

Promise of Citizens' Media

Lessons from Community Radio in Australia and South Africa

Community radio – the cheapest and most accessible of the electronic mass media – is ruled out in many countries because of legal restrictions. This paper looks at community radio in Australia and South Africa. Australia has a mature 'third tier' of broadcasting, now over 20 years old, facing the problems of an established sector, with consistent if relatively diminishing state support. As a relatively new democracy, South Africa's adoption of community radio is significant on a global scale. As the debate around community radio in India gathers momentum, and various initiatives start to emerge, some of the challenges they currently face may have lessons for India.

Jo Tacchi

Marginal or alternative media spaces, cracks [Roth and Valaskakis 1989], or fissures in the mediascape [Rodriguez 2001] are associated with increased and more democratic access, freedom of expression and operation, as well as creativity and innovation. Rodriguez shows how "alternative media function as environments that facilitate the fermentation of identities and power positions...spin transformative processes that alter people's senses of self, their subjective positioning, and therefore their access to power" (2001:18). She objects to theorists who approach alternative media with a binary approach to the concept of power – with large mainstream media organisations being seen as powerful and small-scale alternative media seen as powerless. This, she feels is to misunderstand lived experiences of 'power equations' that are in fact dynamic and shifting (ibid:16). On an everyday level participants in alternative media experience 'multiple subjectivities' and various and shifting power equations. She proposes that if we shift from the term 'alternative media' to 'citizens media' we will avoid binary oppositions (such as alternative:mainstream) and see participation as not merely a resistance to the 'alienating power of mainstream media' but an enacting of citizenship 'actively intervening and transforming the established mediascape' (ibid:20).

Community media is championed by many, including international development agencies, as a tier of broadcasting that gives voice to the voiceless and provides an important channel for local development and the enactment of citizenship. Yet the existence of community radio – the cheapest and most accessible of the electronic mass media – is ruled out in many countries because of legal restrictions. It is remarkable that in the world's largest democracy, independent community radio has yet to be adequately legislated for, especially considering the potential of the medium to contribute to the development of civil society and citizenship. India's is not the only democratic government that resists opening the radio spectrum to communities. In the UK the situation is not much better – only in the past 12 months has the legislation been approved for a trial of what the Radio Authority (the regulator) calls 'Access Radio', despite the existence of private (commercial) radio in the UK since the 1970s. Others in this special section will consider the particular circumstances in India that have mitigated against legislation for community radio – here I intend to take a broader view. I will look at the situation for community radio in Australia and South Africa, consider their development and some of the challenges they

currently face and attempt to draw some conclusions that might be of use in the Indian context.

Community Radio in Australia

Australia provides us with an example of a well developed and large community radio sector. The call for independent community radio in Australia began to be heard in the 1960s. It was in the mid-1970s that a 'third tier' was finally created. The Australian Broadcasting Authority (ABA) regulates broadcasting and issues licences. Interpreting the Broadcasting Services Act, the ABA defines community broadcasting services as those that:

- are not operated for profit or as part of a profit-making enterprise;
- are provided for community purposes;
- represent a community of interest;
- comply with the community broadcasting codes of practice;
- encourage members of the community served to participate in the operations of the service and the selection and provision of programmes;
- are prohibited from carrying advertising, but may broadcast up to 5 minutes of sponsorship announcements per hour; and
- must continue to represent the community represented at the time the licence was allocated.

The Community Broadcasting Association of Australia (CBAA) is the national representative and coordinating body for community broadcasters. It is a membership organisation that provides advice and support. It is dedicated to supporting the development of the sector in Australia and to the principles of local ownership and control. The CBAA established a code of practice for community broadcasters which was written in consultation with community broadcasting groups and was registered by the ABA in 1995. The code includes responsibilities and guidelines for community broadcasters as well as rules on Australian music content, sponsorship and volunteers.

