

Diasporic Media beyond the Diaspora

Korean Media in Vancouver
and Los Angeles

..... Sherry S. Yu



UBCPress · Vancouver · Toronto

Sample Material © UBC Press 2018

..... Contents

List of Tables and Figures	ix
Preface	xi
Abbreviations	xv
Introduction: Understanding Media in Multicultural Cities	3
1 Conceptualizing Media in a Multicultural Society	19
2 Multicultural or Intercultural? Policies and Media Practices in a Multicultural Society	38
3 Korean Diasporic Media in Vancouver	61
4 Korean Diasporic Media in Los Angeles	101
5 Locality, Ethnicity, and Emerging Trends	147
6 The Intercultural Media System and Related Policy Areas	170
Notes	187
References	193
Index	216

..... Preface

Some say diasporic media will disappear with the growth of younger generations of immigrants, while others say these media will continue. The history of journalism in North America supports the latter prediction, since diasporic media date back to the 1700s when international migration to North America began (Hayes, 2003). Although it is more of a history of indifference than of recognition, the argument is that if these media were to disappear, it would have already happened. Recent statistics place even more weight on this argument. International migration continues to grow, especially in Canada and the United States. Annual migration has been steady in the past decade, at around 250,000 for Canada and a million for the United States (OECD, n.d.). Added to this number are the Syrian refugees each country has welcomed since 2015. Between November 2015 and January 2017, over 40,000 and 17,000 refugees arrived in Canada and the United States, respectively (Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 2017; US Department of State, 2017). Given this flow of migration, the expansion of existing diasporic communication infrastructures, along with the development of new communicative space, is a more likely scenario than their disappearance. For migrants, diasporic media are an indispensable part of their lives; these media are historians of and everyday companions in the process of settlement and integration. For established diaspora, diasporic media are a community in and out of themselves. *La Opinión*, a newspaper that is almost a century old, is a living example. For young diasporas, on the other hand, diasporic media are a window to a broader society. A high dependency on the mother tongue and limited sociocultural and linguistic capacity often makes diasporic media a critical source of information during settlement and integration.

Canada and the United States already boast a strong diasporic media sector. There are approximately 1,300 and 3,000 diasporic media outlets in these

countries, respectively, although these are conservative figures registered with the Canadian Ethnic Media Association (n.d.) and New America Media (n.d.). What is new in this sector is the recent transformation brought about by new media technologies and generational shifts. In parallel to so-called first-generation media, new communicative spaces initiated by young hyphenated descendants of immigrants and cross-cultural and -linguistic groups have emerged to offer new alternative voices. News/magazine blogs and websites such as “Angry Asian Man” and “Alhambra Source” are good examples. What is more, major news networks have introduced services such as Fox News Latino, NBC News Latino, and HuffPost Latinovoces.

In this time of interesting continuities and changes, this book explores some important questions: Do diasporic media serve their respective communities exclusively, or are they also *available* and *accessible* to members of greater society at large to serve as *media for all*? To what extent has the discourse produced by these media been made available and accessible, and what are the factors that promote and hinder broadening availability and accessibility? These are new questions in diasporic media studies. To date, studies have focused primarily on the autonomous roles of diasporic media within respective communities without due consideration for their role within the broader society. Certainly, there is more to learn about these autonomous roles: new projects constantly add new value to diasporic media.

Nonetheless, the exploration of *availability* and *accessibility* of diasporic media for the broader society is equally important and timely. In particular, how multicultural cities, diasporic communities, and diasporic media operate in an increasingly multicultural, multiethnic, and multilingual society and its media system is an important area of inquiry, especially when the growing gap in public discourse among increasingly fragmented audience segments is considered. Amidst the continuing under- and misrepresentation of minorities in mainstream media content and employment (Gandy, 2000), the increasing dependency on social media news aggregates for quick newsfeeds in the digital era further limits the opportunities for members of a multicultural society to attend to alternative voices and acquire “cultural literacy” (Wood and Landry, 2008, p. 250). According to a Pew Research Center study, over 60% of adult Americans use Facebook and 50% of those users (who account for 30% of the general population) obtain news from Facebook (Holcomb, Gottfried, and Mitchell, 2013). The question is whether the Facebook news aggregator includes news produced by diasporic media, and if not, where does that 30% of the population obtain news about the rest of

society? Indeed, an information void amidst abundance is a reality. This trend continues in parallel with growing public distrust among ethno-cultural groups. Over 50% of adult Americans believe that conflict between immigrants and people who were born in the United States is the most serious social conflict in that country – more serious than the conflict between rich and poor, or blacks and whites (Pew Research Center, 2009).

