**File: fi8002d6 -- Interview3.mp3
Duration: 0:47:49
Date: 15/06/2018
Typist: 756**

START AUDIO

Interviewer: So the main aim of the workshop is to look at the production process of the radio show, look at who does what and then maybe even identify gaps in the process where this could be improved, things in which we as a Lab could help provide the digital technology to support the production of the show. We're also going to look at listener engagement; who are the listeners, who are you aiming at?

 So I was thinking about asking you a bit on how you engage with the radio show. Does that work for you?

Respondent: Yes, that's fine.

Interviewer: Okay, great. How long have you been part of the radio team?

Respondent: Just a matter of months. A few months at most.

 I find it very interesting how it's kind of set up and worked and how I became involved in it. What appealed to me is the utter informality of it. There's no formal structure at all that you can detect in any way.

 What quite simply happened was that [person], whom you obviously have met... I am in another small organisation- So I met him about a year ago and we were meeting once a month for a charity that reads for the blind, just around the corner from where I live. So I met him and then he said would I like to become involved in this?

 As far as I can see, he's the person who effectively runs it. There's some mysterious council in the background with whom he has contact.

 The arrangement with him is utterly informal. We turn up once a month, we do this programme, we meet once a month and plan programmes about two or three months ahead.

 We run it more or less in accordance with his wishes and his view is that none of us got any training of any kind whatsoever, you just sort of just do it. So there's broken down into tasks; there's running the board, there's writing the notes, there's doing the presentation, there's interviewing people.

 He more or less effectively tries to have us all do a little bit in succession. So this coming next broadcast, I will be doing the board. On the previous one, I think I did one interview. Prior to that, I've done the presentation. Prior to that, I wrote the programme notes for something or other. My turn will come round to do those things again.

 It seems to me a very British way of doing things of his generation. There's no formal structure that one is aware of. All the things that I would have expected there to have been, about an awareness of the audience, formal structures of any kind, simply don't exist, but it bumbles on.

 I think that saves a lot of time. You make it up as you go along. I run a business and myself and my partner started and ran a business more or less in the same way, i.e. with not the slightest idea of what we were doing but just a vague, “I think we ought to get started.” Then we found out as we go along the things that we don't know.

 For example, you just said, “Who is it aimed at?” I've no idea who it's aimed at. I presume from its title that it's aimed at the elderly, but does anybody listen? As far as I know, there's no way of knowing whether anybody listens because they can't afford to have any of these kinds of surveys that people do as to who listens to it.

 I suspect that it's either relatives or friends of some of the other people who are involved in it. I have no idea how [person] would go about contacting people to become involved in it. Presumably, that's on an equally informal, ad hoc basis.

 I think it's kind of driven on by that sort of, as I say, very British – not being British myself – 'make do and mend' kind of thing, and then you find out what you need to do as you go along, which has great merit and great drawbacks.

Interviewer: Do you think it needs some sort of formal structure?

Respondent: Yes, but I think what I've discovered both for myself in all kinds of different spheres is that learning and getting formal structures come further down the line.

 If you go and you sit in a classroom and learn about running a business or doing something before you've actually started, you've very little sense of perspective and very little realisation of what might be important and of the necessity of what you're learning, of the applicability of what you're learning.

 Once you have been doing it for a couple of years and you then start to get some training, you're going \_\_\_[0:05:50], “Ah, that's what I did wrong. Now I understand. That makes sense,” because you bring to it a body of experience.

 So I'm expecting that perhaps out of an exercise like this or perhaps out of something else, that about in a year's time or something when I've been doing this for a year or two, the penny will drop and we can just say, “Okay, that's what we're doing.”

 At the moment, I just sort of sit there riddled with fear in front of this microphone and paralysed by inexperience. Then at some point, you begin to think, “Okay, this is what we're trying to do.”