Today around 200 fully licensed community stations exist in Australia, and around 140 temporary stations run by aspirant community broadcasters. In Australia the Public Service Broadcaster is the Australian Broadcasting Corporation (ABC). The ABC has four national network stations, an international service, nine metropolitan and 48 regional stations. There are 241 commercial stations. Community radio and local ABC services are likely to be the only ones available in the more remote regions of Australia where commercial radio stations would struggle to make a profit.

Traditionally there are two types of community licence models in operation in Australia – special interest and geographical or broad-based. These distinctions no longer appear in the legislation, although they are still used by the ABA to define ‘community’ in relation to community broadcasting licences. The ABA prefers a broad definition of ‘community’:

Given the role that community broadcasters play in promoting the objects of the Act, the ABA believes the most useful definition of community is one that is broad and takes into account social, historical and cultural linkages. The objects of the Act include promoting the diversity of broadcasting services available to the public; developing and reflecting Australian identity, character and cultural diversity; and providing programming material that is locally significant. (www.aba.gov.au/radio/services/licence_types/community/index.htm)

The vast majority of community radio stations in Australia broadcast on FM. When FM was introduced in the early 1970s commercial radio broadcasters were reluctant to change from AM and opposed the introduction of FM. This meant that community stations became the pioneers of the FM waveband. Of the 206 community stations licensed currently, fewer than 5 per cent broadcast on AM. The ABA determines the coverage area for a proposed licence through a detailed planning process. Community stations tend to have lower effective radiated power levels than commercial and public stations. This reflects both their desire to serve local communities and financial constraints.

Community broadcasters are not permitted to take advertising. They are, however, permitted to broadcast up to five minutes in any one hour of sponsorship announcements. There is funding from the Commonwealth government that comes through the department of communications, information technology and the arts (DCITA) and is distributed by the Community Broadcasting Foundation. In 1999/2000 over AUS\$5 million were distributed to community radio in this way. This will have made up between 7-10 per cent of the sector’s total operating revenue. Many stations do not receive any of this funding. The fully licensed stations had an estimated turnover of \$38 million in the same year raising the vast majority of its operating revenue from sponsorship (the largest income generator), subscriptions, membership fees and the sale of airtime.

The CBAA estimates that sponsorship revenue makes up 46 per cent of the sector’s income. Membership and subscriptions make up around 20 per cent of the sector’s income and is a well established income generator. Sale of airtime generates around 10 per cent of the sector’s income. Because of the range of stations in terms of size, location and audience there is a vast difference in both funding required to operate stations and ability to secure funding. The sector as a whole could be described as economically impoverished yet many stations are doing well, especially larger stations in metropolitan locations. The average turnover of community stations is estimated at \$175,000 per year. The average turnover for metropolitan and sub-metropolitan stations is estimated at \$281,000 per year whilst the average for regional (in Australia this term refers to non-metropolitan areas) and remote stations is estimated at \$102,000 per year. Some rural and remote stations operate in a completely voluntary capacity and have turnovers of less than \$50,000 per year. Others, in metropolitan areas with a citywide coverage have many full-time paid staff, large volunteer bases and turnovers in excess of \$1 million.

Within the past decade the numbers of community stations broadcasting has almost doubled in size from around 120 in 1992 to around 200 today. The current expansion rate is around 10 per cent per year and it is estimated that there will be 300 licensed community stations by 2005. This growth has not been matched by a proportionate increase in core funding and the numbers of stations receiving no grant aid is increasing [Thompson 1997,

DCITA 1997, Forde et al 2001]. Some believe that the greater competition for funds may result in better programming as only those that produce good audience ratings will survive; others are concerned that it will result in a blurring of the distinction between community stations and commercial stations precisely because of the desire to attract larger audiences. Some stations, such as some remote regional and some indigenous services, because of the nature of their operations, will probably always require some financial grant aid, whilst others are responding creatively to the need for increased self-sufficiency in income generation.