This book proposes a notion of an *intercultural media system* in which mainstream and diasporic media are not only *available* but also *accessible* for all members of society so that voices from diverse communities are adequately created, circulated, contested, and cultivated in everyday discourse and that all members of society experience a full sense of belonging and have sufficient cultural literacy to make informed democratic choices. This system allows members of society to engage in a two-way conversation – to speak and to listen – by providing a proper access point to diverse voices.

Perhaps this concept sounds too ideal, but the actual need of it is rather real and urgent. The purpose of this book is thus to envision such a media system and begin a conversation on collective efforts to enable it. This book is, after all, an exploration of my long-time query throughout years of diasporic media research that has observed the theoretical and administrative reinforcement of diasporic media as *media for the Other* rather than *media for all*. The history of cultural and linguistic hierarchy influences how culture, race, ethnicity, language, and citizenship, among other aspects of identity, are *theorized, organized, managed, and practiced* in a multicultural society. The consequence is the perceptual or substantial marginalization of alternative voices that hinders opportunities for proper intercultural dialogue. The questions that remain are these: Are we fine with continuing this arrangement? What would be the consequence of missing opportunities for listening to diasporic voices and acquiring cultural literacy in a society that is only becoming more multicultural, multiethnic, and multilingual?

Building an intercultural media system requires a collective effort from government, media sectors, industry associations, and academic institutions. The chapters in this book carefully examine the past, present, and future outlook of diasporic media through a study of Korean media in Vancouver and Los Angeles and their challenges and possible contributions to building an intercultural media system. The focus is on the still-dominant form of diasporic media of young diasporas, which produce content in their respective ethnic languages. Understanding their challenges and contributions in terms of broadening availability and accessibility for a broader

audience helps us to properly address the areas in need of attention as we move forward.

I hope that this book opens up a conversation, an opportunity to speak about and listen to the ways in which individuals in a multicultural society can be more culturally literate and have culturally literate conversations in the years to come. Diasporic media are certainly one of the ways, if made properly accessible.

..... Introduction: Understanding Media in Multicultural Cities

Canada and the United States were among the top 10 destinations for more than 200 million international migrants in 2010 (United Nations, 2015). The presence of foreign-born immigrants, significant in both countries, is continually growing and, as of 2010/2011, accounted for 20% (equivalent to seven million) and 13% (equivalent to 40 million) of the population in Canada and the United States, respectively (Statistics Canada, 2011a; U.S. Census Bureau, 2010a).¹ Especially in cities like Vancouver and Los Angeles (L.A.), a large proportion of the population speaks languages other than the official language(s): 40% and 60%, respectively (Statistics Canada, 2011b; U.S. Census Bureau, 2010a).² In addition to this constant flow of immigration, the resettlement of refugees further intensifies ethno-cultural and linguistic diversity. Between November 2015 and January 2017, over 40,000 Syrian refugees arrived in Canada and 17,000 arrived in the United States (Citizenship and Immigration Canada, 2017; U.S. Department of State, 2017).

Such ever-growing diversity, coupled with the advancement of new media technologies and the influence of transnational economics and politics, has been reflected in the growth of the diasporic media sector across North America in recent decades. As evidence of this, there are roughly 1,300 and 3,000 broadcast, print, and online diasporic media (or more broadly known as “ethnic media”) organizations in Canada and the United States respectively (Canadian Ethnic Media Association, n.d.; New America Media, n.d.). The actual number could be higher, since these listings tend to be based on voluntary membership. In fact, Murray, Yu, and Ahadi (2007) found nearly 150 diasporic media outlets in 22 languages in Metro Vancouver alone. Similarly, in Los Angeles County alone, there are more than 100 such outlets, and this figure represents newspapers only (see County of Los Angeles, 2011).

What are the implications of this growth for diasporic communities and the broader society? Literature on diasporic media has focused on the former. I have discussed elsewhere (Yu, 2017) that among other topics, studies have explored diasporic media as a communicative venue (Couldry and Dreher, 2007; Georgiou, 2005); as a public sphere and political agency (Downing, 1992; Downing and Husband, 2005); as a facilitator of national identity and shared understanding (Bailey, 2007; Georgiou, 2002, 2005; Kosnick, 2007; Sinclair, Yue, Hawkins, Pookong, and Fox, 2001; Sreberny, 2000, 2005; Sun, 2006); as a provider of a sense of belonging (Ball-Rokeach, Kim, and Matei, 2001; H.L. Cheng, 2005; Karim, 2002; Lin and Song, 2006; Murray et al., 2007; Ojo, 2006); and as a distributor of business information to help enable new business start-ups (Zhou, Chen, and Cai, 2006). The role of diasporic media in the process of immigrants' settlement in and integration to the broader society is indeed significant.