Interviewer: So just to be clear, the radio show itself has been running for nearly 10 years. Do you think there should have been a way of introducing you to this in a different way? How do you feel about the way you're involved in it? Because you say you are kind of fearful in front of the microphone. What could help?

Respondent: I'm not sure. I really, genuinely don't know. I kind of understand – maybe it's a generation thing - but I understand why dear [person] does it the way he does it, which is to kind of- it's a thrown in at the deep end type of thing. “Of course you can do it”. You know, “You do it.”

Interviewer: Do you think it's very much [person] who is at the top of the structure?

Respondent: Yes. \_\_\_[0:07:17] he appears to be sort of consensual and collegiate and all the rest of that, but it's not. I think it's his way of doing things. I can imagine other people running it in quite a different kind of way but that's his way of doing it.

 I think it relies on the kind of human instincts of self-awareness and shame. So you sit there and think, “Oh, God, what did I do? What did I do?” Then you sort of spend the next month [more or less thinking 0:07:46], “I'll never do that again. [I'm going] to do that again.” So you're self-correcting, self-criticising, self-taught in that sort of sense. It's an approach.

 I've come across organisations which are run equally well, not better, in another sort of way. I know somebody who runs a major charity here and again, there are all sorts of jobs that are needed for the charity; picking people up, and nobody is allowed to do anything until they've been trained how to do it. They can't move onto the next job until they're trained how to do it.

 It's not micromanagement, but it requires an intensity and a closeness of management which the person who is running that organisation is comfortable with and it reflects his personality and it reflects his approach to running the thing. People are just to that sort of way of doing it.

 When I talk to the other people on the radio thing, they have had exactly the same fears and doubts but on the whole have got over them, as it were.

 I'm a kind of believer in the fact that education and support comes when you've got some experience under your belt, when you've got a bit further down the line, that to have sat down and been told and had to go through an indoctrination or an induction process would not necessarily have worked as well.

Interviewer: What about peer feedback though? Feedback through your peers? For example, if you say that you need to self-feedback, you do something, you reflect, you change your behaviour. What about if other people told you? So if other people fed back to you on your performance, would that be helpful?

Respondent: It would, provided they had the skill to do it well. It's an immensely difficult thing to do to give people feedback. I discovered a good while ago in work that no one is ever improved by criticism, including me. What happens is you become very defensive.

Interviewer: And very aware as well.

Respondent: Yes, and very defensive. So if you do have to try and get people to change the way in which they're doing things, the person who is giving the feedback has to have a very clear analysis as to what it is that they are objecting to, what they find wrong, a clear analysis of what it is that they want the behaviour to become and then they go out and sell that to the person. Ignore the criticism, don't leave that sort of thing out of it, but saying, “Okay, this is how you're doing it and that's fine, that's okay, but I want you to try doing this. I think if you try doing it this way, a number of things would follow from that.”

 The person who has the skill and ability and sensitivity to do that kind of criticism, they're relatively rare. But in the hands of a skilled person who can do it, it's enormously helpful. The person who can just analyse.

 For my sins, I direct plays and over a lifetime, I've known maybe four or five people who can look at a production and then give you useful feedback. It's not sugar-coated and it's not brutal, it's just factual.

 They come and they say, “Okay, the pace was non-existent. I think where the mistake you're mistaking is...” Or they'll say, “None of the relationships on that stage, none of those people had relationships with each other. Everybody on the stage should have had relationships.” Or, “You got the relationships right there, there and there, but there was none between the mother and the son.” Or something of that sort of kind.

 The person with the feedback from peers or other kind of thing, “Look, you're having a real problem with [dead 0:12:46] time. You're going to have to find something which when your brain freezes and you're lost for something to say, you're going to have to have something handy that will get you out of that situation.”

Interviewer: So there needs to be some sort of constructive feedback as well.

Respondent: Yes. Not necessarily- you know the kind of feedback which I find very unhelpful, which is where somebody tells you how they would have done it, which is not necessarily useful feedback.

