all, that statistical relations between variables are representative of an imagined population: if we were to gather another comparable data set, the results would be similar. Secondly, statistical analysis of this kind of data means that the researcher can check how his or her intuitive ideas and initial hypotheses hold in the scope of the whole data set. If, for instance, it appears that playing records or tapes is linked with active interaction situations, to study it by crosstabulation ascertains that the researcher has not only paid attention to situations where that is the case, without inspecting how typical or exceptional these cases are in the whole data set. By counting the cases we can make sure that the data support the interpretations.

However, the results of this study cannot be mechanically generalized into a population, the sample of which the data are regarded. This means that questions of generalization – or, when dealing with qualitative research we should rather speak about extrapolation – must be discussed separately on every occasion. All in all, by statistical analysis of this data set we can see how the situation variables are linked with background variables – that is, the variables describing the interviewee, or how the situation variables are linked with each other. When interesting and statisti-

cally significant relations are found, we may try to find them explanations by referring to other research, by using sociological imagination, and with the help of qualitative analysis of this research material. Compared to a social survey, data comprising thematic interviews has the advantage that whenever a statistical relation between variables is found, you can go back to the text corpus itself and see how the link between them is created in the oral description of each interviewee's everyday life.

The interviewees were selected by theoretical sampling (Strauss 1987, 16-21). The 48 individuals interviewed were fairly evenly distributed so that they are, in terms of background variables that are found sociologically relevant as to radio listening, an as diverse as possible collection of Finns. They are men and women of different ages, occupations, and both city-dwellers and people living in the countryside. The idea was that the data collected in this way include examples of as different as possible radio listening situations and uses of the radio. This kind of sampling strategy, ensuring maximal individual and situational variation, is useful both for qualitative and quantitative analysis. If I were, for instance, to create a typology of the social uses of the radio, it could be assumed that the data contain examples of all of them. On the other hand if, in this "mini sample", there can be found such statistical re-

lations between individuals' background variables and the variables dealing with their radio use as have also been identified in surveys representative of the total population, this qualitative data set can be used in explaining them.

Why do the blue-collar workers listen to the radio so much? One of the main findings of social surveys dealing with radio listening has been that individuals representing a lower educational level, income level, or lower occupational status listen to the radio more than those with higher ones (Ruohomaa 1991; Sarkkinen 1992). This finding, which is also reflected in this mini sample, can be given an explanation in the light of the data. It also gives of a hint about the unnoticed role of the radio.

Since the interviews did not include questions about the interviewees' annual income or educational background, let us compare differences in the amount of daily radio listening between occupational groups. To do this, I went through all the interviews, and, on the basis of how they described their daily radio use, classified the individuals into four categories: "heavy", "fairly heavy", "fairly moderate" or "moderate" radio users. Those who could be estimated to listen to the radio more than three hours a day were classified "heavy" users. From two to three hours a day was classified "fairly heavy", one to two hours was classified "fairly moderate"

Table 1. The Amount of Radio Listening by Occupation

<i>Radio listening</i>	<i>Occupation</i>				
	factory workers	students	functionaries	entrepreneurs	farmers
moderate	3	3	3	3	0
fairly moderate	1	4	2	1	1
fairly heavy	1	4	1	0	5
heavy	6	3	4	2	1
total	11	14	10	6	7

n=48

and less than one hour a day was classified "moderate". The tables 2 and 3 show how occupational groups are distributed to these four classes.

The relative differences between occupational groups in my data are similar to those found in Sarkkinen's (1992) research report. According to her results – with senior citizens, not included in my data, notwithstanding – farmers and other entrepreneurs, treated as a joint group, listened to the radio the most, 292 minutes a day. The workers ranked next with 256 minutes, and functionaries held the third place (220 minutes a day). In my data the farmers and factory workers also hold first places: of the farmers 85 per cent, and factory workers 64 per cent are heavy or fairly heavy radio listeners. As to the proportions of

heavy users, the factory workers are the leading occupation.

So far, so good. The fact that individuals with low income and educational level listen to the radio more than others is reflected in the data at hand in the top-ranking position of farmers and factory workers. But why is it so?

We will get a hint to the explanation by looking at the way in which the listening situations are distributed to programme types among people in different occupations (see table 3).

