

## Channel 4 and Celebrity Big Brother 2007: Multiculturalist or Segregationist?

Shehina Fazal<sup>†</sup>

---

---

### Abstract

The aim of this paper is to discuss the controversy surrounding the events broadcast on the *Celebrity Big Brother 2007* (CBB 2007) on UK's Channel 4. *CBB 2007* prompted a national debate on issues of 'race', racism as well as multiculturalism. Further, the events on the reality television show sparked an international diplomatic incident, during Gordon Brown's (then Chancellor of the Exchequer) visit to India. This paper attempts to outline two key areas that should be rooted in the understanding of the discourse surrounding the *CBB 2007* controversy: multiculturalism and transnationalism. It is proposed that these two areas provide an understanding of the increasing legitimacy given to social segregation of ethnic minority communities since 9/11 and 7/7. The paper suggests that the contemporary understandings of multiculturalism and social segregation have to be foreground, when analysing entertainment programmes such as *CBB 2007*.

### Keywords

*Multiculturalism; Social Segregation; Transnationalism; Race; ethnicity; Media; Celebrity Big Brother; Channel 4 Television; United Kingdom*

---

---

### Introduction

*Celebrity Big Brother 2007* – the reality television show on UK's national TV channel-Channel 4 – began on 3 January and ended on 27 January 2007, with Shilpa Shetty, the Bollywood actor as the winner. Celebrities who participated in *Celebrity Big Brother 2007* (CBB 2007) were offered financial rewards to appear on the show. On 16 January 2007, *CBB 2007* became part of a controversy, following the introduction of the former *Big Brother* contestant Jade Goody, her boyfriend as well as her mother into the *Celebrity Big Brother* house. Contestants Jade Goody- former *Big Brother* contestant, Jo O'Meara - former singer in the pop group S Club 7 and Danielle Lloyd-former Miss Great Britain and model, directed racist comments to fellow contestant Shilpa Shetty (Bollywood actor) using phrases such as 'Shilpa Poppadum' (Goody) and called her 'a dog' (Lloyd) and that Shetty should 'fuck off home' (Lloyd) and poked fun at her Indian accent and

---

<sup>†</sup> Shehina Fazal Lectures at the Department of Applied Social Sciences, London Metropolitan University, Stapleton House, London, United Kingdom. Email: s.fazal@londomet.ac.uk

her cooking. Channel 4 broadcast these events in the *Celebrity Big Brother* house and the subsequent reactions and the responses by various institutions including the media provide instructive insights into issues of race and racism in the UK in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Immediately after the controversy, the sponsor of the series, Carphone Warehouse promptly withdrew its sponsorship. The Chief Executive of Carphone Warehouse explained that the events on the *Celebrity Big Brother* were 'entirely at odds with its brand values, and it had decided to act after watching last night's programme'. (available: <http://media.guardian.co.uk/site/story/0,,1993552,00.html?gusrc=rss&feed=1>).

Additionally, the broadcasting of the above events sparked the largest number of complaints (45,000) to the regulator, the Office of Communications (Ofcom). Most of these complaints alleged "racist abuse and bullying". Politicians intervened in the controversy with the then Prime Minister, Tony Blair who was questioned about the events in *Celebrity Big Brother* house in parliament. There were protests in India about the way in which a Bollywood actor was being treated on a British television show. Gordon Brown, the then Chancellor of the Exchequer was on tour in India during the controversy in the *Celebrity Big Brother* house, and was quick to explain to the Indian media that Britain was not really racist. In April 2007, he went further and was quoted in the *Guardian* newspaper as saying: 'I think we're moving from this period when, if you like, celebrity matters, when people have become famous for being famous. I think you can see that in other countries too-people are moving away from that to what lies behind the character and the personality.' (*The Guardian*, 14 April 2007) Brown wanting to be seen to be disapproving the celebrity culture says: 'It is a remarkable culture where people appear on television and are famous simply for the act of appearing on television.' (*The Guardian*, 14 April 2007)