 It's the person who sees a way for you, given your style or way of doing things, can do much better, who understands where you're going wrong, who can understand. That feedback would be very useful, but it does require not just a very experienced person but somebody who has that particular skill.

 Quite often, sometimes the people who do that, it's like a sort of great teacher. They may not actually be very good at the things themselves. They teach singing, they teach dance. They may not be very good at it themselves, but they know what they require or they know how to help somebody else, how to foster somebody else. So it's getting that kind of...

 I suppose the temptation is to set up a course for people, to set up a thing, and that's not necessarily the solution. It's more a mentoring, an apprenticeship thing.

Interviewer: If you think about the radio show and the way it functions, what do you think works well?

Respondent: The fact that it happens at all is... I have great respect for somebody who makes something happen. It's all too easy for either people to talk about it and do nothing or for people to do something on a little fit of enthusiasm and then it runs away and it all dies, or it's dependent on the enthusiasm of its original founding members. There isn't that sense nor, sort of, structure.

 I suspect that what [person] is doing, whether consciously or otherwise, is by making us all do little bits of us and by making us think that we can do it, that in his absence we would continue to do it and that if he was removed from the equation, it's not going to collapse, it's not dependent on him.

 As it happens, he is the driving force, but he's the driving force by, in effect, making a very simple little structure for us. We broadcast on the first Friday, we meet and plan on the next Friday. The very fact that you sit down in a room and say, “What are we going to be doing in two months?” means that in the absence of [person], we would sit down, a group of us in a room, and say, “What are we going to do two months from now?” He will say, “Who's going to be doing the board and who's going to be doing this and who's going to be doing that?”

 So he has in effect built a very simple structure underneath which is easy to grasp and in his absence, he would imagine people saying, “Well, somebody has to write the notes. Who's going to do that? Okay. Some people have to do the interviews, who's going to do that?”

 It's a structure which is built around the group's knowledge of each other.

Interviewer: That's interesting.

Respondent: When you've been there for a while, you know that person there will do that kind of interview better, it's the obvious person to do that sort of interview. That's a good person to follow up on meeting this group. That's...

 So it's an instinctual group in that sort of sense. It's not something that you could necessarily write down on a paper and say, “That person there, in order to be able to interview, has got to have those sorts of skills.” The phrase is 'horses for courses'.

 It appears to be unstructured, but I suspect that, like a lot of informal apparent organisations or groups that continue to function, there are no accidents. If it is meeting every Friday, it is putting it out.

 Then also at the end, as you have may have noticed at the meeting, “So what did we think of last week? What worked? What didn't work? Any views on last week?”

 Usually at those sorts of things, people say... They make the criticism of themselves that they know that everybody else noticed. “Oh, I got it all wrong,” “Oh, God, it was [awful 0:18:09],” you know, “I got it so wrong about this, that or the other,” which is a kind of acknowledgement of the group, that sort of thing.

 Nobody actually sits round the table: “You...” You know. Later on you may tease somebody about, you know, [that they kind of 0:18:24], “I loved that silence, that wonderful silence that seemed to go on and on and on.” (Laughter) And they will sort of tease away at that kind of thing.

 It's self-policing. I'm not sure how useful or helpful that is to you.

Interviewer: It's very helpful.

Respondent: To signing something.

 I would be a better position to, as I say, know what it is that I need to know in probably a year from now. I'll say, “You've got to find a way to- this is why I need to do this.” I need to sit down with somebody who knows how to do this, because now I think I'll know what they're doing. Now \_\_\_[0:19:15] to learn.

 Because I run my own business and because what I've learned about being market-driven and not market-driven, I know that further on I would really like to know who, if anybody, is our audience. What is it that their expectation is? Why would they listen to it? More importantly, why would they get their friends to listen? \_\_\_[0:19:54] why would it matter to them? Why would it become something which they don't want to miss on a month by month basis? I've no confidence at the moment that what we're doing is necessarily that important to people. That would be great to know how you might be aware of that, how you might find that sort of thing out.