Undoubtedly the size and scope of community radio in Australia is due in large part to the fact that the federal government provides financial support to the sector. Australia has an independent funding body for community broadcasting, the Community Broadcasting Foundation (CBF). Established in 1984 the CBF is an independent, non-profit funding body whose primary aim is to act as the funding agency for the development of community broadcasting in Australia. The CBF receives an annual grant from the department of communications, information technology and the arts plus a smaller grant from the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission. It is independent from the government and from the community broadcasting organisations that it funds. It includes on its board and in its advisory committees people who have working experience of the sector. The government determines the proportion of their annual grant that should be allocated to general community broadcasting and to the different sub-sectors of community broadcasting according to social justice and access and equality criteria.

The CBF assesses applications for funds and distributes grants for development, programming and infrastructure support in four main categories: (1) Aboriginal community broadcasting; (2) Ethnic community broadcasting; (3) Radio for the print handi-capped; and (4) General community broadcasting and CBF operations. For 1999/2000 the Commonwealth government funding to the CBF totalled \$5.061 million. Of this \$4.191 million was for recurrent funding in support of Aboriginal, Ethnic, Radio for the Print Handicapped and general community broadcasting. For 2000/2001 funding was \$5.4 million, of which \$3.39 million is recurrent funding.

Community Radio in South Africa

Apartheid South Africa had a tightly controlled broadcasting environment monopolised by the state-controlled South African Broadcasting Corporation (SABC). Since the early 1990s, following democratisation, the airwaves have been opened up in an unprecedented way. An Independent Broadcasting Authority Act was passed by government in 1993 and established an Independent Broadcasting Authority (IBA). Community radio has been introduced rapidly and is recognised as playing an important role in the development of civil society in South Africa, yet it is a struggling sector largely because of licensing and regulation delays, inadequate funding and skills shortages in many areas of the country.

From 1994 the IBA began issuing community stations with temporary 12-month licences. The stations were largely centred on urban or semi-urban populations. This urban concentration was largely due to lack of resources, expertise and necessary skills in other areas. Whilst community radio is spreading throughout the country, these limitations largely remain. There are more than 100 community radio stations operating in the country, but many of them are still working with temporary licences. The licensing of community radio stations in South Africa is now undertaken by the Independent Communications Authority of South Africa (ICASA), which was formed by the merging of the IBA and the South African

Telecommunications Authority (SATRA) in 2000. The vast majority of community radio services operate on the FM band.

In 1999 a new Broadcasting Act was introduced. The act encourages ownership and control of broadcasting services through participation by persons from 'historically disadvantaged' groups through, amongst other things, providing a three-tier system of public, commercial and community broadcasting services. Community broadcasting services, as defined in the Broadcasting Act number 4 of 1999: (1) Are fully controlled by a non-profit entity and carried on for non-profitable purposes; (2) Serve a particular community; (3) Encourage members of the community served, or persons associated with or promoting the interests of such community, to participate in the selection and provision of programmes to be broadcast; and (4) May be funded by donations, grants, sponsorships or advertising or membership fees, or by any combination of these.

There are two types of community radio services, those serving a geographical community and those serving a community of interest. The communities of interest may be defined as having a specific, ascertainable common interest – a common interest that makes such a group of persons or sector of the public an identifiable community. These may be institutional, religious or cultural communities. The 1999 Broadcasting Act states that programming provided by a community broadcasting service must reflect the needs of the people in the community which must include amongst others cultural, religious, language and demographic needs and must:

(1) Provided a distinct broadcasting service deadline specifically with community issues which are not normally dealt with by the broadcasting service covering the same area; (2) Be informational, educational and entertaining; (3) Focus on the provision of programmes that highlight grass roots community issues, including, but not limited to, developmental issues, health care, basic information and general education, environmental affairs, local and international, and the reflection of local culture; and (4) Promote the development of a sense of common purpose with democracy and improve quality of life.

