

FINDING A NEW POLICY MODEL FOR PUBLIC SERVICE BROADCASTING

Communitas

ISSN 1023-0556

2005 10: 21 - 36

Pieter J. Fourie*

ABSTRACT

The market paradigm in South Africa has eroded public service broadcasting (PSB) values and principles. The adoption of the market paradigm (even in a limited way) has diminished PSB's potential role in development and nation building. In order to secure the future of PSB, a new policy model is needed. In this article such a model is proposed against the background of the need to acknowledge the changed nature of society, democracy, social responsibility, the changed nature of the media and media environment, and the policy paradoxes created by the market paradigm for PSB. Some of the paradoxes related to regulation, funding, access and content are highlighted. The article concludes by stating that the time has come to move beyond PSB as an institution to PSB as a genre spread over the spectrum of the broadcasting industry.

* Pieter Fourie is a Professor in the Department of Communication Science at the University of South Africa in Pretoria.

INTRODUCTION

In the article, *The market paradigm and the loss of public service broadcasting (television) for development and nation building* (Fourie 2004), the nature and impact of the market paradigm on public service broadcasting (television) was analysed. It was concluded that public service broadcasting (PSB) in South Africa, as in the rest of the world, is under serious threat. In terms of the original values and principles of PSB, the market paradigm has eroded PSB's potential to

- perform the function of a national point of reference and identification
- be one of the few links in our individualist mass society, and, in South Africa, a racial, cultural, linguistic, political and economic divided society
- place social and cultural concerns before the imperatives of the marketplace
- maintain a common national culture in an era of fragmented communities and fractured identities, and
- to play a key role in development and nation building

Yet, in a new commercialised and converged media environment, brought about by globalisation, technological development and the market paradigm, PSB remains the last hope for media in which the emphasis is on social responsibility which is free from political and commercial pressure. The question is how to secure such a future for PSB? In this article, this question and the need to find a new policy model for PSB are addressed.

Against the background of a literature study and own observation, it is argued in the following sections that finding an answer lies in the acknowledgement of the profound changed nature of society and the role of the media therein. Secondly, it lies in the acknowledgement of the policy paradoxes created by adopting the market paradigm in broadcasting. Taking these changes into consideration, the search for a new policy model for PSB can start. Such a search points in the direction of moving beyond PSB as an institution to PSB as a genre, or distributed PSB.

THE ROLE OF PSB IN SOCIETY

Three paradigms in media policy research

Currently, three paradigms can be distinguished in media policy and policy research (cf. Van Cuilenburg & McQuail 2003).

In the first paradigm, also called the Emerging Communications Industry Paradigm (before World War II), policy emphasised the strategic importance of the emerging communications media (telegraph, telephony and wireless). Policy mainly involved ad hoc measures to deal with new innovations and the development of separate policies for different media. In the case of the print media, such measures included guarantees of freedom of publication and expression. The role of government was limited and policy was not so much concerned with the structure of the press (industry) and with quality. Telecommunications policy was characterised by strong regulation of ownership and infrastructure, taking into account public rights of access and privacy, and with an emphasis on efficiency, good administration and a public service ethos. In broadcasting

there was a strong regulation of content, access, restricted freedom of expression, and regulating some form of monopoly and oligopoly. The USA saw the emergence of a government-regulated private monopoly model with an emphasis on private ownership. In Europe a model of public/state monopoly in which the media was seen as public utility (and as such, a branch of government) to serve the national/public interest, was established.

The second paradigm, or the so-called Public Service Media Policy Paradigm, emerged after World War II and continued into the late 1980s. Policy was inspired not so much by technological innovations but rather by the needs of democratic politics, the role of the media in democracy, and in establishing national coherence and stability. The focus was on restricting the misuse of the media for propaganda (lessons from World War II). In broadcasting, especially in Europe, it was the period when the PSB model emerged with its emphasis (PSB principles and values) on an impartial space for free expression and open debate. This included programming for all interests, tastes and minorities; concern for national identity and community; competition in good programming rather than for audience numbers; liberation rather than restriction of programme makers; universal accessibility; information that would allow citizens to participate fully in society; audience development and education; emphasis on the best of a nation's cultural resources in literature, art, drama, music, science, history; and an emphasis on national and regional cultural identity.

In broadcasting all of this started to change in the latter part of the 1980s with the emergence of the so-called New Communications or Market Policy Paradigm. The main drive in this paradigm is new technology and convergence. The policy challenge is how to break monopolies under the banner of deregulation and, at the same time, to do so in the spirit of social responsible normative theory.