 It was a painful lesson that we had to learn ourselves as programmers. As you can imagine, we weren't good on the interpersonal relationships, and everybody was kind of [autistic whizzkids 0:20:31]. They would say, “This is what the world needs,” and the world said, “No, I don't need that at all.”

 But once you start a business, you have to go out and you write something and you show it to people and you say, “Do you like it?” and they say, “Yes.” “Will you buy it?” “No, because it doesn't do this.” You say, “Okay, I'll go away and do this,” and I come back. “Now do you like it? Fine, buy it.” I like that kind of an awareness of what they...

 There are some things where the person who's doing the production knows far more than the person who it's aimed at because they're just aware of a wider world, there are wider things.

 When I go into a very good restaurant, if you were to go into an extremely good restaurant, I don't know what they're going to put in front of me. All I'm just going to go and say is, “Wow, that was astonishing. I never thought of that.”

 Or people produced the Sony Walkman when it first came out, or the latest sort of thing like that, and you just go, “Wow, that's great.” If you'd asked me what should be in the next edition of the iPhone, I've no idea what you mean but when it does come out, people say, “Wow.”

 So it's an awareness of the audience but at the same time, an ability to think one step ahead of them is great as well, to be able for them to say, “Yes.”

 My suspicion at the moment is that we don't fulfil that role for our audience. It may be something that friends of people who have been doing it would listen to and take some comfort in, that sort of thing, but I wouldn't think it's a significant part of their life in any way.

Interviewer: If you think about the content, do you think there's anything that could be in the content that's not there yet that would be appealing to an audience?

Respondent: I do think about that and the answer is I don't know the answer at the moment. But you know the way we learnt at work, that when you're doing your website, you don't start by saying how wonderful you are and we've been doing it for 30 years and we started 20 years ago and tell you all about themselves. You try to think why has somebody come to this website? What is it that they want and they need? In that first five seconds, are they going to hear 'this person understands what I need, this person, they know what I'm looking for'?

 On your first screen, you're telling them, “Okay, I know why you've come and you've come to the right place.” Later on, you can tell them about what you've done because they'll want reassurance that you can do it.

 So why would somebody switch on that programme? What is it that they're hoping to hear? I don't know personally, partly because I've only been doing it for a short period of time, but because I've never spoken to any listeners yet, or any potential listeners.

Interviewer: I think this is really important.

Respondent: Equally important, not more important, is to talk to the people who don't listen to it, the people who say, “Why would I listen to that? It's of no interest to me. Why?” Well, what is it that would have interested you?

 Or you're working on a series of assumptions that are invalid. You're working on the assumptions because you keep on putting on programmes and the content for items that are free, or things that you assume they were on a low income.

 “I've got this radio, I listen to you, but we go on foreign holidays two or three a year. You never do anything about that. You never do anything about the ways in which we spend our leisure time, given that [you're the elders 0:25:07], and you're making a series of patronising assumptions about us which are not true at all.”

 It's not a pressing need for me to know that at the moment, but I can see that it would grow to be if you were to get more involved in it and finding a way to both contact between your audience and your non-audience would be important.

Interviewer: In the way the show is planned, what do you think works less well? What are the things that you think don't function very well?

Respondent: That we are scratching around for ideas. I presume it's the dilemma of every newspaper, every person who sits down in front of blank sheet of paper or anything else, like, “How do I fill this?”

 We're not necessarily imaginative enough. Then there's a tendency to sort of say, “Well, about this time of year, we always do one about holidays. About this time of year, we always do one about...” You know, so you reach into the cupboard and \_\_\_[0:26:40].

 Like great newspapers, [great, good things] have an editor who has an instinct for what's going. The commissioning editor, “This is the kind of stuff people are sick of,” those kinds of things. “This is where I think...”

Interviewer: So do you think some sort of new features would be helpful? You know [[person] 0:27:09] and me did these outside recordings, more podcast-y type. Do you think these sorts of things are helpful?