Table 3 gives a fairly good overview of the way in which the 489 radio, record or tape listening situations described by the interviewees are distributed to programme types listened, and how the proportions differ between occupational groups. It

Table 2. The Amount of Radio Listening by Occupation (%)

<i>Radio listening</i>	<i>Occupation</i>				
	factory workers	students	functionaries	entrepreneurs	farmers
moderate	27	21	30	50	0
fairly moderate	9	29	20	17	14
fairly heavy	9	29	10	0	71
heavy	55	21	40	30	14
total	100	100	100	100	100

Table 3. Programme Type by Occupation (%)

<i>Programme type</i>	<i>Occupation</i>				
	farmers	students	factory workers	functionaries	entrepreneurs
Record, tape	10.0	20.0	14.2	18.3	23.9
Music	18.6	25.8	22.0	26.9	29.9
Speech	12.9	17.5	10.2	15.4	10.4
News	11.4	3.3	14.2	5.8	7.5
Sports	18.6	7.5	2.4	10.6	4.5
Programme Flow	28.6	25.8	37.0	23.1	23.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

n=489

shows, for instance, that sports programmes are favoured by farmers, and that the proportion of news is greatest among the listening situations described by factory workers and farmers. However, the proportions of the last programme type, entitled "programme flow", is of particular interest to us. By "programme flow" I coded the listening situations where the describer mentioned several types of programme being heard during the listening session. Such sessions are usually longer than others, so that during them the individuals may hear, say, music, a newscast, and a speech programme. The proportion of such listening sessions are greatest among factory workers, the occupational group among which the proportion of "heavy listeners" was also biggest. This makes sense: a big share of long listening sessions amounts to a big total amount of daily radio listening.

The opportunity to long radio listening situations depends on the listening context. When going to work by car, say, radio listening does not last very long. On the other hand, at work listening may last several hours. As inaccurate as the proportion of "programme flow" is as an indicator of long listening sessions, the statistical relations between listening place and programme type, particularly the proportions

of "programme flow", are quite predictable (see table 4). The share of programme flow is biggest among listening taking place in the morning at home (47.2%) and at work (40.0%). It makes sense to assume that those are the occasions on which long listening sessions are most typical.

Accordingly, it makes sense to assume that the occupational groups whose typical daily listening practices include greatest proportions of listening situations taking place in the morning at home or at work are the ones among whom the proportions of heavy or fairly heavy listeners are greatest. The individuals for whom it is possible and who are in the habit of listening to the radio in the morning and at work are the ones whose total listening time is big, because those are often long listening occasions. Table 5 shows that farmers and factory workers are, along with entrepreneurs, the leading occupational groups in terms of workplace listening. It also shows that farmers lead in the proportions of morning listening – a fact that probably partly explains why farmers listen to the radio that much.

What about the case of entrepreneurs in table 5? Is their high ranking in the proportion of workplace listening an unexpected result? Not really. Sarkkinen's (1992)

Table 4. Listening Place by Programme Type (%)

<i>Programme type</i>	<i>Place</i>						
	morning home	car	evening home	daytime home	workplace	leisure	total
record, tape	1.9	22.5	19.8	15.9	1.8	17.5	17.2
music	15.1	32.4	29.6	20.5	20.0	25.2	24.6
speech	15.1	9.9	11.1	15.9	12.7	15.4	13.5
news	20.8	7.0	4.9	13.6	12.7	4.9	8.4
sports	0.0	5.6	9.9	11.4	12.7	7.7	8.0
programme flow	47.2	22.5	24.7	22.7	40.0	29.4	28.3
total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 5. Listening Place by Occupation (%)

Place	Occupation					total
	farmers	students	factory workers	functionaries	entrepreneurs	
morning home	14.3	10.8	10.2	12.5	6.0	10.8
car	17.1	18.3	9.4	13.5	16.4	14.5
evening home	18.6	15.8	18.8	17.3	10.4	16.6
daytime home	14.3	8.3	10.2	3.8	10.4	9.0
workplace	17.1	7.5	13.3	7.7	13.4	11.2
leisure	14.3	31.7	30.5	32.7	34.3	29.4
total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

research report also showed that farmers and other entrepreneurs, treated as a joint group in her data, listen to the radio the most. By looking into this diverse group of entrepreneurs, comprising six individuals in this sample, in more detail we may in fact learn more of the whole concept of workplace listening.

Of the six individuals, one person, a 58 years old shopkeeper, selling meat at a market hall, never listens to the radio at work. It is practically impossible for him in that environment. Of the remaining five, two persons, a music journalist, making his own programmes for a local radio station, and a bookkeeper only listen to the radio at work during breaks. Two entrepreneurs, a female barber-hairdresser and a male band agent listen to the radio all the time at work, whereas a female physical therapist doing massage listens to the radio while working now and again.