The changed nature of society

The New Policy Paradigm stresses the need for change in due consideration of the changed nature of society (from modernity to postmodernity), the changed nature of democracy, new views about what constitutes social responsibility, and the changed nature of the media itself.

In the new society, a new kind of public exists, characterised by hybridisation, fragmentation, and the rise of minorities. The traditional distinction between public and private is blurred. It is difficult to recognise a coherent population with shared values, and a single, Habermasian idealised public sphere with a common normative dimension, which no longer exists. Several public spheres, all claiming legitimacy in the processes of democratic dialogue and debate, exist.

Scholars (cf. Jacka 2003; Hartley 2004; Schudson 1998) argue that there is a crisis in democracy itself, making it difficult to uphold the ideal of republican democracy, be it representative and/or participatory (communitarian) democracy. Democracy can no longer be viewed as a fixed ideal type, but only as something that is fluid and evolving, due to the fact that the nature of citizenship itself has changed. A clear distinction needs to be made between civil (involving rights and freedoms), political (involving representation), social (involving welfare), cultural (involving identity politics, and so-called do-it-yourself (DIY) citizenship (cf. Hartley 1999). With regard to the latter,

identity is based on a choice people can make from available alternatives (choices), patterns and opportunities, rather than on an identity based on a social contract between the state and its subjects and/or heritage as prescribed by a given community. DIY citizenship is also called 'semiotic democracy' or 'semiotic self-determination'. In this, the media play a significant role as the main disseminator of information, and thus meaning, in present day societies. (cf. Jacka 2003.)

Furthermore, it needs to be acknowledged that in the new society social responsibility is no longer the exclusive asset or responsibility of public organisations, including public broadcasters. In the light of liberalisation, deregulation and self-regulation, social responsibility has shifted from the state and its institutions to social institutions and commercial enterprises.

Most of all, policy makers and researchers need to acknowledge the changed nature of the media and media landscape in postmodern society. Some of the outstanding characteristics of the new media and media landscape that necessitate a new policy framework are:

- new distribution platforms enabling a multimedia approach (e.g. radio, video and print on the Internet)
- an increase in diversity, choice and niche markets
- the blurring of genres: e.g. 'infotainment', making it impossible to elevate so-called 'high-journalism' as a prerequisite for an informed and responsible citizenship
- interactivity between audiences and media institutions
- the convergence of public and private media blurring the previous clear distinction between three main types of national broadcasting systems, namely a core public service system, a core private system, a core state system - all of them now merging into a single system made up of a mix of public, private and other types of broadcasters in which public service broadcasting may still play a significant, but no longer dominant role, and
- the semiosphere and mediasphere of meaning and the processes of narrative accrual.

THE NEED TO FACE POLICY PARADOXES

In order to secure the future of PSB in the context sketched above, policy makers and researchers need to address the policy paradoxes the Market Paradigm has created for PSB.

Paradoxes related to regulation

As far as regulation is concerned, four main paradoxes can be identified: (i) the inherent dichotomy between culture and the market, (ii) diversity and competition leading to remonopolisation, (iii) national regulation in a global context, and (iv) convergence policy which may threaten freedom of expression.

Broadcasting policy in South Africa and elsewhere, mainly strives towards the achievement of two goals. Firstly, it wants to secure a set of privileges for PSB, define its public obligations and formulate control structures to assure PSB's autonomy and monitor its accountability. (cf. Syvertsen 2003: 156-158.) Secondly, and simultaneously, it seeks to establish open markets and more competition. It thus tries to address a set of two principles or the inherent dichotomy between culture and the market, or otherwise stated, between cultural policy and economic policy.

In trying to address this inherent dichotomy, an increasing trend in PSB organisations, the same organisation is to be divided into a dual system (traditional *public broadcasting services* and *public commercial services*). This places PSB organisations in direct competition with the private sector and decreases the weight of their market failure argument, namely that the private sector is and will not be interested in providing public services such as catering for minorities, investing in access (roll-out), and so on. This strengthens and accentuates the private sector's argument that adopting a dual system places the public broadcaster on par with all other media (print, broadcasting and the advertising industry) which have been and are still involved in "citizen-forming" (claimed to be one of the big justifications for PSB), in one way or another. Private media do not only carry popular and commercial content. This is even more so in the new media environment with more media available and a greater diversity of channels catering to more specialised tastes, needs and niche markets (cf. Jacka 2003:187; Hartley 1999). Some of the best examples in South Africa of nation building and development content, contextualisation, public debate, in depth investigation, etc. are in the print media and numerous examples can be cited from the advertising industry and campaigns trying to contribute to a new South African patriotism.