Community radio in South Africa, especially those services that serve black communities (i.e., the 'historically disadvantaged'), is largely under funded and struggling to survive. There is limited state funding for these services in the form of seed funding or funding for particular programming initiatives such as AIDS awareness, so that ongoing core funding is often problematic. Combine this situation with the problem of the difficulties of volunteering in a country without adequate welfare systems and extremely high unemployment in the most disadvantaged communities and the situation is often critical. Added to this, some stations are still operating on temporary one-year licences rather than the full four-year licences, making the generation of income and financial planning difficult.

There are a broad range of stations with varying levels of funding, funding needs and availability of funding sources. Different economies apply to urban and rural stations and to stations run by the historically advantaged (generally white South Africans, religious groups and so on) and those run by the historically disadvantaged (generally black South Africans, serving communities with high poverty and unemployment rates). The amount of advertising and sponsorship that a station may take is unrestricted but many of the struggling services find it hard to generate such income precisely because of the impoverished communities they serve.

Some stations are able to cover running costs through advertising and sponsorship revenue, but often need start-up funding for training and equipment. Some begin with start-up grants (some from the government) and then run with a mix of advertising revenue and donor support. The government, if it does supply

funding, tends to fund start-up equipment costs. The government has recently made 18 million rand (US\$2.1 million) available for programme production concerned with HIV/AIDS, women, children and old people. International donors make a significant contribution to the sector in some areas. The Open Society Foundation has distributed US \$1million per year since 1993/94. There is little information on the amounts and proportions of funding that come to the sector from different sources, but advertising and donor support appear to be the most significant funding sources.

The National Community Radio Forum (NCRF) represents the interests of community radio amongst the 'historically disadvantaged' communities in South Africa. Launched in December 1993 it advocates on behalf of its member stations, lobbies the government and ICASA and encourages and facilitates networking and cooperation amongst community radio services. Programming for community stations is to a large extent described by the Broadcasting Act in that it must relate to and be influenced by the needs of the communities served, it must provide diversity in format and languages, must reflect the cultures of the communities served and must promote South African identity.

Discussion

Australia has a mature 'third tier' of broadcasting. Now over 20 years old, the community radio sector in Australia has gone through many developments and changes. The community radio sector is experiencing a time of rapid growth in terms of the numbers of stations licensed and yet the financial support available through the CBF has not increased in line with this expansion in numbers. While the community broadcasting community generally welcomes the availability of new licences and the growth of the sector it has expressed concern about the lack of increased funding available from the Commonwealth government. Metropolitan stations that serve large populations have, in general, demonstrated the commercial viability of community stations and some maintain a healthy number of paid staff alongside large volunteer forces.

Non-metropolitan stations on the other hand are often wholly volunteer run with small income generating capacity. While some stations are generating income through commercial activity, other stations wish to preserve their non-commercial role, still others will always require income supplementation from government agencies because of their nature or position. It is precisely this breadth and diversity of the community radio sector that makes it on the one hand a hard to define sector, and on the other a hugely interesting and valuable resource for all Australians. The Broadcasting Act specifically refers to the promotion of diversity in broadcasting services, and the development and reflection of Australian identities and cultural diversity. It also includes the requirement to provide locally relevant programming material. These requirements contribute to the variety and diversity present in the sector.

The licensing and regulatory systems for community radio in Australia conceal a vast range of media projects and imposes upon them models of operating that are seen by many as restrictive and constrictive. Despite this, innovation is widely recognised as a key component of community radio in Australia. Many of the content providers in these 'marginal' radio spheres will become the mainstream commercial hits of tomorrow. The government recognises community broadcasting's reputation "for innovation and for being at the forefront in the development and use of new technologies" [DCITA 1997:10]. Community radio is often seen as the training ground for mainstream presenters and producers; creative content providers are more likely than their commercial counterparts to be free to work without the

formatted restrictions of other sectors and programming ideas are often developed that are later taken up by commercial and public service stations. In this way, the sector plays an important R and D role for mainstream broadcast media.