There are, in other words, two kinds of workplace listening, break listening and work listening, and it is quite obvious that continuous work listening easily amounts to a "heavy listener" category. Moreover, the nature of one's work sets limits for one's workplace radio listening. Workplaces may be too noisy (a factory, a market hall) or too official (a bank, an office) for radio listening, or the work itself may be badly

suitable to simultaneous radio listening (making music, giving a lecture, writing, taking part in a conversation).

A factory worker, like this woman, age 44, may listen to the radio all day long while working:

Q: Well lets see. How is it in the morning, do you turn on the radio?

A: No, I don't have time for it. But when I get to work, I immediately turn it on. It's the first thing I do.

Q: Why?

A: Well it's mainly background music, nothing else. I cannot concentrate on the programme that much. There's so much humming and everything, it gets to your ears if you listen to it all day. It's better when there's music and stuff so ... And it's nice then, you'll hear music. Farmers typically listen to the radio while working in the barn, feeding or milking the cows. Men also often listen to the radio when driving the tractor:

Q: Well, then you listen [to the radio] in the tractor. Is there tractor work now, in the wintertime?

A: Yes.

Q: In the forest?

A: No, not in the forest. To clear off the snow, or to take feed to the animals. It depends on the snow situation how much I get to listen to it.

Q: When was the last time you rode your tractor?

A: Yesterday.

Q: For how long?

A: ... Maybe an hour.

Table 6. Workplace Listening by Occupation

	factory workers	functionaries	farmers	entrepreneurs
work listening	7	2	3	3
only break listening	1	3	0	2
no workplace listening	3	5	4	1
total	11	10	7	6

n=34

Let us now take a look at the way in which farmers, factory workers, entrepreneurs and functionaries are divided to different workplace listening categories (see table 6).

The table shows the difference in workplace listening between heavy listening occupations, factory workers and farmers, and functionaries, who usually listen to the radio fairly little. Even if they do listen to the radio at work, it is usually during breaks, as it is with this woman, a bank teller.

Q: How is it at work, do you listen to the radio there?

A: Well we do have a radio there, but we only listen to the news if there is something exceptional going on. That is, we turn it on in the dining room during lunch break. But normally not. We do not listen to the radio there.

Q: So in the bank itself there is no radio?

A: No, no. It is only in the dining room.

Another woman, a researcher, age 38, even has a radio in her office, but she seems to use it in order to mark breaks in her work.

Q: You do not have a radio in your present job?

A: Yes I do (shows a radio set behind a curtain).

Q: Oh yeah, it was hidden. When do you listen to it?

A: Sometimes at full hours I listen to the news.

Q: When was the last time you did?

A: Maybe a month ago, I very seldom turn it on.

Another woman, a 49 year old bookkeeper, also operating as a band agent, cannot

stand hearing music or anything on the radio at work:

Q: Have you had customers today?

A: Yeah, all day, and the telephone has rung awful lot and...

Q: You said that you have a radio here at the workplace.

A: Yes, in one big office there is a radio on all day. (...) I don't want to bear any of it, I keep the doors closed. I cannot stand anything that is played there.

Q: Why don't you want any background music or sound?

A: Well ... why don't I. I have sometimes wondered why. I simply don't want any disturbance. When I get out of here and there's been a hell of a fuss all day, I only want to be alone and quiet and with my dog. It is nice to take the dog for a walk and say let's go, in total peace and quiet. And besides, I cannot think any complicated things [while listening]. Ordinary tasks of course, I can handle mechanical things, but more difficult things do not flow out of my head. That is, I do not get any ideas or anything if there is something on [the radio]. I don't want that, you have to have peace and quiet. There has to be like empty space so that something can come out. I cannot stand any noise. But if I go out to a concert or for a couple of beers, it's different. Everything is okay, doesn't bother me at all.

All in all, it can be said that mechanical tasks enable simultaneous radio listening, whereas tasks that require an individual's full attention prevent it. That is why individuals' total amount of the radio listening is

correlated with their occupation and, more precisely, with the nature of their work. Manual work is usually more suited to simultaneous radio listening than mental work.

The Mind-Altering Device

The link between occupation and radio listening patterns also discloses one of the main functions of the radio. It is used to compensate for insufficient mental activity, to provide use for the mental capacities left unemployed by the task at hand. On a more general level it can be said that by the use of the radio we manipulate our mental activity, both the activity level and the content and direction of our attention.