Having foregrounded the events and the subsequent responses to the controversy in *Celebrity Big Brother 2007*, this article sets out to map Channel 4's remit on the provision of multicultural programmes and how the events in CBB 2007 are antithetical to the remit. The paper also attempts to elucidate the specific issues in the controversy that prompted a large number of complaints to the television regulator, Ofcom. Additionally, the paper attempts to highlight and provide some understanding to the events that occurred on British television in early 2007 and suggests that these should be understood through the multicultural and transnational framework.

## **Channel 4 and its Multicultural Remit**

Channel 4, the public service terrestrial television network was pioneering in its provision of multicultural programming in Britain in the early 1980s. The channel began broadcasting in November 1982, as a subsidiary of the then Independent Broadcasting Authority (IBA). In its early days, Channel 4 provided innovative and experimental programming, as it was conceived as a public service broadcaster that was commercially funded, but publicly owned initially by the IBA. Later the channel was owned by the Channel Four Television Corporation whose Board was appointed by the Independent Television Commission, the successor to IBA and more recently by the Office of Communications (Ofcom) in consultation with the Culture Secretary. Following Broadcasting Act 1990, the Channel 4 Television Corporation took over control of the channel and this period marks the change in the 'multicultural' programming remit of the channel. From catering for the 'minority interests', which included arts and cultural programmes, the channel geared itself towards competing with other channels through

imported programmes, like *Friends*, *ER*, *Frasier* and more recently *Sex in the City* and *Desperate Housewives* from the US. Most of these shows were screened at peak time on the channel and therefore, competing directly with other channels for audience ratings.

In 1998, Channel 4's revised licence included the commitment to provide at least three hours a week of multicultural programming and some of these programmes were to be scheduled during peak time. However, when investigating the performance of this requirement, the 2002 annual report for the channel notes that while the overall amount of multicultural programming has increased, the proportion of multicultural programmes that are shown during peak time has dropped and nearly three-quarters (73%) are shown after midnight.

Since the Communications Act 2003, the public service remit for Channel 4 has been broadened. Nevertheless, the channel is required to cater to the culturally diverse audience as section 265 (3) of the act states:

- (3) The public service remit for Channel 4 is the provision of a broad range of high quality and diverse programming which, in particular
- (a) demonstrates innovation, experiment and creativity in the form and content of programmes;
  - (b) appeals to the tastes and interests of a culturally diverse society;
  - (c) makes a significant contribution to meeting the need for the licensed public service channels to include: programmes of an educational nature and other programmes of educative value; and
  - (d) exhibits a distinctive character.

The above remit for public service provision together with the emphasis on 'innovation, experiment and creativity' echoes the initial remit for the channel in the early 1980s. However, the measure of success of a TV channel in the industry is in the audience share. Audience figures show that the terrestrial Channel 4's audience share has been maintained at around ten per cent over the last ten years, whilst the audience share for as BBC1, BBC2 and ITV1 has been declining. Channel 5 and the non-terrestrial (other) cable and satellite channels continue to attract a significant number of British television viewers. (Table 1) The data demonstrates that Channel 4's strategies in seeking audiences have been successful in helping to maintain its position in the audience share market.

**Table 1: Annual share (%) of UK television viewing**

<i>Channels</i>	<i>1997</i>	<i>1999</i>	<i>2000</i>	<i>2002</i>	<i>2004</i>	<i>2006</i>
<b>BBC1</b>	30.8	28.4	27.1	26.2	24.7	22.8
<b>BBC2</b>	11.6	10.8	10.8	11.4	9.9	8.8
<b>ITV1</b>	32.9	31.2	29.2	24.1	22.8	19.6
<b>Channel4/S4C</b>	10.6	10.3	10.5	10	9.8	9.8
<b>Channel 5</b>	2.9	5.4	5.7	6.3	6.6	5.7
<b>Others (cable &amp; satellite)</b>	11.8	14	16.6	22.1	26.3	33.3

