The Routledge Companion to
Alternative and Community Media

Edited by Chris Atton

Community Media and Media Policy Reforms in Anglophone Sub-Saharan Africa

Patrick E. Okon, Ph.D

Introduction

This chapter explores the interventionist role of community media groups in contemporary media policy developments of Anglophone Sub-Saharan Africa. It is broadly located within the discourse about the 'shapers' of media policy development and aims to respond to the enduring tensions in scholarship with regards to the actual role of and the difficulty of mapping the impact of grassroots policy actors in media policy reforms (Humphreys, 1994; Hortwiz, 2001; Chakravartty and Sarikakis, 2006). The empirical materials draw upon various case studies of media deregulations and campaigning activities of community print and broadcast media groups in South Africa, Ghana, and Nigeria.

Structurally, I reconceptualise media policy in line with the vision of alternative journalists; highlight the value of alternative 'public spheres' to participatory policy-making; streamline trends in media policy debates and the political economy of community media in the Sub-Sahara; and identify the campaigning 'platforms' of community media institutions for policy reforms, indicating some of their achievements and enduring challenges. My fundamental argument is that governments and their political institutions are not the exclusive players in contemporary media policy developments. There are other significant and sometimes unacknowledged decision-makers. However, the effectiveness of community media groups is often conditioned by political, legislative and economic processes, differences in business philosophies, available funding regimes, and structures for audience participation.

Understanding Media Policy

Media policy addresses a wide range of issues that include the structural, ethical, censorship, regulatory and economic principles employed to organise media systems and institutions across national and transnational contexts. Different ideological, technological, and economic value systems provide the necessary contexts for media policy articulation and realization. And the specific approach adopted by each scholar also determines the differences and the specific individual definition of the concept (Freedman, 2008; Braman, 2010; Duff, 2010).

For the purpose of this chapter, I propose an 'ethical-political' approach to media policy conception. The 'ethical-political' recognizes the importance of 'affective' and 'critical-rational' contents to policy-making. The approach is premised on David Hutchison's "sceptical liberalism" (1999: 4); that is, a right-based theoretical framework that questions the absolute agency of governments to determine political and legal truths.

The 'ethical-political' vision requires the integration of the "administrative approach" of governments, the "objectivity vision" of professionalized media, and the "politicised interests" of civil society groups. Such an approach, it is argued, will enable the conception of the interests of governments, professionalized media, and of the life contexts of disadvantaged groups, not just as possibilities, but as rights and as legitimate ends (Negt and Kluge, 1983). The three elements of the integrative policy vision must, however, be realised within the ideological and the production fields. Additionally, the goal of the 'ethical-political' framework is to appeal to policy-makers to continue to recognise the values of 'policy community' and 'policy networks' (Humphreys, 1994) in enabling accountability and new entrants into the policy-making arenas of nation-states.

The proposed approach, therefore, offers a distinctive conceptual framework for understanding the kind of policy vision alternative media groups bring to bear on national and transnational regulatory and deregulatory processes. In this regard, I define media policy, not only in terms of normative principles, but as the mechanisms (ethical, political, economic, legal and social) through which media systems and institutions are regulated and funded against the backdrop of the mundane and rational politics of bureaucratic and corporate life (cf. Moran, 1996).

The value of this conception is grounded in a broader view of the general determinants of State and Corporate actions and how these affect the packaging of information "with alternative labels" (Duff, 2010: 49). In this regard and drawing from different theoretical traditions, I further differentiate between two models of media policy – *mainstream industrial media policy* and *small-scale alternative media policy* (Garnham, 2000; Hackett & Carroll, 2006). Both policy frameworks are, however, impacted by the Enlightenment and post-Enlightenment political thoughts of the seventeenth through mid-twentieth centuries. They are also united around their shared critique of the "objectivity" logic of professionalized popular journalism and how this could be better actualised by alternative media institutions.

The mainstream model is largely grounded on 'liberal' and 'neoliberal' policy values, which respective roots stem from the Anglo-American decentred political sub-systems of policy-making and from its free markets communication project that emphasises media concentration, commercialism, and limited media regulations. The alternative media policy paradigm is rooted in emancipatory or socialist ideologies of citizenship that often finds expression through the instrumentality of experimental media practices and citizenship social movements.