As far as ownership is concerned, the paradox is that greater competition tends to result in fewer competitors. Put in another way, deregulation encourages consolidation and often results in an oligopoly with a handful of companies controlling the market, aiming at (re)monopolisation (Hujanen and Lowe 2003: 21). Despite increased diversity, South Africa is experiencing an increased re-concentration of ownership in both broadcasting and the print media (back to what it was under apartheid, and even worse). Ten years ago two Afrikaans and two English newspaper companies dominated the market. It is now being dominated by one Afrikaans group, *Naspers*, and one English group, *Independent Media* (Irish-owned). Together they have about 70% of the market (cf. Harber 2004: 22). In broadcasting, apart from the SABC, the scene is dominated by three companies, *e-tv*, *MultiChoice* (MIH), and *Primedia*. As Horwitz (1989) and Hujanen and Lowe (2003: 21) warn: although competition is good, it inherently aims towards (re)monopolisation; although deregulation promises greater competition, in application it usually results in fewer competitors and in oligopoly with a handful of corporations controlling the market.

In terms of globalisation, the main paradox lies in trying to mould national policy in the context of international trends. Yet, it is clear that support for public broadcasting solutions is more easily achieved on the national level where a specific population can

judge for themselves what public broadcasting should deliver in terms of their own needs (Syvertsen 2003: 168).

Convergence policy as a way to address future regulation seems to be scattered with problems. At the time of writing (July 2004) South Africa, taking the lead in southern Africa, was in the process of debating a Convergence Bill that aims to regulate the convergence of overlapping technologies. In the media fraternity and amongst online publishers it is feared that the Bill will stifle freedom of expression and result in the regulation of content for all website owners (electronic newspapers and broadcasters publishing online news and information). An anomaly arises where identical content published both in a newspaper and online is not subjected to regulation in the print environment but is regulated in an online environment. Apart from a possible infringement of freedom of expression, the Bill (which requires anyone who publishes online to apply for a licence), will also discourage investment in online content causing publishers to rather invest outside the borders with adverse economic consequences for the sector. At the time of writing, a campaign for stopping the Bill was under way (cf. Mawson 2004: 29).

In Europe, the answer to a single convergence policy seems to be a negative reply (cf. Van Cuilenburg & McQuail 2003: 198). The tendency is back to develop independent national regulatory authorities for media operating in the public sphere with a coherent set of principles especially on matters dealing with freedom and diversity, and to distinguish between the content and audiences of the different media (despite convergence).

Paradoxes related to access

In dealing with access, paradoxes relate to the inherent dichotomy between the concepts of "public/public interest" and "consumer/market interest". [(cf. Raboy (2003); Van Cuilenburg & McQuail (2003); Thomass (2003), Bardoel & Brants (2003) for a discussion of the concepts "public", "public interest", "public sphere" in the context of the debate about the future of PSB)].

Policy usually departs from the public interest perspective. The objective is to ensure a diverse high-quality range of media available to all citizens in the interest of avoiding social exclusion and to contribute to an informed public opinion (cf. Feintuck 1999: 199). In the case of new media, access to new communication technologies is seen as the cornerstone of social change and cultural development. Yet, in practice, access policy often turns out to be mainly in favour of service providers wanting to maximise market opportunities.

Raboy (2003: 42), with reference to Thomas (1960), shows how the market is characterised by attention to things rather than to people. The market is identified with freedom of enterprise, profit, etc. The public, on the other hand, is identified with the state, public service, public interest, community, identity, freedom of expression, etc. Under the market approach the media today tend to address people as consumers, not as a public, and thus, in policy, market considerations have outstripped public ones. The ideal with access policy should be to restore the role of the public.

A second paradox related to access, especially in developing countries, lies in the First World nature of their media (both broadcasting and print), having to function in Third

World circumstances where the majority of their populations do not have the financial means to afford media, be it money to buy a newspaper or a magazine, a radio or a TV set, and, needless to say, without the means for expensive new media and access to such media. Within the media industry itself there is the knowledge, skills and means to develop the industry in line with international trends, yet, such development often only benefits a minority.