**Source:** *MediaTel News Bulletin 09.03.07* (date accessed: 12 March 2007) available from [newslinebulletin@mediatel.co.uk](mailto:newslinebulletin@mediatel.co.uk) ([www.mediatel.co.uk](http://www.mediatel.co.uk))

Hill's (2002) study on the 'Real Audience' of Big Brother states that the multimedia platform of the series led to Channel 4 achieving the 'best Friday nights ratings in its history' for the first series (p.326). Further series continued to build the audience and given this commercial success, it is not surprising that the format of the series became popular in the international television market place. Hill's (2002) study also investigated the viewing patterns of over 8,000 viewers of reality television in 2000 and concluded that:

The format has proved to be successful across different cultures, tapping into a desire for new factual programming as was successful with segments of viewers, in particular the much coveted sixteen- to thirty-four-year-old, educated, upwardly mobile viewer. (Hill, 2002, p. 337)

Georgina Born (2003) proposes that there is increasing commercialization of public service broadcasting, which includes Channel 4 and reiterates this point in 2007 when writing about the "culture of rampant commercialism" in the *New Statesmen*. She says of the independent production companies: 'The independents are a varied bunch. Some, like Endemol, are multinational subsidiaries that pride themselves on delivering ratings.'

Peter Bazalgette, Chairman of Endemol UK the makers of *Big Brother*, wrote in the *Prospect* magazine earlier this year that the reality television show is not new to controversy. The events that occurred in January 2007 in the Celebrity Big Brother house meant 'business as usual for the most celebrated and reviled reality television show in Britain'. (Bazalgette, 2007, p.14) A somewhat similar position was reiterated by Andy Duncan, Channel 4's Chief Executive in an article by James Robinson for *The Observer* newspaper:

One of the ironies of all of this is Channel 4 has done more than any other broadcaster to help push forward issues around race and multi-culturalism. It's part of our remit - to cater for minority audiences and promote diversity, and we're incredibly good at it. Our ambition is to portray a wide range of views and help build a more tolerant society ... where people have a better understanding of others with different views to their own. (*The Observer*, 28 January 2007)

The above responses reinforce the strategy of 'desperately seeking the audience' that the channel seems to have adopted. The reactions by Channel 4 and Endemol to the *Celebrity Big Brother 2007* controversy are justified within the liberal frame where the perception is that, by portraying racist attitudes and terminology within the reality television show, the audience who are predominantly young people (Hill, 2002), will be much more aware of the issues of racism. However, the sub-text of the racist comments made in the Celebrity Big Brother house should also be understood in the context that they perpetuate pre-existing prejudices and discrimination and it is arguable whether the racist comments encourage the viewers to reflect about such attitudes and behaviour. Further, in order to maintain its audience share in a fiercely competitive television landscape, Channel 4 has clearly decided to reconfigure the innovative and experimental nature of its programming

in the early days to one where tried and tested programme formats with controversy that may offend but also attract viewers to the channel.

### **Complaints to the Regulator – Office of Communications (OFCOM)**

The television regulator Ofcom received almost 45,000 concerning Channel 4's broadcast of Celebrity Big Brother alleging – among other things – racist abuse and bullying. Ofcom stated: 'We take such allegations extremely seriously' and announced while the series was on air that 'we would launch an investigation into the programme'. On 24 May 2007, Ofcom published its adjudication on Channel 4's broadcast of handling of events in Celebrity Big Brother and said that their investigation found that Channel 4 had made serious editorial misjudgements, compounded by a serious failure of its compliance process, putting it in breach of the Broadcasting Code. The result was that Ofcom imposed a statutory sanction on Channel 4 requiring the channel to broadcast a summary of Ofcom's finding on three separate occasions.