The main challenge faced by community radio in Australia is funding. According to the manager of 3PBS in Melbourne "it is a matter of surviving and finding that balance between good radio and financial survival" (interview June 2002). PBS (www.pbsfm.org.au) is a specialist music station in Melbourne that has been operating for over 20 years. It plays all kinds of music that does not get airplay on mainstream stations (apart from classical) and is widely seen as an important element in Melbourne's cultural and musical environment. Their current manager was employed by PBS two years ago. He had never worked in radio before and recognises that he was employed because of his business background to ensure that PBS continues to survive financially, achieving that delicate balance between 'good radio' and income generating activity. This reflects a widely felt pressure across the sector to take a business-like approach to management in order to allow the station to achieve its community-oriented goals. PBS depends to a great extent on a subscriber base of 4,500 people who each pay subscription fees to the station annually. PBS cannot survive on subscription revenue alone (which makes up 60 per cent of their income) and so also generates revenue from sponsorship income and donations.

Radio Goolarri is an aboriginal radio station in Broome, Western Australia. The radio station has many revenue streams including grants, sponsorship and training. Radio Goolarri is a part of Goolarri Media Enterprises (GME) (www.gme.com.au), established in 1996. GME demonstrates another trend in community media in Australia – diversification. Goolarri operates as a distribution point for radio services, sharing programmes across the region and the country through the National Indigenous Radio Service and the regional Pilbara and Kimberley Aboriginal Media radio network, which are satellite networks for media distribution. It also operates a local community television station, film and television production services, music recording facilities and events management. In recent years a highly popular radio show made at Goolarri has been taken up and made into a nationally successful television show.

Increasingly new media technologies are linked with enterprise development, as is the case with Goolarri. Another example is in Bordertown, South Australia. 5tcbFM (5tcbfm.org.au) is a community radio station in a regional town with a population of just 2,500. The shire that the station serves has a population of 10,000. This is an agricultural area with high levels of unemployment and a falling population as young people tend to leave for urban centres as soon as they are able. In an attempt to counteract this trend, 5tcb raised funding to establish a multimedia facility – audaCITY. This contains a learning centre, recording studio, broadcasting and webcasting complex. The idea behind this initiative is that it will appeal to young people, giving them opportunities to engage with new media technologies and networks and develop the kind of new economy skills that will enable young people to generate income without leaving the area.

The three main trends emerging through my recent research on community-based media in Australia can be described as enterprise development, diversification and the incorporation of new technologies, the last often as a means to achieve the first two. This is a mature environment for community radio facing the problems of an established sector, with consistent if relatively diminishing state support.

As a relatively new democracy, South Africa's adoption of community radio is significant on a global scale. It can be seen to have more progressive broadcasting policies than other long

established democracies. But the sector is struggling. Like those nations that have long adopted the three-tier model (Australia and Canada for example) there is a wide diversity of stations and organisations that are incorporated under the term 'community radio'. There have been problems with implementing legislation for community radio and for many of the stations this has served to magnify problems linked to the inequalities and social and economic deprivation that historically disadvantaged communities continue to endure.

On the one hand the development of community radio in South Africa has been a remarkable exercise in building democracy and civil society. On the other hand there have been serious delays and shortcomings at each stage. According to the CEO of the National Community Radio Forum (NCRF), despite ensuring that legislation was in place for the establishment of a community radio sector, because of the ways in which the legislation is applied, the government and the regulator are 'killing community radio' (interview with Mabalane Mfundisi, October 2001). The IBA Act of 1993 had made provision for permanent four-year licences, but it did not set out the regulatory framework. This had to happen through an inquiry and according to the head of the Licensing Unit of ICASA "I think that everyone thought that the inquiry and the formalisation of the regulatory framework [would] only take 12-months and that soon after we would start issuing the four year licences" (interview with Pheladi Gwangwa, October 2001). There was a desire to fast track applications so that "by the election you have a number of different voices that would be able to report fairly" (ibid). In order to achieve this, an amendment was put into the act to allow for temporary 12-month licences and it was envisaged that by the time those licences came up for renewal the four year licences would be available. However, it took until 1997 for a position paper on four-year community licences to be issued (<http://iba.org.za/compos.htm>).