Certainly, more studies on these autonomous roles of diasporic media within their respective communities are needed, especially as factors such as the advancement of new media technologies and the demographic shifts across generations constantly transform the nature of diasporic media and offer new opportunities and possibilities. Specifically, new media technologies have enabled diasporic communities to go online. So-called digital diasporas formed online by and for media organizations and ordinary migrants help these user communities connect to one another locally in new countries and globally across diasporas and with home countries (Brinkerhoff, 2009; Chan, 2006; Hiller and Franz, 2004). Added to this dynamic is the expansion of homebound transnational media that reach out to a global diasporic audience, especially to transnational, cosmopolitan migrants (Sun, 2006; Punathambekar, 2014).

Demographic shifts across generations also facilitate the expansion of diasporic media beyond the domain of first-generation immigrants and open up opportunities for their discourse to reach a broader audience. Culturally and/or racially hybrid second- and third-generation descendants of early immigrants create "communicative spaces" (Couldry and Dreher, 2007, p. 80) of their own. Online news and magazine blogs such as "Schema Magazine" and "Angry Asian Man" have emerged to represent the voices of the younger generations. These new spaces suggest that just as the diasporic experience is unique for each group within and across communities, so too is the utility of diasporic media. The growth in population of the younger generation, particularly in the United States, explains this trend. Between 1998 and 2013, the

second-generation population – defined as “U.S. native (born in the United States or territories) with at least one foreign-born parent” – grew by 23% from 30 million to 36 million (Trevelyan et. al, 2016, p. 1). What is more, cross-cultural, -ethnic, and -linguistic communicative spaces emerge to test possibilities for new communicative platforms for intercultural dialogue. Grassroots initiatives such as “Alhambra Source” (a multilingual news site in the city of Alhambra) and LA Beez (a former hyperlocal news site in L.A.) have been tried as innovative ways to facilitate dialogue across cultural and linguistic groups on a local level (Yu, 2017). In the private sector, new media ventures such as Saavn.com and DramaFever.com invite producers and audiences from the broader society to be involved in production and consumption of ethnocultural content (Yu, 2015). Indeed, DramaFever.com, an online streaming service of international television programs, was established by Korean Americans but is watched primarily by non-Koreans (Nawaz, 2015).

These continuities and changes within the diasporic media sector confirm the “inevitably dialectic nature” of diasporic media, which constantly pushes diasporic media beyond their former boundaries, despite the general understanding that diasporic media are “*only* by, for, and about ethnic communities” (Yu, 2015, p. 133). Diasporic media are indeed both *here* and *there*, both *universal* and *particular*, and both *in-between* and *intercultural* (see Chapter 1). This dialectic nature of diasporic media, especially its increasingly intercultural nature, provides the reason for the need for new research focusing on the broader implication of diasporic media within a multicultural society – along with continued research on the autonomous roles of diasporic media within their respective communities. The question is: Do diasporic media serve their respective communities exclusively, or are they also available and accessible to members of greater society at large to serve as *media for all*? This book focuses specifically on the extent to which diasporic media are *available* and *accessible*, not only for diasporic communities but also for the broader society, as a means to improve cultural literacy, intercultural dialogue, and civic engagement in a multicultural society.³ In doing so, this book explores the *structural* (policy) and *institutional* (media organization) conditions that promote or hinder broadening the availability and accessibility of diasporic media, as well as how these conditions fare in constituencies where multiculturalism is implemented differently – in the case of this study, Canada and the United States.

These are indeed new questions in diasporic media studies. Theories, policies, and practices related to media and cultural diversity in general and

diasporic media in particular have focused primarily on diasporic media within their respective diasporic communities, without due consideration for their role within the broader society. Such a tendency is certainly related to how culture, race, ethnicity, language, and citizenship, among others are *theorized, organized, managed, and practised* in a multicultural society. Diasporic media have long been confined as *media for the Other* rather than *media for all*. This is manifested in public perception, policy articulation, industry practices, and academic research, which collectively have overlooked the significance of availability and accessibility of diasporic media for the broader society. The consequence is detrimental: the continued marginalization of minority voices and limited access to those voices for the rest of society hinders opportunities to listen and be listened to. In the words of Charles Husband (1996, 1998), both “the right to communicate” and “the right to be understood” for all members of a multicultural society are at risk (see Chapter 1 for a full discussion). How are these missed opportunities manifested in a society that is only becoming more multicultural, multi-ethnic, and multilingual?

The growing gap in public discourse among ever-fragmented audience segments warns us of possible repercussions. Illustrating this reality is a recent finding by the Pew Research Center (2009): over 50% of adult Americans believe that the conflict between immigrants and people who were born in the United States is the most serious social conflict in the country – more serious than the conflict between rich and poor or blacks and whites. Perhaps this should not be a surprise, given continuing under- and misrepresentation of ethnocultural minorities in media content and media employment (Gandy, 2000). The changing news media habits in the digital era further sets up a double whammy and widens the gap in public discourse. In the United States, over 60% of adults now use Facebook, and 50% of those users (who account for 30% of the U.S. population) obtain news from Facebook (Holcomb, Gottfried, and Mitchell, 2013). The question is whether the Facebook news aggregator includes news produced by diasporic media and, if not, where that 30% of the population obtains news about the rest of society.