But just like the dominant policy model, the alternative model also has two value strands: 'the ideologically and culturally radical' (the *reformative* and *subversive* policy visions) that advocates a complete over-oiling and democratisation of the mainstream media sector and the 'not too ideologically and culturally radical' (the *incorporation* and *supplementary* policy visions) that advances minimal reforms within the mainstream media sector (Atton & Hamilton, 2008). These policy trends of alternative journalism can particularly be detected in the ideological and production fields, as well as in the specific proposals offered by community media groups for the resolutions of practice dilemmas tied around the subjects of institutionalization, capitalization, the encroachment of political economy into media contents, as well as around the diasporic experiences of alternative journalists.

The alternative policy perspective, therefore, offers to the politics of media regulations and deregulations some sets of benchmarks that transcend that of liberal pluralists. Among them are the demands for the expansion, through statutory reforms, of direct participation in decision-making by which existing media and representative democratic systems could be rejuvenated; the prioritisation of equality (in terms of 'voice' and 'access' to resources) as the central principle of democracy; individual freedom from State and/or Corporate power; and emphasis on social solidarity and community, egalitarian social changes, and on the need to adopt a self-reflexive approach to all forms of injustices imbedded in national social and political orders (Hackett and Carroll, 2006).

But within the two distinctive media policy perspectives, I make a further distinction between 'external' and 'internal' institutional media policy frameworks. While the 'external' framework refers to the set of official (constitutional and legislative) rules imposed by governments on media institutions to guide public communication practices, the 'internal' policy framework refers to the set of institutional practice guidelines formulated internally by media proprietors and editors in response to specific needs for discipline (Oosthuizen, 2001).

Community Media as Public Spheres

The integrative conception of media policy, notwithstanding, the understanding of the interventionist potency of community media in media policy formations requires that a certain model of community media be adopted. In this regard, I propose the conception of community media in Anglophone Sub-Saharan Africa in terms of *public spheres*; that is, those public arena where citizens can engage critically with one another and with government through deliberations to influence the affairs of the State (Habermas, 1962; Negt and Kluge, 1983; Sholle, 1995; Curran, 1991; Hackett and Carroll, 2006).

A consideration of community media in terms of the *public sphere* model is, therefore, important for the following reasons: it locates the different formats of community media within the framework of media activism and of the global movements to transform communications, so that communications and representations can be less constrained by bureaucracy or commercial interest and remain increasingly open to positive social values and to public good; it provides spaces for the articulation of media deregulations in terms of State-citizens relationships and offers prospects for understanding the interactive platforms necessary for media policy formations within nation-states. Additionally, the model offers the theoretical parameter for critiquing how the development of contemporary media policy agendas have been destroyed by large-scale commercial organizations that are primarily concerned with fragmentation and commodification, rather than facilitating the realization of the everyday life concerns of private citizenship.

Trends in Media Policy in the Anglophone Sub-Sahara

An overview of the contemporary media policy environments in Ghana, Nigeria, and South Africa is meant to provide the necessary political and regulatory contexts for understanding the empirical data on the growth and political economy of community media, as well as on

community media activism for contemporary media policy reforms. As noted by Sholle, "what is alternative about alternative media […] can be answered only by describing the structure and operation of the mainstream media" (1995: 22) environments.

Key 'drivers' of media deregulations and debates across the three countries are rapid technological developments and transfers of the pre- and post-1980s that brought about the need "to fill a regulatory vacuum in several areas" (Hamelink, 1994: 30); the political economy of communication that outlines the constraints of diversification and globalization on communication managements; the crucial role of colonialism and modernisation process; the development initiatives of international institutions (especially UNESCO) in the area of media deregulations; the NWICO regulatory politics that emerged with the Non-Aligned movements of the pre-1990s; and the dynamics of the emerging democratic politics that advance decentralization, privatization, and popular participation in public policy decision-making. African scholars, in particular, have also placed emphasis on the importance of African ethical values and communitarian systems to media managements (Nymnjoh, 2003). This chapter, however, recognises the crucial role of community media institutions, as the neglected elements, in the debates about 'shapers' of media policy developments.