Ofcom's notice of sanction published on 24 May 2007 states:

Ofcom has found that in relation to the following three incidents, Channel Four failed to appropriately handle the material so as to adequately protect members of the public from offensive material:

Remarks about cooking in India (transmitted 15 January 2007)

"*Fuck off home*" comment (transmitted 17 January 2007)

"*Shilpa Poppadom*" comment (transmitted 18 and 19 January 2007)

The Sanction goes on to say:

For reasons set out in the Adjudication, Ofcom has directed Channel Four and S4C to broadcast a statement of its findings in a form determined by Ofcom immediately before the start of the broadcast of the first programme of the eighth series of *Big Brother* on Channel 4; immediately before the start of the broadcast of first re-versioned programme of the eighth series of *Big Brother* on Channel 4; and immediately before the start of the broadcast of the programme in which the first eviction from the eighth series of *Big Brother* occurs on Channel 4.

Andrew Taussig (2007) deemed that 'the farthest thing Ofcom, regulator of television shows did was to impose financial sanctions to the show and revoke the license of its broadcaster'. He observed that the effort made by Ofcom was 'only a light touch regulation which is a sensible mix of desistance and intervention'. This light penalty is an interesting example of the regulatory body Ofcom discharging its responsibilities in the highly competitive arena of digital broadcasting in the UK.

### ***Big Brother* and the Reality Television Genre**

The development of *Big Brother* that was created by Jon De Mol in the Netherlands has become the most successful reality television formats in the modern history of television. Hill and Palmer (2002), in an editorial for the journal *Television and New Media* that was devoted to the international phenomenon, state that '*Big Brother* is a typical product of

our commercially oriented age in being a hybrid, a combination of various genres designed to maximise audiences' (p.251). The programme format has been exported to many countries of the world where it has become a platform for displaying national characteristics. The format has attracted controversy in many countries of the world. For instance, in France it was perceived to damage public morals (Jost, 2004) and in Belgium, it attracted a critical debate in the press on the negative impact of the series (Meers and Bauwel, 2004).

Couldry (2002) writing about the first series of *Big Brother* in the UK, suggests that we need to analyse the display of "ordinary reality" on television as well as the Web. Couldry proposes three avenues of analysis: the live event, media/ordinary and true fictions or fake truths? The role of the media in making *Big Brother* series one as a big event was obvious, particularly with the Friday night evictions, as well as the press coverage given to the evicted contestant during the weekend. The 'liveness' of the *Big Brother* show and the emphasis placed on it meant that the *Big Brother* was constructed as a media event. But how did the representation of reality as ordinary impact upon the idea of the series being a media event? The transition of contestants from ordinary to celebrities was the aim of *Big Brother* and the journey is made by some of the contestants. However, *Celebrity Big Brother* has been perceived to be not so successful as celebrities are not ordinary and therefore, unclear what the show set out to do. The third point of analysis proposed by Couldry (2002) is in the 'ambiguity of the programme'. He writes: 'More important may be precisely the ambiguity of the programme and the event. BBUK1, like all successful collective games, traded on ambiguity: yes, it was only a game, but wider "truths" were revealed through the way it was played' (p.290).

Ash Sharma (2007) provides another perspective to the controversy on CBB 2007, where he says that we were not ready for the 'global media spectacle' of the row between Shilpa Shetty and Jade Goody. Sharma goes on to state that the row has raised many questions concerning the 'multiplicity of racisms' in everyday life in Britain in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Germain Greer (also a former *Celebrity Big Brother* contestant in 2006) insisted that the controversy has more to do with class than race. Greer's argument echoed with others who claimed that the UK tabloid press in its coverage of the controversy resorted to issues of class differences and blamed Jade Goody. Ash Sharma (2007) fittingly encapsulates the CBB 2007 controversy and the responses: 'What was dubbed as the "race row" revealed an 'anti-racist' public discourse that was little more than moralistic liberal knee-jerking'.