In South Africa, the case of *MultiChoice* illustrates this point. Using the most advanced digital and satellite technology and offering a wide range of national and international services, this subscription service is available to a small minority of the population who can afford it. The paradox is that while *MultiChoice* shows that South Africa as a developing country is capable of competing with the best in the world, it, at the same time, increases the divide between rich and poor, and as such contributes to rising conflict and tension.

In terms of *access*, the SABC can almost claim universal reach - SABC1 reaches 89%, SABC2 91% and SABC3 77% of the population (South African Broadcasting Corporation, 2003: 64). However, some sections of the population have no choice of services and they often have to rely on a single service, usually one of the SABC's public service radio stations. To further increase access, the SABC has embarked on a (planning) process to migrate from an analogue to a digital-broadcasting environment (with international partners such as BBC Technology). Within the context of a developing country, the main questions remain: (i) Who will benefit from this technological roll-out? (ii) The SABC may perform well in terms of providing access to services, but access to what (content)? (iii) Does the public have the necessary (media) literacy to use the media in terms of development needs and what is being done to increase (media) literacy? (iv) How does access address language, educational and cultural needs?

New media is far removed from the realities of the majority of people who do not have access to new media. If they do have access, it is mainly institution-based access through schools, libraries and civic centres, where, as research shows (cf. Conradie 1998), problems related to management, technical support and skills, and user knowledge (how to use the new media and towards what purposes) prevail. Without developing countries first progressing towards resolving their socio-economic and (media) literacy problems, the "digital divide" will grow. Without resolving the problem of unemployment, the lack of access will increase as the ability to afford goods and services decreases, leading to shrinking levels of demand (cf. Duncan [s.a.]: 191). In its turn, unemployment will have an impact on the advertising industry. Advertiser-driven-media, as the majority of media in South Africa is, will have to compete more fiercely for a shrinking layer of upper-income earners.

Paradoxes related to funding

When it gets to funding, the paradoxes are multiple: sponsorships lead to increased and often unfair competition; voluntary donations raise questions about independence and autonomy, as do direct government funding and subsidies. Advertising, as was shown, leads to increased competition. Licence fees are usually too inadequate to meet costs. Taxing is met with private sector resistance, and switching to a dual system, as was shown, is riddled with problems and criticism.

As Price and Raboy (2001: 7) clearly formulate it:

All being said, and all being mainly normative in nature, the biggest problem confronting public service broadcasting in the new media environment, is funding. Public service broadcasting comes at a price, financially, in the capacity of the state to tolerate criticism and keep its hands off management, and, in the resources needed to nurture an audience against the pressures of the persuasive and appealing channels of a newly opened global bazaar of entertainment (and information). In economies that must contend with balancing extraordinary claims on a struggling budget, public service broadcasting must be widely understood and its principles appreciated for expenditures to be justified. Building a sustainable, accepted public service broadcaster is a complex task.

How can the problem of funding be approached? Mixed-funding seems to be the way most public service broadcasters are going. Yet, as shown by McKinsey & Company (1999), the paradox is that the higher the advertising figure as a proportion of total revenue (as is the case with the SABC), the less distinctive a public service broadcaster is likely to be. Additionally, that dependence on advertising revenues creates a conflict of interest that prevents the public service broadcaster from meeting its public service obligations.

As for licence fees, apart from the lack of a culture of paying for services, the biggest problem with licence fees in developing countries is that people often do not have the money to pay such fees. This is in addition to the problem, as pointed out by Steemers (2003:124), that the licence fee (alone) may not allow public service broadcasters to do everything they wish in order to participate in the digital revolution.

The policy challenge is therefore to secure funding for PSB that would be realistic and substantial enough to allow the public broadcaster to fulfil its public mandate in a competitive market.

Paradoxes related to content

Critics (cf. Brants, Hermes & Van Zoonen 1998; McChesney 1997; Tracey 1998) are unanimous in their view that program strategies in line with market orientation have eroded the role of PBS in, and its claims to, amongst others, provide *high-quality and innovative programming*, be a *standard-setter*, provide *service programming* close to peoples' specific needs, and provide *diversity*, all which cannot be provided by private broadcasters (cf. Fourie 2003 for a more in-depth discussion of the principles related to the PSB content). In short, the problems related to content stems directly from the inherent dualism between quality and quantity.