We may "open up" a channel for one of our senses, hearing, in a situation where hearing is not needed to accomplish the task we are engaged in. We may also "shut down" voices we find uninteresting, disturbing, or irritating. By choosing to concentrate on a programme we may be highly active, while at the same time performing a dull task, such as washing the dishes. The channel and programme may be selected very carefully to adjust one's activity to the preferred level. When performing a task that requires much concentration we may choose an easy-listening music channel or turn off the radio altogether. For instance, it can be seen in table 4, that the proportion of music listening is biggest among the descriptions of car listening. On the other hand, less demanding tasks or situations enable and favour speech programmes. At the other end of the continuum we have programmes, such as radio drama, which require full attention. In the interviews people typically report of listening to such programmes during holidays or weekends, at the summer cottage for instance.

Adjusting one's activity to the preferred level may also mean that the radio is a surrogate friend, a companion during one's lonely moments.

A: Usually I turn the radio on if I want to dispel gloomy days. Bad wether or something, then you kind of want some sympathy from the radio.

Q: Do you find it in the radio?

A: Well it comes in that you know some others are going to work too, and you get the ...

Q: Others fell gloomy too?

A: Yeab, others have the same feeling.

(...)

A: This morning? Well, there was music and the news. In other words, it's only that at least there are others awake too, at least the reporter (laughter) in the morning.

By selecting the right kind of channel or record we may also manipulate our emotions (see also Tortzen 1992a; 1992b). We may tune our radio set to a channel that corresponds our frame of mind, thus enforcing or stabilizing it, but we may as well get attuned to a different emotional state by selecting a suitable channel or record. A woman, age 24, working as an interviewer for a market research company, put it this way:

Q: What are the situations in which you play a record instead of listening to the radio?

A: Usually if I have guests or if I get a certain frame of mind – that is, if I'm sad or very happy or something. Or you want to get the feeling more intense, so you know what to do it with when you have records. On the radio you do not necessarily get just what you want.

Another woman, a 28 years old highschool music teacher, uses the radio in a similar fashion:

Q: Do you ever listen to the music during the weekends or more than on weekdays?

A: Yes, more actually. During Saturday evenings and if I'm going out to have fun I may turn on the radio, you know! (laughter)

Q: When was the last time you went and turned on the radio?

A: It must have been two months ago (laughter)

Q: You said you didn't have the channels in that [preset]

...

A: No ...

Q: How have you found then?

A: Well I just search for a kind of groovy music that would tune me up to the beat of the city already at home.

Q: So you just keep searching for a suitable channel?

A: Yeah.

Q: For how long have you listened to it before going out?

A: Well, let's say I might make up for an hour or so and have some white wine (laughter).

Drugs are sometimes called mind-altering substances. In this sense the radio could be called a mind-altering device. And the same goes for other mass media, such as television. By this comparison I do not mean to suggest that the habit of listening to the radio should be considered an addiction, or that we should assume the media to have a powerful effect on individual minds. Let me rather emphasize the active role of individuals in manipulating their emotions and frames of mind with the help of the mass media. It is the individual who chooses to use the radio, and who selects the channel and programme that suits to his or her present or desired frame of mind. It can only be compared to mind-altering substances in that both the media and the drugs are technical means by which to aspire to the desired condition; means that can be individually employed whenever needed. The human imagination is, of course, itself a "mind-altering device": we may simply picture ourselves

some other time and place, or someone else. However, with the means of the mass media we get more ready-made food for thought, without the need to hunt it ourselves, and we may actually see or hear things taking place somewhere else. With the help of the mass media individuals are much less restricted by given conditions, by time and place or by other people physically present. The history of the radio is part of the story of individualization.

The Radio – No Problem

As one of the electronic media, the radio has been and still is an important device in helping individuals organize their everyday life: level of activity, objects of attention, emotions and interaction. With the help of the radio, we are much of independent of time and place, and thus also much more able to tolerate present conditions, such as dull tasks, idleness, or loneliness. On the level of social organization, the emergence of electronic media have meant simultaneous individualism and real time connection with other people, and with everything important taking place anywhere in the world – the modern society in a nutshell.

Yet, from the point of view of culture and social structure, the radio has been left practically unstudied. The radio seems to be no problem to anyone. As a given part of everyday life, it is, unlike television, only unconsciously important. It goes routinely unnoticed. Why is that?

One of the reasons is that the radio is also mainly a medium used for informative purposes such as listening to the news. Fictitious programmes have long since been a rarity, and it is fiction that surrounds television with moral concerns.