Given that the responses to the controversy in the CBB 2007 where the media, particularly the press was very quick to make an anti-racist stand and laid the blame on class rather than 'racial' divisions, this paper would like to propose multiculturalism and transnationalism be rooted in understanding the discourse surrounding the *CBB 2007* controversy. In my view, these perspectives have a particular resonance in providing an understanding of the events surrounding the CBB 2007 debate, particularly as racism continues to play a key role in the contemporary socio-economic structure and politics in Britain.

## **Multiculturalism**

In a succinct critique of multiculturalism, Yasmin Alibhai-Brown (2000) states that its shortcomings are that it is only about 'ethnic minorities and has therefore created a sense

of white exclusion, it engages with elites in its models of representation, does not recognise change and creates group barriers and have not connected with globalisation'. Alibhai-Brown goes on to provide a classification on three types of multiculturalisms that she describes as minimalist where there is minimum intervention and proposes the wait and see approach; celebratory multiculturalism is where the focus is on style and 'corporate' multiculturalisms that just scratch the surface on the understanding of diversity in society; tribal where the essentialism prevails where differences are not inclusive. (Alibhai-Brown, 2000)

Alibhai-Brown's (2000) critique captures the somewhat narrow interpretations of multiculturalism in Britain in the 1980s and the 1990s. All three types of multiculturalisms have been practised in the UK in the public and, to some extent, private sectors. However, increasingly such interpretations have resulted in segregation and resentment between communities (Bradford and Oldham). The state policy was to promote an interpretation of multiculturalism that categorised the ethnic minorities as the 'other' and subsequent policies dominated by the binary divide of 'us' and 'them'. In this scenario, people from other parts of the world were allowed to stay in the country and continue their cultural, religious and linguistic practices provided that they did not impinge upon mainstream society. This take on multiculturalism has resulted in the exclusion of minority communities from the mainstream society.

Such interpretations and policies of multiculturalism in the late 20<sup>th</sup> and early 21<sup>st</sup> century have reinforced social segregation experienced by ethnic minority communities living in the UK. This management of the 'ethnic identity' through the multicultural policies have resulted in two different experiences of this vision of multicultural Britain. On the one hand, the 'Asian cool' image was projected in music, films, fashion and comedy together with the rich Asians who were socialising with the politicians and were celebrated by the media (Kundnani, 2007). Terms such as 'hybrid' and 'fusion' and their celebratory connotations were common descriptions in the media and academia. However, the majority of the young Asians were not part of this fashionable development. For the young, disenfranchised Asians, the recognition of a small number of well-known people resulted in a greater sense of alienation. For these young people the reality was racism and exclusion that was part of their everyday lives.

Given the above context, the resultant complaints on the *CBB 2007* 'race-row' to the regulatory body Ofcom are not surprising. Comments and behaviour of Goody, O'Meara and Lloyd directed towards Shetty reflect the experiences of everyday lives of many Asians living in UK. Within the multicultural frame, ethnic minority communities continue to be understood within the context of the 'other' and the state allows them to be segregated from the dominant culture, which is tolerant of separate cultural practices as long as they do not encroach upon the conceptualisation of the nation and its identity. The complaints to Ofcom highlight the continued racism and violence encountered by ethnic minorities in the UK and that public service television channels like Channel 4 have to a certain extent legitimised racist behaviour through the broadcasting of the controversial events in *CBB 2007*. Additionally, the 'container model' of multiculturalism (Runnymede Trust, 2000) does not recognise that issues of cultural belonging and political participation extend beyond the administrative and geographical boundaries of the nation state.