Most of the criticism about content can be brought together in what is increasingly argued to be PSB's loss of *distinctiveness*. In the changed media environment, where the public broadcaster exists side by side with private and community broadcasters, it is increasingly difficult to differentiate between them. It is as difficult to justify the argument of market failure by proving that private broadcasters, if regulated, can and will, not produce quality, diversity, cater for minorities, be innovative, create new slots, new genres, and set the pace.

Closely related to the problem of distinctiveness is programme scheduling. In adopting the market approach popularised prime-time scheduling and programming (soaps,

game shows, popular talk shows, etc.) have come to dominate PSB prime-time viewing. The little PSB programming that may remain, is usually screened outside prime-time schedules. This is also contributing to the paradox of a growing generation who no longer knows what public service broadcasting is about and what the significance thereof could be. This, in itself and from the public's point of view, threatens the relevance of any debate about the future of PSB. After ten years of "democratising" broadcasting in South Africa - "democratising" often used as a synonym for "privatisation" and "liberalisation" - it is doubtful if a study such as that reported by Holtz-Bacha (2003: 112) in Germany, will yield any significant results in South Africa. In this study respondents distinguished between public and commercial broadcasting in the following way: Public broadcasting is more objective, believable, competent, ambitious, critical, and catering more to information needs. Commercial broadcasting is seen to be more casual, modern, entertaining, daring, versatile, and catering more to entertainment needs.

Given the present blurred nature of broadcasting in South Africa, it would be significant to see if respondents would be able to distinguish in the same way between public and commercial broadcasting, especially amongst the younger generation, who, since the liberation of broadcasting, had little exposure to public service broadcasting. At the same time, the older generation of especially black viewers may have a negative impression of public service broadcasting, having been subjected to the apartheid propaganda of the SABC as state broadcaster in the era of apartheid.

Furthermore, in developing countries PSB easily succumbs to the attractiveness and affordability of purchasing programmes and/or programme formats from the "outside", instead of producing independently and creatively, and by so-doing, establish an own signature.

To conclude: The dilemma, if not the paradox, of public service broadcasting is clear. On the one hand public broadcasters have to adhere to public service obligations. On the other hand, if they fail to compete in the market environment and to rise to technological and competitive challenges, they can not afford their public service obligations and will lose their audiences in the process. As Steemers (2002: 19) formulates it:

...if they seek to concentrate their efforts on popular programming, then they are bound to be accused of neglecting their public service remit, which also threatens their claim to licence fee funding. If they occupy the cultural high ground to provide those things which commercial media do not, they risk marginalisation and cutting themselves adrift from public support and ultimately adequate funds.

IN SEARCH OF A NEW POLICY MODEL FOR PSB

Future predictions include that profitability will continue to be the main driver in broadcasting. Content push and user pull will increasingly go hand in hand. Branding will increase as content pull will change from "what do you have for me?" to "I want you to provide me with this". Technological innovation will continue to be a driver, including the expansion of the potential of broadband and mobile technologies and with that the potential of ICTs to lower costs for content production, delivery and billing in relation to pay for specific content (cf. Punie et al. 2002: 12-16). From this, it is clear

that as far as the management of media in the era of convergence, the breaking up of monopolies and in dealing with new technology, the market approach will rule supreme.

For PSB, the policy challenge is thus to find a balance between economic and non-economic goals (cf. Van Cuilenburg & McQuail 2003). From the literature study and observations conducted for this research it is increasingly becoming clear that a new way of thinking about, regulating and funding PSB and its contribution to broadcasting is necessary. In short, a new policy model needs to be established that would secure the values and principles of PSB as a democratic force, or, as earlier referred to and as formulated by Raboy (2003: 46) "...as the last best hope for socially purposeful media acting in the public interest".

Such a model needs to recognise that PSB

- can take a diversity of forms at different sites (cf. Jacka 2003: 188)
- needn't be restricted to existing public service institutions (cf. Steemers 2003: 128-129)
- should be access driven, but access in acknowledgement of the means and nature of the new media environment (cf. Van Cuilenburg & McQuail 2003: 205; Raboy 2003: 50), and that
- securance of PSB values should be based on industrial logic (cf. Alm & Lowe 2003: 223)

In the words of Ed Richards (Senior Partner: Strategy and Market Development of Britain's Ofcom), a new model should be based on recognising that the world has reached the end of broadcasting as it was known (cf. Richards 2004).