What all these findings suggest is that without having a set of mechanisms in the media system that helps individuals in a multicultural society *access* diverse voices, “living together” in mutual respect amidst increasing differences is hard to achieve (Fleras, 2011, p. 249). Thus, a new model that helps to critically reassess theories, policies, and practices concerning media and cultural diversity in general, and diasporic media in particular, is indeed

necessary. As its starting point, this book introduces the notion of an *intercultural media system* in which mainstream and diasporic media are not only *available* to but also *accessible* for all members of society. This system would mean that voices from diverse communities are adequately created, circulated, contested, and cultivated in everyday discourse and that all members of society experience a full sense of belonging and have sufficient cultural literacy to make informed democratic choices. This system would allow members of society to engage in a two-way conversation – to speak and to listen – by providing a proper access point to diverse voices (see Chapter 1 for a full discussion).

The need to envision an intercultural media system emerges from immediate necessity rather than utopian idealism. Certainly, this media system requires the examination of both mainstream media and diasporic media. In particular, understanding the extent to which mainstream media are available to, and accessible for, new members of society as well as existing ethnocultural minorities is as important as diasporic media being available to and accessible for members of broader society. This book focuses on diasporic media and attempts to initiate a conversation on how government, media sectors, industry associations, and academic institutions can work together to build a more interculturally available and accessible media system and help individuals in a multicultural society to become more culturally literate, have meaningful conversations across communities, and actively engage in civic matters that are common to *all*.

The focus is on the still-dominant form of diasporic media that produces content in the respective languages of its audience. A case study of Korean media in two multicultural cities, Vancouver and Los Angeles, helps us understand the challenges and possible contributions of diasporic media as a community, a civil society, and a market, which are governed by locality and/or ethnicity.

Why Korean Media and why Vancouver and Los Angeles?

This is the first comprehensive international comparative study of Korean diasporic media in the two most multicultural cities in North America. Korean media in Vancouver and Los Angeles were selected primarily for two reasons: the uniqueness of the Korean media, on the one hand, and of the cities, on the other. With respect to the uniqueness of Korean media, first, the Korean media sector provides rich case-study material in terms of availability of services in these two cities. During the time of study, more

than 20 Korean media outlets operate in Vancouver, and 50 to 100 operate in L.A., depending on the source (see Chapters 3 and 4). The rate of growth of Korean media stands out within the diasporic media sector. Especially in Vancouver, Korean diasporic media are the fastest-growing media segment among 22 language groups tracked (Murray et al., 2007). Korean media are also available on all media platforms – in broadcasting (over-the-air, cable, satellite) and print (newspapers, magazines) as well as in online and offline formats (e.g., websites, e-papers, online community bulletins, online streaming services). They are also available across all major cities in North America. *The Korea Times* and *The Korea Daily*, the two leading transnational media organizations, for example, operate branches in L.A.; Seattle; Atlanta; Washington, DC; Chicago; Texas; New York; Vancouver; and Toronto.

The second reason for selecting Korean media is the adequacy for an in-depth international comparative analysis. In terms of development paths, for example, the comparison is between young and mature infrastructures. The first Korean media outlet in Vancouver was founded in the 1980s, when L.A.'s Korean media sector had already formed all genres of media outlets. Beginning with the launch of *The Korea Times* in 1969, L.A.'s Korean media now boast nearly 50 years of history. In terms of ownership, the comparison is between the sector of solely immigrant media and the sector of immigrant and transnational media combined. Korean media in Vancouver are owned entirely by local immigrants, with the leading outlets being independent franchises of either L.A.'s branches or headquarters in Korea. L.A.'s media, on the other hand, consists of immigrant media and branches of transnational media that operate under the auspices of their headquarters in Korea (see Chapter 4).

Korean media in these cities can also be compared in terms of micro and macro market structure – not only the sheer number of media outlets, as mentioned above, but also the size of the average monthly advertising market – in 2011, \$500,000 for Vancouver compared to \$5,000,000 for L.A. (see Chapters 3 and 4). The stronger presence in L.A. of local branches of Korean transnational corporations such as Samsung, Korean Air, and Hyundai Motors is one of the contributors to the expansion of the local advertising market. Exploring how these different conditions influence local Korean storytelling in each city can provide significant insights.

With respect to the uniqueness of the cities, first, Vancouver and L.A. are under the governance of Canada and the United States, which take different

approaches to multiculturalism. Chapter 2 details how these understandings of multiculturalism – as a political philosophy (in Canada) and as an ideology (in the United States) – influence the policies for media practices, especially that of diasporic communities. This structural difference provides a rationale for a more thorough examination of diasporic media practices across cities.