Respondent: I'm really looking forward to hearing it, yes. Maybe, as you say, also a bit more experimentation. But if you're not in contact with your audience, how do you know whether...?

Interviewer: It always comes back to that.

Respondent: Yes. I don't mean that you should pander to your audience, I think you should astonish your audience. You should engage your audience. You should say, “I don't want to miss that on a Friday, they've got some really good...”

Interviewer: How could the audience be engaged differently?

Respondent: How would we even find them?

Interviewer: Yes, but how would you engage them from the programme in a way that you could maybe... I'm thinking of calling into the studio, things like this. Win something.

Respondent: Yes. I think there has to be something. The call into the studio I think has been done to death by people who are better and more receptive.

 It's degenerated into being- the people who call into the station are the kind of people who like to call into stations, if you know what I mean. It's the sound of their own voice, it's some mad obsession of their own, it's this kind of stuff.

 Is the somewhere where your potential audience would go that you would be able to say, “We will be at such and such a thing, come and talk to us, have a cup of coffee. Talk to us, tell us what you like, tell us what you don't like.” “We're going to have a stand at-” or, “We're going to be on the beach at [place] sitting behind a table, come and talk to us. Tell us what you-” you know. Just chat.

Interviewer: Yes, that's really good. Thinking about different things, so for example, involving people in a different way, I'm thinking of people like [place] who is fairly housebound, how could we use technology in a way to include her? Could we help her to do recordings at home, then broadcast these? What do you think?

Respondent: Anything like that would be great, yes.

 I would not underestimate the social importance- just for us as a radio group what keeps it together is the fact that we meet these people who we would not otherwise have met.

 You get to be 70, 75, 80 or something else, you don't make many new friends. To find an activity which is not all-consuming and is a new area of activity and that you meet a new group of people-

 I had never met any of those people with the exception of [person] before and the team only a year ago and they'd never met me. I like all the people there at it and I admire some of them very much. [person] has a wonderful broadcasting voice, [person] is a wonderful, driven person, [person] is \_\_\_[0:31:03], and I like the others. I like Eunice and her thought for the month and this kind of stuff, which has a charm and an authenticity. It's just lovely.

 So what drives us on is continuing to be in the company of those people. They're not your new best friends in the entire world, but it is a sort of social grouping built around something that's worth doing and is interesting to do.

 So what I'm saying I suppose really in these sense of being at home, a home worker, and not meeting the group, not having the social contact, might not be... It's a balance. We all have other lives to live as well, so were it to become hugely demanding then we would probably start to drop out because there are family [claims 0:32:06] and all the rest of it.

 So there's a balance between the amount of time, resource, involvement, energy that you can bring to something.

 I remember that in the university here you used to have adult education classes. People would go to them for 20 years in succession because they would go every other- there'd be a different poet [one 0:32:30], a different poet would be taken and they would go. It was the same people in the class and the same thing and that was hugely enjoyable.

 Then the government, in its wisdom, decided there had to be outcomes. So people now have to do homework and write essays and do an exam, and people stopped coming. It was great to be able to come along once a week, two hours, that sort of stuff, but... You know. Now, it might well have been that people felt they're going to get much more out of it by actually having to write an essay, but it killed it. It killed it.

Interviewer: It still should be joyful.

Respondent: Yes.

Interviewer: I assume you have a computer.

Respondent: Yes.

Interviewer: Do you listen to the radio online? Have you ever tried it?

Respondent: No, I don't. That's not true, a few times I've listened to it, but I'm completely illiterate. My eyes began to glaze over around about 1967, so we end up having our children set everything up. So I don't tweet, I'm not on Facebook, I don't do any of those kinds of social media things at all.

Interviewer: But for the radio. So you know there's an option that people listen to the radio online to your show.

Respondent: I didn't realise that at all. It was actually [person] saying it the other day. Because I can't get the radio programme in my house because we're below the level of where it's broadcast from, down \_\_\_[0:34:19] over there, and I can't get the programme.