While the 'drivers' of deregulatory debates across the three countries are fundamentally the same (with differences only in the degrees of technological developments, corporate economic activities, as well as empowering political orientations), the actual media regulatory experiences of the three countries are never homogenous. And, while there are now expanded legislative frameworks for media liberalization and democratization across the three countries, it is the media policy experiences of Ghana and South Africa that now holds out, through established constitutional and legislative means, expansion in community media and greater hopes for the continuing broad-based participation of minority groups in media management. Nigeria's broadcasting policy environment, by not enabling 'grassroots

communities' gain greater access to the technologies of public communication, is still weak in this regard.

Again, apart from the fact that the media policy orientations of the three countries are now relatively progressive, the degree of activism and civil society engagements with national governments to bring about changes in favour of 'leftist' policies has been impacted principally by their different political histories, the level of rural mobilizations, and socio-economic contexts. While the State has remained the principal legitimator and administrator of media policy for decades, with the transition to democracy across the three countries, the participatory frameworks for the legitimization of policy have relatively expanded over the years to include civil organizations, radical movements, and disadvantaged groups.

Additionally, though the media deregulatory environments of the three countries now favour community media developments, their regulatory experiences are united in the common reliance, not only on colonial and postcolonial State media policy legacies to inform policy changes in the twenty first century, but also on the adoption of transnational media policy frameworks as benchmarks for constitutional and legislative reforms. These, among others, include the various United Nations resolutions on the media and human rights; the 1990 African Charter for Popular Participation in Development and Transformation (Arusha); the 2001 African Charter on Broadcasting (Windhoek); and the 2002 Declaration of Principles on Freedom of Expression in Africa (Banjul). These documents, among others, urge the adoption of development communication policies that support access and participation, freedom of expression, social changes, and the preservation of African languages and cultural heritages.

The State of Community Media in the Sub-Sahara

There is now a robust and complex culture of community print and broadcasting media in South Africa, Ghana, and Nigeria. The complexity admits of differences in size, type, ideology, technology, economy, and professional imperatives. But because of governments' strategic dispositions towards community radios, this sector is better developed across the three countries than the community television (CTVs) sector.

South Africa currently has about 480 community newspapers and magazines; over 127 community radios; four CTVs; and a couple of campus media. Out of the four CTVs, only the Cape Town CTV operates at the grassroots and outside satellite networks. Others licensed as 'grassroots' CTVs, due to their inability to withstand the initial financial recessions, now operate as affiliates and advertisement outlets of Kagiso Media – a situation that demonstrates the adoption of an 'absorption' or 'parallel' general policy orientation and questions their competency to educate the citizens in civil cultures.

The complexity of community media in South Africa is, therefore, particularly about the split among 'corporately-affiliated media' with commercial business interests, the 'authentic community media' at the suburbs with interests in service deliveries and education, and the 'radical democratic media' (e.g. the *Mail & Guardian*) with business interest in the exposition of corruption and the promotion of democracy.

There are also a number of community newspapers and magazines in Nigeria. A few function to serve community-specific interests. Others serve primarily the interests of commerce or regional politics. Those owned by religious organizations serve principally socialist interests. Though a few of these small publications just come up and after a while disappear, they generally function to empower the citizens at the local information level. However, the 'knock-and-drop' experience and the big industrial production capacity evident in some

community press in South Africa is not a general experience for Nigeria. Most small newspapers are sold to interested readers. But voluntarism within the press sector of the two countries is now an exception, rather than a rule.

'Grassroots' community broadcasting is non-existent in Nigeria at the moment. Legislation favours only the licensing of 'campus broadcasting' for universities. The development of over 19 campus broadcasting, though good for apprenticeship, is only a partial and strategic official response to the need for broader media democratisation. NBC, the broadcasting regulatory body, confirms that government is favourably disposed towards 'grassroots' community broadcasting (e.g. Chapter Nine of the NBC Code) and that over 1,000 applications for 'grassroots' broadcasting licenses have so far been received. But unless a letter of authorisation is received from the presidency, the regulatory body is constrained from issuing licenses.