Second, these cities are two of the most popular destinations for Korean migration to Canada and the United States, which provides a rationale for the Korean communities to develop a strong enclave economy and communication infrastructure. Not only have Canada and the United States been the primary destinations for Koreans migration in the past two decades – accounting, respectively, for over 30% and 50%, on average, of the total global Korean migration (see Table I.1) – but also the province of British Columbia and the state of California, where the research sites are located, host over 30% of the Korean migrants in each country (see Table I.2; Republic of Korea, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade, 2009, 2010). Specifically, Vancouver is home to the second-largest Korean diaspora in Canada, after Toronto, and the city was also chosen as the top destination for Korean entrepreneur immigrants in 2001 (British Columbia. B.C. Stats, 2001). L.A.'s Korean community is by far the largest Korean diaspora in North America in terms of the size not only of the Korean population but also of the enclave economy. As mentioned, most branches of major Korean transnational media, as well as Korean corporations, are located in this city (see Chapter 4).

Third, the Korean communities in these cities are one of the largest monolingual, first-generation–dominant diasporas in Canada and the United States. First-generation Koreans account for 83% and 74% of the total Korean populations, respectively, in Canada and the United States (Statistics Canada, 2011c; U.S. Census Bureau, 2011). Dependency on the mother tongue is therefore common. In the United States, 79% of Koreans speak Korean at home and 45% “speak English less than ‘very well’”; these figures increase when narrowed down to Koreans in L.A., where 87% of Koreans speak Korean at home and 59% “speak English less than ‘very well’” (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011). This explains the dependency of Korean immigrants on Korean diasporic media (E.T. Chang, 1988; A.Y. Chung, 2007; I. Kim, 1981; Min, 2006b) and provides a rationale for the rapid growth of Korean-language media.

TABLE I.1

Global Korean migration, 1990–2009

Year	Total	Canada	U.S.	Australia	New Zealand	Latin America	Europe	Asia and other
1990	23,314	1,611	19,922	1,162	119	456	14	30
1991	17,433	2,651	12,754	1,113	308	550	3	54
1992	17,927	3,407	11,473	1,093	1,320	594	11	29
1993	14,477	2,735	8,133	538	2,569	467	14	21
1994	14,604	2,356	7,975	542	3,462	257	4	8
1995	15,917	3,289	8,535	417	3,612	49	2	13
1996	12,949	3,073	7,277	519	2,045	24	–	11
1997	12,484	3,918	8,205	216	117	3	–	25
1998	13,974	4,774	8,734	322	96	–	–	48
1999	12,655	6,783	5,360	302	174	8	–	28
2000	15,307	9,295	5,244	392	348	–	1	27
2001	11,584	5,696	4,565	476	817	1	–	29
2002	11,178	5,923	4,167	330	755	3	–	–
2003	9,509	4,613	4,200	256	435	5	–	–
2004	9,759	4,522	4,756	350	127	4	–	–
2005	8,277	2,799	5,083	327	67	1	–	–
2006	5,177	1,605	3,152	357	49	14	–	–
2007	4,127	1,517	2,227	347	15	21	–	–
2008	2,293	820	1,034	405	6	4	2	22
2009	1,153	383	599	158	7	–	2	4

NOTE: The numbers represent Korean migrants who declared their destination to be either the United States or Canada on departing Korea. Those who changed their status in their respective countries are excluded here.

SOURCE: Republic of Korea, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (2010).

Finally, the Korean communities in the two cities have different local experiences, which means that diasporic media fulfill different roles in the two cities. In a comparison of factors such as immigration history, demographic profiles, and interracial relations, Vancouver's Korean community was found to be much younger, less settled (with more of a floating population; see Table I.2), and more peaceful. L.A.'s Korean community is older and more settled (with a greater naturalized citizen population; see Table I.2) and has experienced intense interracial relations such as during the 1992 L.A. riots (see Chapter 4).

Thus, this study uses the city as a conceptual reference from three perspectives for a comparative analysis. First, the city as a legal reference is subject to the constitutional and legal frameworks of multiculturalism, immigration,

TABLE 1.2

Koreans in Canada and the United States, 2009

	Canada		B.C.		U.S.		California	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Korean total	223,322		76,712		2,102,283		622,100	
Canadian/U.S. citizens	98,860	44	23,228	30	1,003,429	48	359,200	58
Korean citizens	124,462	56	53,484	70	1,098,854	52	262,900	42
• Permanent resident	80,705		35,133		524,084		105,900	
• Visa student	22,249		7,599		105,242		20,800	
• Other	21,508		10,752		469,528		136,200	

NOTE: Extracted for Canada and the United States only.