Or is there fiction on the radio? The majority of programming time is composed of music, and the song lyrics are a

form of fiction, like short stories or parts of a dialogue. Often the song lyrics are criticized for their stupidity or sweet romanticism, quite like television serials. So why don't the informants justify their radio listening because of this?

The explanation lies in the fact that when listening to the radio the music choices are not made by the listener. This differs from listening to a record or a tape, which directly reflects the listeners' own taste.

Media use is also time-consuming, and that is one of the reasons why it could be a moral issue. Some people, especially women, excuse themselves for watching television because the time spent in front of the screen is away from other activities. That is why it is no wonder that many informants stated that they prefer the radio to television.

I listen to the radio fairly much. Well, not at work but in the morning the radio wakes us up and we listen to it. In the next room we of course have the breakfast television on (laughter), but in the bedroom the radio is on all the time until I go to work. And also in the evening when we get home from work, my husband turns on the radio, and we don't watch television that much in that I'm quite selective, I don't watch just anything. I prefer listening to the radio, 'cause then you can do other things as well. (woman, age 43)

Radio listening is almost always a side-activity, a way to use the mental capacities not needed in tasks, such as driving a car or doing manual work, that do not require an individual's whole attention. The time spent on listening to the radio is not away from something else. On the contrary, by also listening to the radio when doing something else an individual may feel that he or she is more efficient and dynamic.

Both the radio and television are mind-altering devices, individuals' means to manipulate their activity level, but as such they are opposite cases. The radio is typically used to raise one's activity level, whereas watching television prevents oneself from doing much else. Indeed, it is often used to sit back and relax, to cool off and to get one's thoughts away from something they were working on. In that sense, the radio could be compared to coffee and television to an alcoholic drink. Modern culture approves of coffee and prizes action, but we have an uneasy relation to alcoholic drinks and idleness or laziness.

Moreover, the radio is a lot more an individual medium than television. As a background voice the radio is like an extra sense through which the individual is linked with other people and the rest of the world, no matter what the person is presently doing, or where he or she is. The radio is a mobile, highly individualized medium. Unlike television, it is seldom a family medium, and that is why program or channel choices need not be negotiated and justified. Radio listeners are seldom accountable for their programme choices. For these reasons the radio is to a much lesser extent a moral issue. People seldom justify radio listening.

On the other hand, in that respect it seems that the radio is the future of television. Just consider breakfast television, MTV, or CNN. An even greater share of television viewing has become radio-like, a side-activity amidst other activities going on in the household, at work, or other places. A growing number of television sets per a household also means that watching television is less often a joint family activity. As a consequence, individual family members less often need to justify their program choices to others. Yet, in the main stronghold of television use –

that is, prime-time fiction, viewing habits remains to be a delicate, moral issue because they reflect individuals' taste.

To make radio more "visible", more important in people's lives, should the programmers make more important, informative and touching speech programs? The recent developments in the Finnish broadcasting system speak for the effectivity of an exactly opposite strategy. With the rise of commercial radio, and the channel proliferation and audience segmentation of the state-owned broadcasting company done as a response to the competition for listeners, the radio is listened to much more than it used to be. We may also assume that the radio has become more im-

portant as a medium. That is because the channels specialized in attracting different segments of the population reflect the tastes of these audiences much more than the old unspecialized channels used to. As a consequence, since listening to a channel of one's own choice now reflects an individual's aesthetic taste and identity, channel preferences and listening habits are becoming more of a delicate and personal issue. To use the concept of Paul Willis, the radio may still not belong to the "cultural field", to the objects and artifacts that have particular meaning and symbolic value in the identity formation and realization of cultural groups, but it has certainly become closer to that field.

Bibliography

- Ruohomaa, Erja: *1990 radioundistus ja yleis"t. Helsinki: Yle, Tutkimus- ja kehitysosasto, tutkimusraportti 13/1991.*
- Sarkkinen, Raija: *Valtakunnallinen radionkuuntelu marraskuussa 1992. Helsinki: Yle, Tutkimus- ja kehitysosasto, tilastaselvitys 36/1992.*
- Strauss, Anselm L.: *Qualitative Analysis for Social Scientists.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1987.
- Tortzen, Anne: Unge, musik og radio. *Mediekultur* 18, 1992, 22-33. (1992a)
- Tortzen, Anne: *Youth, Music and Radio.* Paper for the third Nordic Youth Research Symposium, 23-25 January 1992, Copenhagen. (1992b)
- Willis, Paul: *Profane Culture.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul 1978.