Unlike Nigeria, 'grassroots' community broadcasting is thriving very well in Ghana. The situation is comparable to the development in South Africa. There are about 12 community radios currently on air and only one CTV (Coastal TV). Ghana Community Radio Network (GCRN) is working to get 12 more radios on air. These are in addition to a couple of campus radios already in operations. These broadcast stations generally show distinctive interests in environmental protections and the empowerment of local populations towards socio-cultural developments.

One of the primary factors militating against further development in 'grassroots' community broadcasting in Ghana is the willingness of NCA to grant operational frequencies. How the functioning community media are firmly rooted in the local communities to minimise elite influence also remains contestable. And how poor and unstable social infrastructures

(electricity, telephone and road services) negatively impact on the capability of small media was also recognized by respondents.

Except for *specialist* and a few faith-based community publications, evidence shows that there is the demise of community press in Ghana today. There were some 'authentic' community newspapers in the past. But most have died out. Though there are some newspapers which production centres are now locally-based, they are mostly newspapers sympathetic to either the ruling or the opposition political party. They are not community newspapers as conceptualized by UNESCO.

The structural organizations of community media to ensure local participation and accountability to the regulators are diversified across the two industrial sectors. While the management structures are better organized within the community broadcast sector of the three countries in the form of 'Board of Trustees' or its equivalent for the participatory benefit of local communities, they are somewhat 'loosely' organized within the community press sector around 'Executive Board' primarily for the benefit of business stakeholders. But generally without the existence of such structures, evidence suggests that the sustainability of community media outside elitist political and commercial influences could be difficult.

Also, funding mechanism for community media across the three countries is gradually shifting from 'patronage' towards 'commercial' or 'mixed' funds arrangements. The shifts are necessitated by a combination of factors: the poor economic conditions of African countries; reductions in international developmental supports; the impact of globalisation; and the changes in the way audiences access news. The availability of diversity of funding models is particularly significant in understanding the capability of small media to engage in ongoing trainings and productions geared towards activism for reforms. Though a large percentage of 'corporately-affiliated' community press in South Africa still lean strongly on a

purely 'business' model for survival, the possible danger this holds for editorial competencies and campaigning practices needs to be recognized.

Audience participation strategies in the three countries, in varying ways, draw on three emerging practice patterns: the engagements of different cadres of audiences in the ownership and management of community media stations through diversity of representational structures; the provision of access to technologies and technicalities of programming; and the partial delivery of audiences from the informal economic sectors to advertisers. The outstanding thing about the participatory models adopted by community media is that it encourages private producers to benefit from their creativity in terms of the actualisation of talents and equitable revenue distributions. The use of participatory models in relation to audiences also implies a deliberate rejection of the top-bottom model operational within commercial media and the strengthening of the interventionist ability of local communities, through community media, in media policy reforms.

Campaigning for Media Policy Reforms

Because of the media deregulations of the 1990s that enable expansions in community media, campaigning for media-related reforms in the three countries has, in the last two decades, moved beyond the known parliamentary or District Assembly representative processes to include community media processes. Three main community media 'platforms' have been identified: 'programming', 'capacity-building', and 'deliberative social forums'. Also important is the 'horizontal' and 'vertical' linkages community media groups have maintained over the years.

Bush Radio (Cape Town) organizes, in partnership with GCIS, a discursive programme called "Talk to the Ministers". In bringing issues (e.g. the 'Protection of State Information' and the 'Media Appeal Tribunal' Bills) for public debates, the station is always conscious of

the split of opinion between government and the communities within the Cape Flat. The management admit that in facilitating dialogue, the radio station is not the 'Voice', but the 'Mediator' of consensus among communities and between local communities and governments. The justification for this role rests on the conception of the radio station as a conduit for social change and on the need to extend discussions on sensitive policy issues from the parliament to the local communities.

The capability of diversity of 'programming' (news, articles, editorials, discussions, etc.) to pressure governments for policy changes, through agenda setting and opinion-formations, generally depends on adopted institutional programme philosophies, the chosen programme languages, the availability of necessary funding and expertise for sustainability, the kind of organizational structures adopted to ensure participation and division of labours, co-production agreements with audiences, as well as the use of professional and non-professional skills. Strong emphasis is also placed on the importance of 'follow-ups' on stories and eye-witness testimonies in the construction of credible information to help citizens find resources to question political authorities.