Earlier arguments about PSB's distinctive role in democracy (cf. Garnham (1996); Curran (1992); Murdock (1992); Keane 1995); Tracey (1998)) are lately challenged. They are regarded by some authors as being modernist views in the context of outdated conceptualisations of an "ideal democracy" in which the emphasis is mainly on representation and participation (cf. Jacka 2003). What is needed is a postmodern view of democracy as a changing and evolving phenomenon and a postmodern view and understanding of the media, in the case of television as being a "transmodern" medium (cf. Hartley 1999). Such a view would provide room for taking cognisance of the changing nature of citizenship in a pluralised society (Schudson 1998), the changed nature of the relationship between audiences and media, and the changed relationship between production, dissemination, interpretation and the use of media and media messages.

As far as social responsibility is concerned, Bardoel and Brants (2003: 181-182) argue that social responsibility is no longer the exclusive asset of public organisations including public broadcasters. In the light of liberalisation, deregulation and self-regulation, social responsibility has shifted from the state and its institutions to social institutions and commercial enterprises. In such circumstances the question arises whether there should be a continuation of the present policy situation in which highly regulated public broadcasters can be expected to fulfil public service obligations alone.

The question is whether new policy shouldn't be introduced in which both public and private broadcasters share a social responsibility and public duties?

Towards a new model: From PSB as an institution to PSB as a genre

Taking this argument and the suggestions by the authors above as point of departure for future research, this article concludes by suggesting that an alternative may be to move beyond public service broadcasting as an institution and in its institutionalised form, and to focus on PSB as a genre spread over the spectrum of the broadcasting sector.

In South Africa, the adoption of the market approach has reached a point of almost no return. To counterfeit the negative impact thereof on the potential role of PSB in development and nation building by slowing down the process of liberalisation or by introducing new and restrictive ownership regulations, is not the answer. Such a step would hamper the growth of the emerging (in some cases already flourishing) private industry and its growing contribution to the national economy, as well as the role the private industry could and often wants to play in development and nation building. It would provide fertile ground for turning the public broadcaster back into a state broadcaster without necessarily empowering it to contribute to the ideals of development and nation building. Most of all, it would place South African broadcasting out of step with international trends and technological developments (positive and negative as some of these trends and developments may be).

With development and nation building being a national priority, spreading the values of PSB in the form of a specific programme genre to be offered by all broadcasters, may be the way forward. It is not the objective of this article to give a detailed description of what PSB as a genre could or should be. That remains the topic of future research. At this stage, suffice it to say that in defining PSB as a genre, the ideal content principles of public service broadcasting could be used as a cornerstone. That is programmes that have as their clear objective, (independent of its form - be it documentary, drama, magazine programmes, current affairs, educational programmes):

- the development of audiences in matters related to national development, national history, culture and identity
- to adhere to the principles of distinctiveness and creativity, and
- to perform the "journalistic grammar of democratic political conduct" (cf. Garnham 2003: 195) and are thus investigative, revealing and set the table for debate.

Such a genre could embrace the values of PSB as argued by Alm and Lowe (2003: 223) in their work on the outsourcing of core PSB competencies, namely content that

- nurture, support and defend cultural pluralism
- instil a sense of security and reliability, and
- set standards for quality and professionalism.

As far as the regulation of such a genre is concerned, local content policy and the regulation thereof could be taken as point of departure. Funds in the form of incentives to the whole spectrum of broadcasters could be made available instead of trying to

address the problem(s) of funding and regulating a single so-called public service institution in competition with all other broadcasters. Within the jurisdiction of the regulator an agency for public service programming could be considered, similar to the *New Zealand on Air* (NZoA) funding body for local content (cf. Horrocks 2004).

Focusing on a public service genre could be a beginning to address the numerous paradoxes with which present PSB policy is faced and the tensions that arise from the dichotomies between public/private, culture/market, service/profit, national/global, citizen/consumer, quality/quantity. It could, in a developing country, acknowledge the need for social responsibility across the board. It could stimulate local production and the local production industry and the development of an unique South African style.

In terms of access, focusing on PSB as a genre and getting rid of what increasingly seems to be an artificial distinction between public, private and community broadcasting, could expose the public/audiences (fragmented as they may be) to be more social responsible content. By so doing, a beginning can be made to address the problem of the information rich/poor divide. As far as the rollout of technology towards a universal service is concerned, there is no reason why this could not be regulated in order to assure the private industry's contribution in this regard.

