

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 294 547

IR 013 092

AUTHOR Splichal, Slavko
TITLE Socializing Audiences--or Television? On Theory and Practice of Media Socialization in Yugoslavia.
PUB DATE Jul 86
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the International Television Studies Conference (London, England, April 10-12, 1986).
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Audiences; Capitalism; *Communications; Democratic Values; Foreign Countries; Freedom of Information; Government Role; Information Sources; *Mass Media; Political Attitudes; Public Service; *Socialization; Social Responsibility; Socioeconomic Influences; State Programs; *Technological Advancement; *Television Viewing
IDENTIFIERS *Yugoslavia

ABSTRACT

Socialization is generally considered the process of making individuals "fit" for living in society. To understand the specific social role of the media, their particular place among agencies of socialization, and the real possibilities of a democratization of mass communication, the question should be inverted to ask, "Who makes the media 'fit' for what society and how?" In essence, the questions are how best to fulfill the collectively transmitted social interest in the field of mass communication through social management bodies, or how to make these bodies independent and responsible; and also how to use the positive experience of the democratization of mass communication in the development of western democracies, and how to develop new methods of actively integrating the population into the communication processes themselves, as well as in their management and control. The opportunities that Yugoslav society provides for the establishment of social property and the development of self-management in the field of mass communication have remained to a large extent unused. Too much social energy has been used in creating the most perfect, comprehensive laws; too little energy has been spent in developing concrete instruments and mechanisms of socialization of the communication activity. (10 references) (CGD)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED294547

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

* This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy

SOCIALIZING AUDIENCES - OR TELEVISION?
On Theory and Practice of Media Socialization
in Yugoslavia

Slavko Splichal
University of Ljubljana

Paper Presented to the 1986 International Television
Studies Conference

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Robert Paterson

IR013092

Introduction

Socialization is usually considered as the process of making individuals "fit" for living in society. It refers to what, why, and how people learn, and have to learn, to participate as a more or less effective members of groups and the society. Socialization research has traditionally focused primarily on changes in the behaviour of the learner, e.g., the recipient in communication processes, rather than the "teacher" (media). Accordingly, traditional communication theories were more interested in dealing with the audience behaviour as (re)produced by the media than with the social nature of the media themselves, i.e. in asking "What?" rather than "Why?" about the communication process.

To understand the specific social role of the media, their particular place among agencies of socialization, and the real possibilities of a democratization of mass communication, we need to invert the question: Who makes the media "fit" for what society and how? Instead of increasing the ability of those who control the media to manipulate the audience, communication research should develop an understanding of and critical consciousness about economic, political, and social conditions and the dimensions of the development of the media from the past to the future. Among them, media ownership - or, to put it more exactly, the ownership of the means of production and distribution in communications, as a special form of the dominant pattern of ownership in society, is particularly important (Masterman, 1985: 82-85).

Certainly, the question of socializing the media, setting them free of private and state ownership does not apply only to television. The dominant pattern(s) of ownership subordinate(s) all kinds of (productive) material and mental activities in the society, the more so the more they are instrumentally useful in achieving the key objectives of the (economic, political) system. But precisely from the point of view of its instrumental usefulness, television deserves particular attention. The evidence is simple. If the continuous and lifelong flow of messages is the most distinctive feature of mass media (Downing, 1980: 160), then television best represents this continuity in attracting public attention throughout the life cycle of individuals and, in particular, during their childhood. On the other hand, among all mass media, television in most contemporary capitalist and socialist societies is organized to the largest extent as a state, private and/or transnational monopoly.

Radio is from the production point of view (quantity of produced programmes) and from the consumption point of view (number of listeners) the most developed form of mass communication in Yugoslavia as well as elsewhere. With almost 400,000 hours of programmes broadcast by 200 Yugoslav radio stations, the amount of radio time exceeds that of 14 television programmes of the 8 Yugoslav TV stations almost tenfold. However, far smaller differences exist between the two electronic media with respect to their recipients: one radio for 1.3 households as against one television for 1.5 households. Television viewing, on the other hand, is a far more time consuming activity among Yugoslav citizens than listening to

the radio, though the radio supply is far more diversified (200 stations) than television (8 national stations, one in each of the six republics and two autonomous provinces of Yugoslavia). As indicated by several surveys, television is - among all mass media - the most important source of information, entertainment, and socialization. On the other hand, access to television programming is more restricted than to all other media, which is why the question of socializing the media applies primarily to television.

Socialization of the Ownership of Communication Means

Technological and social changes in communication ever more falsify traditional models of mass communication as necessarily a one-way, intermediary communication for which "extensive division of labour in complex organization" is significant in the production sphere while, in the consumption sphere, mass audiences exist, i.e. audiences that are "relatively large and heterogeneous and whose members are anonymous so far as the communicator is concerned" and among whom little interaction exists so that they are not capable of action (Wright, 1966: 15, 49, 50). Development of the mass press and of complex and centralized systems of electronic communication have in fact given the impression that these are the general and necessary characteristics of mass communication, which are not essentially different from the characteristics of any mass commodity production. This was the dominant form of development of mass communication from the end of the 19th century to the end of 1960s.