'Capacity-building' that enable community media connect with the experiences of local populations and experts often comes in the form of organized trainings, community-based researches, and feasibility studies. The significance of capacity-building rests fundamentally on its literacy, empowerment, and greater outreach potencies. The process enables local communities make informed decisions, design their media processes, and sustain peaceful working partnerships. Training in competency in media arts, participatory planning and management, and skills in accessing financial resources, as well as literacy in social relation process, are therefore vital to the success of community media's interventions in the complex manipulations of symbols and culture and in influencing media policy developments.

GCRN's (Accra) participatory research is essentially field-based. It draws on the benefits of oral testimonies from community members and the power of audio-visuals to engage marginalized groups in discursions and decision-making at every level of community radio initiatives. The interconnected layers of the research include: the need to help the people understand themselves, the developmental needs of their communities, and the potentials of community media in responding to those needs.

'Deliberative social forums' (conferences, workshops, seminars, and retreats), in turn, are important in providing opportunities, not only for social interactions, but also for paper presentations, discussions, and exchange of views on practice and policy challenges. They also enable collective articulations of unified policy positions for onward submissions to regulatory agencies of governments. Deliberative forums also have the capacity of bringing about joint advocacy visits to ministers, parliamentarians, and media regulators or in generating force for minimal street actions and open protests in partnership with unionist and human right movements to pressure for policy changes.

The 2-day annual 'retreat' organized by the Forum of Community Journalists (Mpumalanga Province) provides Lowveld Media (Nelspruit) and other provincial community newspaper publishers the opportunities to impact on media policy issues. The most recently reformed press rules undertaken by the provincial community-based journalists in partnership with other stakeholders is the current *South African Press Code* (2011). The revisions of industrial Codes in South Africa since late-1990s have always remained a collective industrial responsibility.

But in order to deepen conversations, expand self-reflexive joint actions, and broaden campaigning impacts, community media groups do consciously sustain broader 'horizontal' and 'vertical' links with national and transnational individuals, communities, and groups.

Data identify three dimensions of such cross-relationships: the 'horizontal' links with civil right organizations, donor agencies and NGOs; the 'vertical' relationship with government departments; as well as the 'vertical' (and sometimes 'horizontal') relationship with mainstream media institutions. While some of the organisations are merely programming partners, others are simply funding, training or lobbying partners. Again, while deliberation, cultural practice for the purpose of visibility, philanthropy, and social interactions still remain the primary defining qualities of the three modes of cross-partnership, the networking ability of community media groups has, however, changed irrevocably over the years with the advent of the World Wide Web and the surge in social media and virtual community membership.

However, community media groups in Sub-Saharan Africa must always remain conscious of how the diversity in cross-partnerships could inadvertently lead to a loss in their distinctive humanist and emancipatory objectives if they become completely subsumed in elite totality (Negt and Kluge, 1983; Okon, 2006).

Media Policy Activism: Achievements and Challenges

While it would be unrealistic to assume that all the achievements of the community media groups of the three countries could be completely captured in this small chapter, it is nevertheless important to note that they have, in varying ways, recorded significant victories in their campaigns for media policy changes over the last two decades. Three different criteria have been used by respondents to measure their successes: the number of Awards and trophies received; the level of participation in policy debates and decisions; and the positive policy outcomes recorded. But generally respondents admit that the successes recorded are indicative, not only of the strengths of their adopted participatory mediatory processes, but also of organized streets activism to influence policy changes at all levels.

The community radio initiatives of Ghana, working under GCRN and COTA, have made policy recommendations towards the formation of a comprehensive broadcasting law and local language Code for the purpose of media programming and political campaigns. They have mobilized for the inclusion of local ethical values in media deregulations as safeguards against the neo-liberal policies entrenched in the country by the NDC-led government. GCRN successfully obtained from government a 'waiver' on taxation imposed on imported equipment for community broadcasting and a 'lowering' ($100, US Dollars) in the licensing tariff for community media. The Network has worked with other stakeholders to overturn NCA's initial regulations on political programming and the generation of minimal income in favour of community media. It has ensured the inclusion of an 'exceptional clause' in NCA's 2007 Guidelines on community radio, whereby a 25kms coverage radius could be granted to community radios operating under exceptional terrestrial circumstances. And under COTA, GCRN is working through street actions to promote press freedom and checkmate implicit official attempts to strengthen monopoly of broadcasting spaces by commercial media.