SOURCE: Republic of Korea, Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (2009)

citizenship, and media. Second, the city as a socio-urban reference is subject to the structure in which immigrant settlement and media undertakings actually take place. Finally, the city as a geographic reference is subject to the area in which local stories are told. The two cities examined in this book refer to Metro Vancouver, on the one hand, and L.A. County (and the adjacent Orange County, as needed, as these two are the major markets of Korean diasporic media), on the other.

In addition to these city-specific references, political and sociocultural changes in (or initiated by) Korea and the rest of the world make this study timely, including Korea's 2009 election law, which extended voting rights to overseas Koreans, and the widespread popularity of the Korean Wave around the world (see Chapter 6).⁴ These push factors originating from Korea create new dynamics in the relationships among Korea, the Korean diaspora, and Canada and the United States, dynamics that occur on sociocultural, economic, and political levels and are worth exploring in the study of Korean media.

Data Collection and Interpretation

COLLECTION OF DATA

Peter Dahlgren's (1995) fourfold typology of the public sphere provides a useful guide for exploring structural and institutional factors across cities

(Vancouver and L.A.) and ethnicity (Korean). Dahlgren's "four dimensions" are "social structures" (e.g., "historical conditions"), "media institutions" ("organization, financing, and legal frameworks"), "media representation" (e.g., news topics, "modes of discourse," "character of debates and discussion"), and "interaction" (e.g., "people's encounters and discussions with each other") (Dahlgren, 1995, pp. 11, 17, 11, 12, 15, 18). The first dimension helps explore structural conditions – as in policy frameworks for immigration, citizenship, and media – while the remaining three dimensions help explore institutional conditions pertaining specifically to Korean media organizations. Because each dimension requires a different approach, a multimethod approach was chosen, as detailed below, using in-depth interviews, content analysis, and observation. The fieldwork was conducted in Vancouver and Los Angeles, between May 2009 and April 2011.

In-depth Interviews

Using in-depth interviews to examine the first two of Dahlgren's dimensions, social structures and media institutions, this book explored the history of the community; the demographic profile of media practitioners and community organization leaders; and the organization's history, day-to-day operation and production, financing, and regulation. For the regulation, in particular, the level of awareness of relevant multicultural and media policies among media practitioners was explored. Fifty semi-structured, in-depth interviews were completed with individuals from two groups: (1) media practitioners (e.g., owners, editors, reporters, staff writers) involved with diasporic (or multicultural/multilingual) media – whether printed, broadcasted, or published online or offline – that are directed to immigrants in Canada and the United States; and (2) nonprofit, nonpartisan CSO (civil society organization) representatives who serve immigrants in Canada and the United States. The semi-structured interviews involved a self-administered importance-satisfaction rating survey on news production and on institutional collaboration both between media and CSOs and among media institutions. These attributes were developed based on findings from earlier studies (Murray et al., 2007; Yu and Murray, 2007).

Content Analysis

A content analysis of news items and surrounding ads was conducted to explore the third dimension – media representation, described by Dahlgren

(1995, p. 15) as “what the media portray, how topics are presented, the modes of discourse at work, and the character of debates and discussion.” The analysis helps us understand not only Korean discourse in general but also both the potential influence of media policies (Chapter 2) and institutional conditions (Chapters 3 and 4) on editorial directions and the level of availability and accessibility of diasporic discourse in broader society. The analysis was based on answers to the following questions: What news items are covered most frequently? What news of *here* (country of settlement) and *there* (country of origin) are covered? Is this coverage consistent with what media practitioners claim to cover? How do these media situate their community in the national and local discourse? How civic and engaging are these media in terms of covering *here* and working towards improving cultural literacy? Thus, the focus is more on what is covered than on how it is covered, the latter usually being the focus of cultural studies through semiotic or narrative analyses.

A content analysis of the ads surrounding news items was also conducted to increase understanding of not only the types of businesses that constitute the Korean enclave economy but also the level of economic embeddedness and social belonging of Korean immigrants in the local economy, as an indicator of mutually constitutive socioeconomic activities. A content analysis is more useful than a semiotic analysis for this study, since the majority of ads provided brief business and/or contact information in spaces smaller than a business card rather than using the artistically designed images usually associated with full-fledged commercial ads.

Data were collected from a full range of media platforms (television, radio, and newspapers) and ownership types (local immigrant, transnational, and multicultural media). A three-week sample (Monday to Saturday) of more than 1,800 news items and more than 2,800 surrounding ads was collected in total in March (newspapers and TV) and April (radio) 2010. From the total of 18 days, 6 days were selected to form a “constructed week” that assumes “cyclic variation of content for different days of the week and requires that all the different days of the week be represented” (Riffe, Aust, and Lacy, 1993, p. 54). The coding was done entirely by the author followed by the intercoder reliability testing on a “reliability subsample” (10% of the total 1,839 items) by a second coder to ensure that “the obtained ratings are not the idiosyncratic results of one rater’s subjective judgment” (Tinsley and Weiss, 1975, p. 359). A variety of measurements

was used to check the level of agreement and covariance, and the result was satisfactory on all measurements.⁵