When the invitation to apply for four-year licences was issued the IBA received 252 applications. They had been expecting around 100. They were overwhelmed and had to make legislative amendments just to facilitate hearings for the applications. Finally momentum was established, but quickly hampered by budget cuts, a council restructure and a reduction in numbers of staff. There was then the merger of the IBA and SATRA which involved a physical relocation.

Additional problems for the sector are no less significant, and can be seen to be made more intense by the delays in licensing. Funding is a clear problem, especially where the stations are serving communities that are unable to support the station because of serious social and economic underdevelopment. It is precisely this underdevelopment that provides the driving force for a large section of community radio in South Africa – community radio is seen as a means of empowerment, education and in many cases enterprise development (such as the 12 station project) [see Tacchi 2002]. Legislative and regulatory delays aside, it is widely recognised that stations need to think in terms of a variety of sources for revenue generation. Funding is inextricably linked to the ability (or lack of) to achieve the specific community-oriented goals that community radio promises.

ALX fm was one of the first community radio stations in South Africa, having received its first temporary 12-month licence in 1995. ALX fm was still broadcasting on a temporary licence when I visited. Alexandra is situated to the north of Johannesburg and is made up of government housing and shacks. There are few pavements in Alexandra as shacks have been built on every spare piece of land. It covers less than 4 sq miles and is home to 6,00,000 people. Unemployment in Alexandra is in the region of 60-65 per cent, and many children are unable to attend school, as their parents simply cannot afford to send them.

The initial funding for ALX fm came from a Dutch development agency. This provided seed funding and funding for training, "That money helped ALX fm to run two, two and a half years, but then it just ended, the funding... since then it has been a struggle for ALX fm to get back on its feet" (interview with Willie Lekoloane, CEO, October 2001). Apart from occasional project grants from overseas development agencies, the main income is derived from sponsorship, advertising and the selling of airtime. Willie's vision for the future is a station that serves a community that is able to support it and sees this as achievable only through local social and economic development. The community needs to develop in order to be able to sustain the station, which in turn can contribute to local development.

Radio KC in Paarl, 50 miles north-east of Cape Town, had only just received their full broadcasting licence when I visited in 2001. They had formed in 1996 but missed out on the chance to apply for a temporary 12 month licence and had to wait several years to apply and receive a permanent licence. However, they had run a series of 30 day broadcasts during the past five years under special events licences. During this time, and in a effort not to allow the delays to dampen enthusiasm and involvement locally, they developed a production facility making programmes and burning them to CDs for their own broadcasts and for distribution across community radio in South Africa.

These production enterprises were funded by various NGOs and tackled issues of local community development, such as the problems experienced by those working in the wineries locally who had traditionally been paid extremely low wages which were supplemented by payment in wine itself. The social problems that such practices have contributed to are far-reaching and the programme production was funded by a development company formed by one of the large wine producers. Other programmes have tackled a variety of key social issues such as gangsterism, AIDS, juvenile crime and domestic violence. Radio KC was successful in keeping together a core team of producers through this exercise and has therefore been able to offset some of the problems that licensing delays might have caused, by keeping a steady stream of activity happening. They have also spent the time generating ideas for other funding initiatives and developing structures that they feel will enable them to develop into a fully effective community radio station over the next few years. Keeping local people involved, establishing relationships with funders and building relationships with potential sponsors and advertisers has been crucial for Radio KC and they have done this mainly by taking the opportunity presented to them to build a production facility which now gives them a strong programme production base from which to launch their permanent community radio station.