The community media institutions in South Africa, working under CODESA, FAWO, and NCRF, have brought about the establishment of a diverse sector of community media. With other stakeholders, they have facilitated the formation of MDDA, the establishment of ICASA, and the formation of the 2005 *Electronic Communications Act (No. 36).* Under OWN, they negotiated with SABC, prior to 2004, for a 'natural partnership' between emerging CTV studios and SABC for capacity development purpose. They have made policy recommendations to ICASA and to the Portfolio Committee on Public Communication in relation to digital migration, laws dealing with payment of royalties to SAMRO for music played by community radio stations, and the high cost imposed by SENTECH on signal distribution, enabling the subsequent reviews of some of the situations. Under SASFED, the groups are working with DTI for the amendments of section 21 of the *Copyright law* that

regulates audio-visual creativity and benefits. And under the Right-to-Know-Campaigns, they are pressurising the parliament not to legislate on the 'State Information Secrecy' and 'Media Appeal Tribunal' Bills put forward by the conservative wing of the ANC-led government.

The community radio initiatives in Nigeria have, under NCRC, contributed to researches and the capacity developments of community broadcasters. They have worked with NBC to establish modalities for community media operations. NCRC is also working with its partners to minimize clientelistic tendencies in campus broadcasting and to promote extensive use of local languages in media programming. They also made policy recommendations towards the revisions of the *National Mass Communication Policy,* the *National Broadcasting Policy*, and towards the convergence of ministerial and broadcast regulatory agencies to best manage public resources, just to mention a few.

The successes recorded notwithstanding, empirical data indicate that there are still enduring challenges facing community media groups in the three countries, problematising what brings additional pressures on them. While majority of the challenges are general to either two or three of the countries, a few are unique to each legislative country or are specific to the needs of each community media sector.

The challenges are tied, among others, around the difficulties community broadcast media have in documenting political impacts on the national level informed by the 5kms coverage radius imposed on them; lack of equitable frequency allocations in line with the requirements of ITU; and the 'closed' approaches adopted by media regulators to inform broadcast licensing procedures. Others are the limitations in official funding supports; the failure of national media policy to provide for equal advertising benefits for all media sectors; the poor social infrastructures that impede stable and quality programming in Ghana and Nigeria; attempts by governments in Ghana and South Africa to impose media ethics for mere

political gains; the frustrations of community newspaper establishments in South Africa in securing immediate official responses to media enquiries in line with the 48 hours dateline stipulated by existing national policy; and the problem of digital contents regulations and how this impacts on community media active engagements with end-users.

In view of these challenges, I wish to make the following recommendations in prospect of the future activist role of community media: the need to reconceptualise media policy in terms of the 'ethical-political' policy framework so as to sustain a meaningful balance between government and ordinary citizens' policy processes; the adoption of 'open' administrative approach in terms of 'policy community' (durable and official rules of participatory engagements in policy-making) and 'policy network' (less durable and less official mode of relationships) that can enable a more effective management of the complex web of interactions and resource dependencies in policy-making (Humphreys, 1994); broader uses of social media subcultures to enable community media groups improve on participation, mobilization and documentation of impacts at all levels; the continuing digitalisation of community broadcast media to enable the sector effectively bypass governments' frequency scarcity arguments and strengthen the education of citizens through compressed and multiple electronic transport modes (Kleinsteuber, 1998); and an integrative protection of thinly-resourced small media, in terms of expansion in the common law defences available to them to enable them best manage defamation suits, the provision of sustainable 'mixed' funding supports, improvements in social infrastructures available to them, and a more effective management of the political and commercial influences on community media to prevent the possible subversion of their transformative agendas.

Conclusion

At the heart of this chapter was the need to explore how community media intervene and impact on media policy-making in Anglophone Sub-Saharan Africa. Against the enduring tension in scholarship with regards to the actual role of grassroots policy actors in media policy reforms, I have argued and documented that the community media groups of Ghana, South Africa, and Nigeria have played (and are playing) substantial interventionist roles in progressive media policy developments of the most recent times. Their active involvements, which have in varying ways been impacted by the diversity of mediatory, participatory, legislative, economic, political, and structural processes available to them, however require greater official and academic acknowledgements.