On a macro theoretical level, moving beyond PSB as an institution and focussing on PSB as a genre would be in line with postmodern thinking about, amongst others, the media and media planning in general (not a specific medium in isolation) within the broader context of the "semiosphere" (cf. Hartley 2004: 20) of media communication.

Although the SABC may claim that it alone has an official PSB mandate, in practice all the media support and adhere in different forms to the ideal of development and nation building. Of this the SABC's social responsibility announcements, soaps, occasional documentaries and discussion programmes form a part, but is in no way exclusive and distinctive. There is hardly a newspaper or magazine group or a private broadcaster without a clearly defined development and nation building project or involvement with such projects, be it through day-to-day reporting, weekly supplements, competitions, festivals and campaigns. Within the broader media context it is thus possible to already identify a clear South African development and nation building discourse and a distinctive dialogue in telling and debating the country and it's peoples' histories, fears, hopes and ideals. In short, in telling the story of development and contributing in different ways to the idea of nation building, the South African media as a whole are contributing to a process of "*narrative accrual*" (Attwood 1996). This means that through diverse media messages devoted, related, or referring to development and national issues - be it in dramatic series, soap operas, advertisements, or in magazine and newspaper articles, the South African story is told and retold. Focussing on PSB as a genre will acknowledge this contribution and motivate continued involvement.

CONCLUSION

In the first article (cf. Fourie 2004) of this two-part publication, the impact of the market paradigm on PSB was analysed. It was concluded that this paradigm has eroded PSB's means to fulfil its social responsibility, and that it is difficult to continue to distinguish between public and private broadcasting. In South Africa this has a profound effect on PSB's much needed role in development and nation building - on being a kind of "social cement" in a highly divided society.

In this article, a beginning was made to argue a new policy model for PSB. This was done against the background of emphasising the need to acknowledge the changed nature of society, democracy, social responsibility, the nature of the media and media landscape, and the paradoxes created by the market paradigm for PSB. In this regard some paradoxes related to regulation, funding, access and content were highlighted. It is concluded that the time has come to move beyond PSB as an institution and to focus future policy on PSB as a genre spread over the whole spectrum of broadcasting.

REFERENCES

- Alm, A. & Lowe GF. 2003. Outsourcing core competencies?. in *Broadcasting & convergence: New articulations of the public service remit*, edited by GF Lowe & T Hujanen. (Eds) Göteborg, Sweden: Nordicom.
- Attwood, B. (ed). 1996. *In the age of Mabo: History, Aborigines and Australia*. Sydney, Australia: Allen and Unwin.
- Bardoel, J. & Brants, K. 2003. Public broadcasters and social responsibility in the Netherlands, in *Broadcasting & convergence: New articulations of the public service remit*, edited by GF Lowe & T Hujanen. Göteborg, Sweden: Nordicom.
- Brants, K., Hermes, J. & Van Zoonen L. (eds). 1998. *The media in question. Popular cultures and public interests*. London: Sage.
- Conradie, P. 1998. Using information and communication technologies for development at centres in rural communities: lessons learned. *Communicare* 7(1): 97-116.
- Curran, J. 1992. Mass media and democracy: A reappraisal, in *Mass media and society*, edited by James Curran and Michael Gurevitch. London, Edward Arnold.
- Duncan, J. [s.a.]. *Broadcasting and the national question. South African broadcast media in the age of neo-liberalism*. Braamfontein, Johannesburg: Freedom of Expression Institute.
- Feintuck, M. 1999. *Media regulation. Public interest and the law*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Fourie, P.J. 2003. The future of public broadcasting in South Africa: the need to return to basic principles. *Communicatio. South African Journal for Communication Theory and Research* 29(1):148-182.
- Fourie, P.J. 2004. The market paradigm and the loss of public service broadcasting (television) for development and nation building. *Communitas* 9 (2004): 1-19.
- Garnham, N. 1996. The media and the public sphere, in *Communicating politics*, edited by P. Golding et al. Leicester, UK: Leicester University Press.
- Garnham, N. 2003. A response to Elizabeth Jacka's "Democracy as Defeat". *Television & New Media*, 4(2): 193 - 200.
- Harber, A. 2004. Vibrant media 10 years into freedom. *Sunday Times* 22 February: 17.
- Hartley, J. 1999. *Uses of television*. London: Routledge.
- Hartley, J. 2004. Television, nation and indigenous media. *Television & New Media* 5(1): 7- 25.
- Holtz-Bacha, C. 2003. Of markets and supply. Public broadcasting in Germany, in *Broadcasting & convergence: New articulations of the public service remit*, edited by GF Lowe & T Hujanen. Göteborg, Sweden: Nordicom.
- Horrocks, R. 2004. Turbulent television. The New Zealand experiment. *Television & New Media*, 5(1): 55-68.