The situation in South Africa is far more complex than these two examples reveal, but they demonstrate to some extent both the problems faced by community radio and some of the enterprising ways in which communities are tackling them. State support for the sector along the lines of the Australian model, beyond start up costs and specific programme production, would clearly have a positive impact on the sector.

Conclusion

As the debate around community radio in India gathers momentum and various initiatives start to emerge, there are two main lessons that we can take from the examples given above. Firstly, funding is clearly a crucial aspect to the development of an independent third tier of broadcasting. Early sector development in Australia was closely associated with the establishment and licensing of university-based stations. As the sector grew the importance of university support diminished, and some of

those stations linked to universities became independent (partially or completely). As this kind of development seems likely now to occur in India it is worth noting that the ongoing development of the sector and the range and diversity of the initiatives contained within it owes a considerable amount to the consistent support offered by the state. The funding model that exists in Australia should be examined with a view of adopting some of its characteristics in India if legislators are serious about their desire to see a strong community radio sector. Simply comparing the Australian experience with South Africa illustrates this point.

Secondly, we can see in both Australia and South Africa that innovative and entrepreneurial practices, aimed at both developing local economies and strengthening the base from which a station operates, rely to some extent on the ability to diversify. New business approaches are being tried in various stations across Australia in response to funding pressures and the need to move beyond the idea that simply providing a good and alternative community-based radio service is no longer in itself enough. In order to achieve community development and participation aims stations must develop a sound business base and in many cases engage in market practices that have hitherto been of no interest to them. This is a universal trend from subsidy to enterprise, which the South African community radio sector is experiencing at a much earlier stage in its development. Dependence on volunteering and state subsidy is far more problematic there and it is clear that those stations that diversify and generate income through various activities will be more likely to succeed. In order for stations to get to this stage, early state support is critical.

This in essence is the key lesson that India can take from experiences elsewhere. State support in terms of adequate legislation and funding, especially in the early stages of the development of community radio in India is clearly the key to the development of effective citizens' media. [17]

Address for correspondence:
j.tacchi@qut.edu.au

[This paper draws on data generated through three separately funded research projects. One was a comparative study of models for community radio in six countries funded by the Community Media Association (www.commedia.org.uk) [Price-Davies and Tacchi 2001]. A 12-month research project in Australia on the role of community-based media in the new economy was funded by the Queensland University of Technology (QUT) ATN Small Research Grants Scheme during 2002, and a month long research visit to South Africa to investigate community radio was funded by a QUT professional development grant through the Creative Industries Faculty in late 2001 [Tacchi 2002].]

References

- DCITA (1997): 'A New Funding Model and Future Strategies for the Community Broadcasting Sector', discussion paper, March.
- Forde, S, K Foxwell and M Meadows (2001): 'Commitment to Community: Results from a National Survey of the Community Radio Sector', paper presented to Australian Broadcasting Authority Conference 'Radio, Television and the New Media', Canberra, May 3-4, 2001, (Available at www.cbonline.org.au).
- Price-Davies, E and J Tacchi (2001): *Community Radio in a Global Context: A Comparative Analysis in Six Countries*, Community Media Association, Sheffield.
- Rodriguez, C (2001): *Fissures in the Mediascape: An International Study of Citizens' Media*, Hampton Press, New Jersey.
- Roth, L and G Valaskakis (1989): 'Aboriginal Broadcasting in Canada: A Case Study in Democratisation' in Marc Raboy and Peter A Bruck (eds), *Communication for and against Democracy*, Black Rose Books, Montreal.
- Tacchi, J (2002): 'Transforming the Mediascape in South Africa: The Continuing Struggle to Develop Community Radio'. *Media International Australia* (incorporating *Culture and Policy*). No 103, May, pp 68-77.
- Thompson, M (1997): 'Expansion of the Community Broadcasting Sector: How Do We Proceed?', July www.cbaa.org.au.