Additionally, along with the news items and surrounding ads, more than 300 online community bulletin board threads were analyzed. The threads were retrieved from the so-called community section of the websites of all dailies during the time of study. This analysis was designed to address Dahlgren's fourth dimension – interaction. Although the online threads represent virtual encounters, readers share events or announcements (e.g., congratulatory messages, social programs, job postings, cultural events, new business promotions or updates), raise concerns or questions (e.g., regarding immigration, health, the job market, studying abroad), buy and sell items, or promote locally originated blogs. This rich community section provides useful information for understanding reader-initiated conversations on the topics that matter to them, in addition to the topics selected by publishers. The threads posted in the first three weeks of March 2010 (Monday to Sunday) were collected six months after the initial posting in order to provide enough lead time for readers to respond to the posts and for the analysis to measure hit frequency.

Unobtrusive Observation

Finally, the purpose of observation was to have a closer look at media announcements of the events that actually took place during the fieldwork period. The advantages of observation are “subjective understanding,” “being there: seeing the unseen,” “immediacy,” “grounded research,” and “richness and colour” (Deacon, Pickering, Golding, and Murdock, 2007, pp. 255–260). For this study, observing events through a series of questions helped develop an understanding of what was considered worthy of an announcement in the media on the part of media practitioners and how people (who may or may not have been the consumers of diasporic media) in the local community responded to and utilized the information in their everyday lives. Some of the questions asked were the following: What is the event about (what)? Who is hosting the event (who)? When does it take place (when)? Where does it take place (where)? How is the event structured (how)? Who are the participants? What are the demographic specificities, and how do those vary with type of event? What are their main issues and concerns? What is the purpose of the event? For those events that media practitioners attended and reported on, this type of observation facilitated the understanding of

media's actual roles as well as their interactions with the audience. The audience members' comments also revealed how they made sense of communication infrastructure. Thus, the observation in this study achieved a dual purpose in that it not only "put flesh on the bones of quantitative methods" but also added to and enriched the findings (Deacon et al., 2007, p. 259).

INTERPRETATION OF DATA

In discussing the politics of interpretation, Ang (2006, p. 184) argues that "the 'empirical,' captured in either quantitative or qualitative form, does not yield self-evident meanings; it is only through the interpretive framework constructed by the researcher that understandings of the 'empirical' come about." This conception of the "interpretive framework" is heavily indebted to the ethical injunction for researchers to aspire to "reflexivity," since "the ethnographer and his or her language are inevitably a part of the phenomenon that is being investigated" (Spencer, 2001, p. 450). According to Alasuutari (2004, p. 26), the researcher's standpoint is a reflection of who she or he is in totality:

Standpoint researchers draw a radical conclusion by emphasizing that what you observe and how you conceive of reality depends on your perspective, and that different perspectives are mutually incommensurate. Consequently, as part of a research report the researcher must give an account of his or her characteristics and standpoint so that readers can assess its effect on the results.

In this study, the author depended on the author's own hyphenated identity as the "interpretive framework" when interpreting the data. The lived experience of a "cultural negotiator" between the two cultures, Canada/United States and Korea, offers a view of the in-between, which is the very nature of diasporic media as well.

The pros and cons of this double in-between standpoint are discussed in a body of literature. Bissoondath (1994) illustrates the dilemma that people with hyphenated identities face, both inside and outside of the subscribed ethnocultural boundaries. From inside, the second generation is often labelled "banana," which implies "yellow on the outside, white on the inside," and is considered less authentic, mostly because of low proficiency in its own ethnic language (Bissoondath, 1994, pp. 105–106). From outside,

the foreign appearance constantly evokes questions from the dominant culture such as “What nationality are you really?” (Bissoondath, 1994, p. 111). This dual foreignness is also raised by Ang (2002) in her autobiographic work *On Not Speaking Chinese: Living between Asia and the West*. Her self-claimed identity as a multiple migrant (“an ethnic Chinese, Indonesian-born and European-educated academic who now lives and works in Australia”) contributes to the idea that “there can never be a perfect fit between fixed identity label and hybrid personal experience” (pp. 11, 34).

The author’s own hyphenated (or culturally hybrid) identity may lack the authentic in-group representation; however, cutting across two different cultures may offer new possibilities in accessing and understanding the practices of cultural negotiation. Therefore, the interpretation that this study presents is neither the in-group narration speaking on behalf of the Korean community nor the out-group narration looking in at the Korean community from the third-person perspective. Instead, it is the narration of a cultural negotiator who attempts to offer the contact point between the two cultures. Such a standpoint (or the reflexivity that the author assumes) has two implications. First, it is reflective of not only the author’s own identity but also the overall objective of this study – to see possibilities for connecting multicultural “sphericules” (Gitlin, 1998, p. 173) – to work towards building an intercultural media system. Second, the author’s standpoint is not only a deliberate and natural choice of self-positioning as a narrator but also an almost automatically prescribed and expected role imposed by the study participants; they expected the author to serve the community as a spokesperson or a negotiator between the Korean community and the broader society (or the broader media system) by delivering to the broader society the community’s messages, such as calls for advertising support or policy recommendations.