 It was only [person] saying, “Oh, I listen to it on the computer.” I didn't realise that, in my ignorance.

Interviewer: Do you think that should be made more aware? Do you think there should be some sort of marketing?

Respondent: Yes.

Interviewer: If you think about the audience, do you think the audience will just be older people or would they be younger people? What do you think would be the audience? Who do you imagine listens?

Respondent: Well, I think it should be older people because there are concerns and interests and a culture of groups of old people which are not necessarily being addressed by other things.

 You know Mark Twain's line about 'put all your eggs in one basket and watch that basket well', yes, I think you focus on your audience, and there are enough of us. If nobody else is doing it, you might say well, once a month isn't going to alter people's lives, but that's who your audience are.

 You found it in business, that's where your market is. There are other people and other groups and they're either already catered for or it's somebody else's \_\_\_[0:36:25], but everybody who's there involved in that programme, we're all beyond 70. There ought to be therefore a shared view with your audience.

 Sometimes, what you need to do is look into yourself and say what is it that interests me at the moment? It may not be necessarily what people would imagine. There is a chance that if it interests you, it will interest other people in your own age group.

 I don't know, I can't give you an example off the top of my head but the likelihood is... It was just like when- \_\_\_[0:37:33] always \_\_\_ your peer group \_\_\_ you like the same kind of music that your other 20-year-olds did when you were 20 or 19 or 17 or whatever. You discover classical music at a certain stage in your life, you discover gardening at a certain stage in your life, you discover the pleasures of walking at a certain stage of your life.

 If you do that, then you find- it's like finding everybody's going to Italy for their holidays or everybody's going to whatever it is. When you say 'everybody', you mean you, your group, your peer group. I suspect that focusing on what interests us and trying to make as much possible contact with the audience is a way of moving forward.

Interviewer: That sounds reasonable.

Respondent: Word of mouth is a great recommendation. How do you both contact your own audience and how do you get them to recruit friends? That is the crucial kind of thing. It's beyond our resources to in any way advertise or something or other outside that. But as I say, if there were areas where you thought they would be at, you know, “We will be at such and such,” \_\_\_[0:38:53].

Interviewer: I think this is where the Lab comes in, because obviously we have these resources so we're just trying to figure out how and where to put effort in. We were thinking about it could be interesting to actually store the content online so people could then listen to it online, then we can track the clicks. So we would then know how many people listen to what.

Respondent: And how long they listen to it. (Laughter) How quickly they switched off, yes.

Interviewer: Also which topics are they the most interested in, and also making-

Respondent: That would be very good.

Interviewer: Making the content that you produce more long because it will just be there. Now it's like a broadcast and you have all these amazing guests and then it just disappears. So making it more long-lasting, in a way.

Respondent: That would be fantastic.

Interviewer: So I'm trying to figure out these sorts of things. I think you are really helpful already.

 I have one last question. If you think about your involvement, would you like to be involved differently? Would you like to do other things or something that you don't do now?

Respondent: No, I'd just like to sort of get over the hump of fear and paralysis at the moment and get to be able to use the board properly.

Interviewer: I can imagine.

Respondent: To interview people. At the moment, it's just very much around the foothills of the thing and just trying to find your way. I've not got to the heights where I can look out, but I really think that's something that comes further on down the line.

 I remember... Sorry, I go back to this business. I'm sort of running my own business.

 We ran our own business, myself and these various other guys, and after a shameful number of years, we woke up one day and realised we weren't running a business at all. We were just a bunch of self-employed people in a room. Because we did work for people and charge them, we thought we were running a business. We weren't even running a business at all. We hadn't even thought about how you recruit people, how you keep people, how you get in contact with your market, how you understand what it is that people do. None of those things.

 We haven't reached that stage at the broadcasting thing: What's this for? What are we trying to do? I can't even think in those kinds of terms at the moment from where I am at the moment. I think [person] probably does and I'm sure that Wendy does as well.