References

Atton, C. & J. Hamilton (2008), *Alternative Journalism*, London: SAGE

Braman, S. (2010), "Mediating the Public through Policy", In S. Papathanassopoulos & R. Negrine (eds.), *Communications Policy: Theories and Issues*, England: Palgrave, 22-48

Chakravartty, P. & K. Sarikakis (2006), *Media Policy and Globalization*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University

Curran, J. (1991), "Rethinking the media as a public sphere", In P. Dahlgren & C. Sparks (eds.), *Communication and Citizenship: Journalism and the Public Sphere in the New Media Age*, London: Routledge, 27-57

Duff, A. (2010), "The Age of Access? Information Policy and Social Progress", In S. Papathanassopoulos & R. Negrine (eds.), *Communications Policy: Theories and Issues*, England: Palgrave, 49-64

Freedman, D. (2008), *The Politics of Media Policy*, Cambridge: Polity

Garnham, N. (2000), *Emancipation, the Media and Modernity: Arguments About the Media and Social Theory*, Oxford: Oxford University

Habermas, J. (1962), *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, Thomas Burger (trans.), Cambridge: Polity

Hackett, R. & W. Carroll (2006), *Rethinking Media: The struggle to democratize public communication*, New York: Routledge

Hamelink, C. (1994), *The Politics of World Communication: A Human Rights Perspective*, London: SAGE

Horwitz, R. (2001), *Communication and Democratic Reform in South Africa*, Cambridge: Cambridge University

Humphreys, P. (1994), *Media and Media Policy in Germany: The Press and Broadcasting since 1945*, Second Edition, Oxford: Berg

Hutchison, D. (1999), *Media Policy: An Introduction*, Oxford: Blackwell

Kleinsteuber, H. (1998), "The Digital Future", In D. McQuail & K. Siune (eds.), *Media Policy: Convergence, Concentration & Commerce*, London: SAGE, 60-74

Moran, A. (1996), "Terms for a Reader: Film, Hollywood, national cinema, cultural identity and film policy", In A. Moran (ed.) *Film Policy: International National and Regional Perspectives*, London: Routledge, 1-20

Negt, O. & A. Kluge (1983), "The Proletarian Public Sphere", In A. Mattelart & S. Siegelaub (eds.), *Communication and Class Struggle 2: Liberation, Socialism, An Anthology In 2 Volumes*, New York: Bagnolet, 92-94

Nyamnjoh, F. (2003), "Media Pluralism and Diversity: A Critical Review of Competing Models", In T. Kupe & J. Barker (eds.) *Broadcasting Policy and Practice in Africa*, London: Article 19, 114-37

Okon, P. (2006), *Community Radio and Political Education through News Formats*, A Dissertation, Port Harcourt: CIWA

Oosthuizen, L. (2001), "The External Media Policy Framework: From Restrictive Policy to the Democratisation of Communication", In P. Fourie (ed.), *Media Studies: Institutions, Theories and Issues*, Vol. 1, South Africa: Juta, 163-86

Sholle, D. (1995), "Access Through Activism: Extending the Ideas of Negt and Kluge to American Alternative Media Practices", In *Science Communication: An International and Interdisciplinary Journal of Social Philosophy* 2(4), Thousand Oaks: SAGE, 21-35

Further Reading:

C. Calhoun's *Habermas and the Public Sphere* (Cambridge: MIT, 1992) provides other dimensions for public sphere reconceptualization; C. Carter. & S. Allan's "If it bleeds, it leads: ethical questions about popular journalism" (In D. Berry, *Ethics and Media Culture: Practices and Representations*, Oxford: Focal, 2000: 132-53) offers another critical framework for integrating alternative and mainstream news policy concerns; Kwame Boafo's *Promoting Community Media in Africa* (Paris: UNESCO, 2000) further explores community media development in Africa; and R.A. Rhodes' *Understanding governance: policy networks, governance, reflexivity and accountability* (Buckingham: Open University, 1997) offers a comparative approach to the notions of policy community.