## **Transnationalism**

An explanation on the widespread currency of transnationalism in the analysis of national identities and global media is captured by Virinder et al (2005) where they write:

[Transnationalism] It is able to describe wider sets of processes that cannot comfortably fit within the diaspora rubric. Thus we talk of transnational corporations rather than diasporic corporations. The transnational also manages to avoid the group or human-centered notions that diaspora invokes. The term allows a side-stepping of the usual pattern, when discussing diaspora, of having to evoke Jewish or Greek archetypes. At the same time, transnational is a more precise, if somewhat tame, description of the contemporary world of nation-states that might otherwise be called the World System, Imperialism, Empire or New World Order. The transnational describes forces that cross or work across the nation's boundaries but do not necessarily disrupt the workings of the nation-state as executive committee. This lack of disruption does, however, allude to the weakness of the term'. (p.34)

Current understanding of transnational media occurs within two contexts: firstly it is in the framework of the host country where studies on reception of transnational programmes situate the viewers as 'ethnic minorities'; the second framework is one that is seen in the context of viewers' relationship to their country of origin and the diasporic associations. National channels, like Channel 4 with a remit of providing 'diverse programming' have a somewhat limited experience of the reception of their programmes beyond the British national boundaries, except for programmes that have been sold to other broadcasting systems. *CBB 2007* became a "global pantomime of race" (Sharma, 2007) and how the 'CBB race row' impacted in India, particularly as it hit the headlines provides further insights into the repercussions of the controversy. As Malik (2007) states:

There is a big question around the global dynamic that underpins this kind of cultural trading. Shilpa, by agreeing to appear on CBB, clearly wanted to expand her market to include the British. Endemol, who apparently worked hard to get Shilpa on their show, evidently saw this as an opportunity to jump on the Bollywood bandwagon and "connect" with Channel 4's British-Asian audience. But what has the media packaging of the 'CBB race row' really done for India: is it anything more than selling globalisation (albeit in the form of reality TV stars and cloned TV formats) to the India? Or is this a naïve view that presumes that India represents a passive audience that uncritically receives Western-led media messages?

Malik's (2007) comments point to the big disparities in social divisions in India between the urban, Westernised citizens for whom the impact of the 'CBB race row' is felt more strongly than it is for the majority of the citizens in India who live in the rural areas. Such divisions are further compounded by vested interests of the political parties as well as campaigning groups who used the Richard Gere - Shilpa Shetty 'kiss' furore, to promote their political agendas and concerns. Likewise, social segregation also exists in the UK, between the ethnic minority communities and the dominant community, with politicians from both the major parties-Labour and Conservatives playing on the fears of



inward migration and migrant numbers in recent weeks. Another feature of social segregation in the UK is the survey conducted by You Gov in 2004 for the Commission for Racial Equality asked respondents –white and non-white about their close friends. Over half (54%) of the white respondents claimed that their close friends were white, only one percent of white respondents claimed that all of their close friends were from ethnic minorities. In comparison 13% of non-white respondents claimed to have all close friends who were white and eighteen percent saying most of my close friends are from ethnic minorities. Given that there is not much social mobility across ‘racial’ divide, the media is a key vehicle in increasing awareness between the whites and non-whites. Public service broadcasters like Channel 4 have a responsibility to be proactive in encouraging greater mobility across this chasm, rather than reacting to the publicity concerning the ‘race row’ in the reality television genre.

## Conclusion

The paper has attempted to outline key areas that provide an understanding in the discourse around *Celebrity Big Brother 2007*. It is proposed that multiculturalism and transnationalism have a particular resonance in providing an understanding of the non-white communities in the UK, particularly since 9/11 and 7/7. The arguments presented earlier, problematize the narrower perspectives on multiculturalism and transnationalism. They show that the contemporary understandings of transnationalism and multiculturalism in the media have to recognise the deep-seated racism that exists in the UK. Further, the idea of multiculturalism should not be abandoned in favour of integration. Rather, multiculturalism and transnationalism perspectives should be considered in parallel, when analysing entertainment programmes such as *CBB 2007*. Such perspectives encourage modification from the ‘container model’ of multiculturalism to one that incorporates transnational identities and global media.