Interviewer: I think it's interesting that it seems to be very much initiated by [person], in a way. It would be interesting to talk about that on Friday. I know he does a lot of things like writing up the running order, all these things need to go to [person].

 Is there anything else? I think I covered a lot. Is there anything else?

Respondent: No, these are my unstructured ramblings really about it.

Interviewer: No, it was really, really helpful.

Respondent: It's only just when you say something like well, we could keep them, because we keep them, therefore you could have longer items, that I begin to see where your kind of thinking can come into this and that that would make sense and completely change the nature of the thing.

 I can't suggest them because I didn't even know them. It's like, as I say, what's going to be in the next iPhone? I have no idea because I don't think in those kinds of terms. I would never have invented the Walkman. Laughter)

 You're in a position to do the lateral thinking. You're seeing what's going on out there and you're saying, “These people could use that, that would make a difference to them.”

Interviewer: I still want to keep you in the loop because I think what's happening is incredible, the way it's happening, and I don't want to go in and say, “Do this, do this, do this,” because I think that's not how my research approach functions.

 This was a lot of information, this is really helpful and I think definitely what seems to be the key is the audience. Halina told me you're producing for the [theatre], so you know about that as well.

Respondent: Yes. Even there, you see, what's interesting about that and what's interesting about amateur drama is you may pay lip service to the audience and, “We're doing it for the audience,” you're not doing it for the audience, you're doing it for yourself and you're doing it to get better at something.

 I think it's an odd thing about the human species, is we're the only ones who want to get better. Different things; I want to be a better parent or I want to be a better child to my own parents, or I want to be better at telling stories or I want to be able to drive better, I want to be able to organise my holidays better. There's some one thing that you want to do.

 They're not set by external standards, they're set by your own internal standards. You want to be able to say, “I couldn't have done that five years ago, I couldn't have done that.”

 What makes the [theatre] work is that the people who are doing that and are on stage want to get better. It's not them having a go, it's not a hobby, it's not a charade. They want to get better at what they're doing and that's what drives them on as an organisation.

 Within that, the audience are a very necessary part of the ingredients because you can't play to a blank wall and you can't play in an empty room, but you're not doing it really for their benefit, it's about yourself and hoping that if you do it well, that they will come along for the ride, that they will see what you're trying to do.

 So it's a funny kind of tension. I would have thought that professional theatre you do it for the audience. If they're paying £100 a ticket to see it, you'd better be good. But in our sort of thing, you can experiment and be bad and fail.

Interviewer: Even though everything I've seen at the [theatre] was really good.

Respondent: (Laughter) Right. But is it about... There's a very funny thing on at the moment, by the way.

Interviewer: Which one?

Respondent: The one that's on at the moment, 'The 39 Steps'. Once your recording is over, I'll tell you about that.

Interviewer: Yes, I need to know. The last one I watched was 'The Wind in the Willows'. It was lovely.

Respondent: Yes, okay. Yes, it's a strange organisation. It's a great organisation in that sense, but it's about the people there wanting to get better at what they're doing. I think that's probably true of everybody involved in the radio thing. We do want to get better, not just get away with it.

Interviewer: Yes, it's interesting. How do you improve without feed-backing each other as well? It's interesting, yes.

Respondent: Because most of the time, you know yourself and the bits that you know that you got wrong is- you're aware of yourself enough so that you can put those right.

 You know when you're typing, “I've just typed the wrong- I've just hit the wrong key,” and you can go back and erase it. But you know. It wasn't somebody over your shoulder saying, “You have hit the wrong key,” just at the very moment of doing it. You're driving a car and say, “God, I made a mess of that. I've parked badly,” “I took the corner badly.” You are your own best critic, and ought to be.

Interviewer: Thank you. Is there anything else you want to add before I turn off the recorder?

Respondent: No.

Interviewer: Wonderful.

END AUDIO
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