Structure of the Book

This book is structured to guide readers through a comprehensive overview of the multicultural mediascape in North America, followed by a specific case study. Chapter 1, “Conceptualizing Media in a Multicultural Society,” examines theoretical debates on media and cultural diversity in general and diasporic media in particular and conceptualizes an intercultural media system as a conceptual tool for reassessing existing theories, policies, and practices of diasporic media. The chapter also conceptualizes diasporic media by

problematizing existing terminologies that are used to refer to media of this nature and introduces the three dimensions of diasporic media explored by this book – diasporic media as a community, a civil society, and a market. Chapter 2, “Multicultural or Intercultural? Policies and Media Practices in a Multicultural Society,” attempts to understand the relationship between policies and actual practice: how cultural diversity is organized and managed in policy influences the actual practice, such as the availability and accessibility of diasporic media for *all*. The chapter begins with an examination of the relationships among policies concerning multiculturalism, immigration, citizenship, and languages, and the historical trajectory of diasporic media as an outcome of that relationship. This chapter further explores the relationship between the media policies and the multicultural mediascapes of Canada and the United States by providing an overview of multicultural media options on various platforms, and discusses the structural issues pertaining to the availability and accessibility of diasporic media for *all*.

Chapter 3, “Korean Diasporic Media in Vancouver,” and Chapter 4, “Korean Diasporic Media in Los Angeles,” discuss the findings of case studies on Korean media. Both chapters examine three dimensions of Korean diasporic media: as a community, a civil society, and a market. Each dimension specifically illustrates the level of availability and accessibility of Korean discourse for members of diasporic communities as well as of the broader society and identifies areas of strength and weakness. Challenges and prospects for broadening availability and accessibility are revealed through the analysis of data gathered via three research methods: interviews with media practitioners and civil society organization leaders; a content analysis of selected news items, advertising, and online bulletin board threads from Korean diasporic television, radio, and newspapers; and observation of community events.

Chapters 5 and 6 return to the notion of an intercultural media system and discuss the importance of collective efforts by government, media sectors, industry associations, and academic institutions in building an intercultural media system. Chapter 5, “Locality, Ethnicity, and Emerging Trends,” identifies city-specific and ethnicity-specific factors and discusses the similarities and differences in how structural and institutional characteristics across cities fare in developing functioning communication infrastructure. This chapter revisits the findings discussed in Chapters 3 and 4 and explores potential contributions of and expectations for diasporic media; it includes



a brief discussion relating to mainstream media institutions. In addition, the chapter examines the emerging new factors – other than structural and institutional characteristics – originating in Korea. Special attention is given to the rise of the Korean Wave.

Chapter 6, “The Intercultural Media System and Related Policy Areas,” focuses on policy areas that are in need of attention if an intercultural media system is to be built. This final chapter revisits Chapter 2 and projects the comments from media practitioners onto the existing policies in order to provide policy recommendations for government, media sectors, industry associations, and academic institutions to consider for building an intercultural media system.

© UBC Press 2018

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without prior written permission of the publisher.

Library and Archives Canada Cataloguing in Publication

Yu, Sherry S., author

Diasporic media beyond the diaspora : Korean media in Vancouver and Los Angeles / Sherry S. Yu.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

Issued in print and electronic formats.

ISBN 978-0-7748-3578-7 (hardcover). – ISBN 978-0-7748-3580-0 (PDF)

ISBN 978-0-7748-3581-7 (EPUB). – ISBN 978-0-7748-3582-4 (Kindle)

1. Ethnic mass media – British Columbia – Vancouver – Case studies 2. Ethnic mass media – California – Los Angeles – Case studies 3. Koreans – British Columbia – Vancouver – Case studies 4. Koreans – California – Los Angeles – Case studies. I. Title.

P94.5.M552C365 2018

302.23089'957

C2017-906476-2

C2017-906477-0

Canada

UBC Press gratefully acknowledges the financial support for our publishing program of the Government of Canada (through the Canada Book Fund), the Canada Council for the Arts, and the British Columbia Arts Council.

Printed and bound in Canada by Friesens

Set in Scala and Minion by Artegraphica Design Co. Ltd.

Copy editor: Joyce Hildebrand

Proofreader: Kristy Hankewicz

Indexer: Cheryl Lemmens

Cover designer: Will Brown

UBC Press

The University of British Columbia

2029 West Mall

Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z2

www.ubcpres.ca