## Bibliography

- Alibhai-Brown, Y. (2000) *After Multiculturalism*. London: Foreign Policy Centre.
- Born, G. (2003) ‘Strategy, positioning and projection in digital television: Channel Four and the commercialisation of public service broadcasting in the UK’. In *Media, Culture & Society*, Vol.25, No. 6 pp., 773-799. Sage Publications.
- Born, G. (2007) ‘Television's Faustian pact’. In *New Statesman*, 30 August, 2007.
- Communications Act 2003-Office of Public Sector Information. Available at:<http://www.uk-legislation.hmso.gov.uk/acts/acts2003/> (Accessed: 18 September 2007)
- Couldry, N (2002) ‘Playing for Celebrity: Big Brother as Ritual Event’. In *Television and New Media*, Vol. 3, No. 3, pp. 283-293. Sage Publications.
- Frau-Meigs, D (2006) ‘Big Brother and Reality TV in Europe: a Theory of Situated Acculturation by the Media’. In *European Journal of Communication*, Vol.21, No. 1, pp33-56. Sage Publications.

Greer, G (2007) Why does everyone hate me? *The Guardian*, January 17, 2007.

Hill, A and Palmer, G (2002) 'Editorial: Big Brother'. In *Television New Media*, Vol. 3, No. 3, pp.251-254. Sage Publications

Hill, A (2002) 'Big Brother: The Real Audience'. In *Television and New Media*, Vol. 3, No. 3, pp. 323-340. Sage Publications.

Jost, F (2004) 'Loft Story: Big Brother France and the Migration of Genres'. In Mathjis, E and Janet Jones (eds.) *Big Brother International: Formats, Critics and Publics*. London: Wallflower Press.

Kundnani, A. (2007) *The End of Tolerance: Racism in 21<sup>st</sup> Century Britain*. London: Pluto Press.

Malik, S (2007) Celebrity Big Brother 2007- For Better or Worse? In *Darkmatter*, May 2007. Available at: <http://www.darkmatter101.org/site/2007/05/07/celebrity-big-brother-07-for-better-or-worse/> (Accessed 1 September 2007)

Mathjis, E and Janet Jones (eds.) (2004) *Big Brother International: Formats, Critics and Publics*. London: Wallflower Press.

Meers, P and W Hessels (2004) 'Debating Big Brother Belgium: Framing Popular Media Culture'. In Mathjis, E and Janet Jones (eds.) *Big Brother*

*International: Formats, Critics and Publics*. London: Wallflower Press.

Office of Communications (Ofcom) Notice of Sanction: Channel Four Television Corporation and S4C-Celebrity Big Brother (15-19 January 2007.) Available at: [www.ofcom.org.uk/tv.obb/prog\\_cb/obb86/](http://www.ofcom.org.uk/tv.obb/prog_cb/obb86/) (Accessed: 20 September 2007)

Robinson, James (2007) 'It was a terrible week-but I've had worse'. *The Observer Newspaper*, Sunday 28 January 2007. (<http://media.guardian.co.uk/broadcast/story/0,,2000229,00.html>)

Runnymede Trust/Commission on the *Future of Multi-Ethnic Britain* (The Parekh Report) (London: Profile Books, 2000).

Sharma, A. (2007) Celebrity Big Brother dialogues-the global pantomime of race. In *darkmatter*, May 2007. Available at: <http://www.darkmatter101.org/site/2007/05/07/editorial-celebrity-big-brother-dialogues-the-global-pantomime-of-race/> (Accessed 1 September 2007)

Taussig, A (2007) 'Stuck with the media we deserve?'. In *Intermedia*, Feb/Mar, Vol. 35 Issue 1, pp.4-7.

Virinder, S.K., R. Kaur and J. Hutnyk (2005) *Diaspora and Hybridity*. London: Sage Publications.

YouGov/Commission for Racial Equality (June 2004) 'Survey for the Commission of Racial Equality'.