- Horwitz, R.B. 1989. *The irony of regulatory reform: The deregulation of American telecommunications*. NY: Oxford University Press.
- Hujanen, T. & Lowe, G.F. 2003. Broadcasting and convergence. Rearticulating the future past, in *Broadcasting & convergence: New articulations of the public service remit*, edited by G.F. Lowe & T. Hujanen. Göteborg, Sweden: Nordicom.
- Jacka, E. 2003. "Democracy as defeat". The impotence of arguments for public service broadcasting. *Television and New Media*, 4 (2): 177-191.
- Keane, J. 1995. Structural transformations of the public sphere. *Communication Review* 1 (1): 1 -22.
- Lowe, G.F. & Hujanen, T (eds). 2003. *Broadcasting & convergence: New articulations of the public service remit*. Göteborg, Sweden: Nordicom.
- Mawson, N. 2004. 'Hands off online content'. *Mail & Guardian*, 5-12 February: 29.
- McChesney, R.W. 1997. *The mythology of commercial media and the contemporary crisis of public broadcasting*. Spry Memorial Lecture, Montreal, 2 December 1997/Vancouver 4 December 1997.
- McKinsey & Company. 1999. Public service broadcasters around the world: A McKinsey Report for the BBC. [O]. Available: <http://bbc.co.uk/info/bbc/pdf/Mckinsey.pdf>. [Accessed on 2002-11-11].
- Murdock, G. 1992. Citizens, consumers and public culture, in *Media cultures, Reappraising transnational media*, edited by Michael Skovland and Kom Schroder. London: Routledge.
- Price, M.E. & Raboy, M (eds). 2001. *Public service broadcasting in transition: A documentary reader*. Brussels: European Commission. Compiled by the Programme in Comparative Media Law and Policy for the European Institute for the Media. [O]. Available:<http://pcmlp.socleg.ox.ac.uk/PublicServiceBroadcasting.htm>. [Accessed on 2003/03/13].
- Punie, Y. Burgelman, J-C, Bogdanowicz, M. Desruelle, P. & Ducatel, K. 2002. *The future of online media industries. Fact & figures, drivers of change and validated scenarios for 2005 and beyond*. Seville: European Commission Joint Research Centre, Institute for Prospective Technology Studies.
- Raboy, M. 2003. Rethinking broadcasting policy in a global media environment, in *Broadcasting & convergence: New articulations of the public service remit*, edited by G.F. Lowe & T. Hujanen. Göteborg, Sweden: Nordicom.
- Richards, E. 2004. How light a touch? *Journal of the RTS*, January 2004:6-10.

- Schudson, M. 1998. *The good citizen: A history of American civil life*. New York: Free Press.
- South African Broadcasting Corporation. 2003. *South African Broadcasting Corporation Annual Review 2002/2003*. Auckland Park, Johannesburg: SABC.
- Steemers, J. 2002. *Changing channels: The redefinition of public service broadcasting for the digital age*. [O].
Available: <http://www.essex.ac.uk/ecpr/jointsessions/Manpapers/w24/steemers.pdf>.
Accessed on: 2002-04-03.
- Steemers, J. 2003. Public service broadcasting is not dead yet. Strategies in the 21st century, in *Broadcasting & convergence: New articulations of the public service remit*, edited by G.F. Lowe & T. Hujanen. Göteborg, Sweden: Nordicom.
- Syvetsen, T. 2003. Challenges to public television in the era of convergence and commercialisation. *Television & New Media* 4(2): 155-175.
- Thomas, A.M. 1960. Audience, market and public. An evaluation of Canadian Broadcasting. *Canadian Communications* 1: 16-47.
- Thomass, B. 2003. Knowledge society and public sphere. Two concepts for the remit, in *Broadcasting & convergence: New articulations of the public service remit*, edited by GF Lowe & T Hujanen. Göteborg, Sweden: Nordicom.
- Tracey, M. 1998. *The decline and fall of public service broadcasting*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Van Cuilenburg, J. & McQuail, D. 2003. Towards a new communications policy paradigm. *European Journal of Communication* 18 (2): 181-207.