The development of communication processes in contemporary societies have long been proving the inadequacy of the classic freedoms which originated from the bourgeois revolutions of the 18th century: "freedom of speech", "freedom of thought" and "freedom of the press", as well as the necessity of the definition and, above all, the enforcement of the generic freedom of communication. All special freedoms are always only partial freedoms, or, to quote Voltaire, "des libertés sont des exemptions de la servitude générale", or Marx, "the limited horizons of 'freedoms' are dangerous for the freedom" (Marx, 1969: 95). Freedom - also in the sphere of communication - has always existed; the question is, however, whether it was a universal freedom or simply a privilege. The common right to communicate - the freedom of communication - supposes the liberation of the communication activity from all those "freedoms" which do not belong to all citizens and to communication as men's generic ability and need.

Socialization of the communication activity stands and falls with the universal democratization of social relations. There are no conditions of uneven distribution of power in a democratic society, in an association of actually free and developed personalities. In such a pluralistic society, the interests, needs, opinions, attitudes and views of each individual have equal value and the same possibility of fulfillment through democratic dialogue; in principle, they do not have higher or lower value when democratic decisions are in question. The communication activity certainly cannot exist and develop, either, without expert authority and decisions that are not based on subjective evaluation, but on objective, factual (inclu-

ding the level of what is actually possible), instrumental or technical knowledge. As in other activities, there is no sharp, exclusive limit between expert (professional) and democratic decision-making in the communication activity: between the two spheres, there is an interface between the expert and democratic authority which represents the real foundation of the often biased, and thus incorrect, belief that democratization develops to the detriment of expertise.

The democratization of communication includes a number of suppositions that have not yet been realized by any society. These primarily include the abolition of the uneven distribution of social wealth, the centralized and bureaucratic management system, the political restrictions of rights and freedoms, as well as the development of new communication technology, knowledge, and critical consciousness. Within the framework of efforts to democratize the communication sphere, many different strategies have been developed elsewhere (MacBride Report, 1980: 197).

(1) Traditional mass media systems as developed by monopoly capitalism have begun to advance an idea of B. Brecht, which emerged half a century ago, that "the radio should turn from a means of distribution into a means of communication" (1983: 169), as well as an old idea of Marx (1969: 80), which suggested that the press should become "a talking link among people". The legalization of the right to correct, reply, and criticize, and the tendencies of communication organizations to establish feedback between recipients

and communicators increase the individual's possibility of writing and speaking instead of just reading, listening and watching, although such recipient activity is limited to, e.g., readers' letters, questions on the phone, etc. and may also have a manipulative character.

(2) National media systems, above all the electronic ones, in some places give unprofessional communicators possibilities of participating in the production of media messages either independently or with the help (mediation) of professional communicators (e.g., interviews, special articles in newspapers, radio and television transmissions, round tables, etc.).

(3) The influence that recipients-consumers have upon decision-making and management in communication organizations increases at least to a limited extent (e.g., on the local level).

(4) Finally, in Western parliamentary democracies, new forms of media develop that are alternative or complementary to traditional ones (media for special geographic areas or specific social categories, like the young, minorities, etc.). Their origin and development are closely connected with the relative reduction of the prices of communication technology.

All these new forms which have been developing within communication activity certainly do not necessarily provide a higher degree of democracy, for they may also represent just a new form (adapted to

the level of technologic development) of the essentially unaltered one-way communication. Their actual contribution to the democratization of human communication and, thus, the society as a whole, is defined by whether or not they expand not only the number of the active participants in the communication process, but also the social basis of mass communication, i.e., whether or not the new forms contribute to the incorporation of, until then, excluded social categories and groups, for example, national, ethnic, linguistic and religious groups, the young, women and socially, economically or politically deprived groups, etc.

At the same time, the democratization of communication presupposes a number of other rights and freedoms, the realization of which represent a condition of the free development of man's personality as a totality. Communication freedom includes the responsibility of the individual and the society for creating realistic suppositions concerning the exercise of the freedom of communication. The entire development of mass communication and the enforcement of human rights and freedoms has until now been based on the mere provision of the citizens' passive accessibility in the sphere of consumption. In contrast the realization of the generic communication freedom pre supposes primarily the development of the conditions for their active participation, i.e., direct and indirect incorporation of citizens into the production and exchange of messages, as well as into the management, direction and supervision of communication processes, in which the individual can realize his interests and meet his needs in cooperation with others.

By the end of the 1960s a revolutionary idea was brought into practice in regard to the possible transformation of mass communication into public communication. In contrast to mass communication,"(1) almost as many people express opinions in public communication as receive them. (2) Public communications are so organized that there is a chance to immediately and effectively answer any opinion expressed in public. Opinion formed by such discussion (3) readily finds an outlet in effective action, even against - if necessary - the prevailing system of authority, and (4) authoritative institutions do not penetrate the public, which is thus more or less autonomous in its operation" (Mills 1964: 392). However, is such a conception of public communication at all feasible?

Mills' dimensions of differentiating the public from the mass, which are denoted by Habermas as "useful criteria for defining public opinion" (Habermas, 1969: 312) can be on a normative level operationalized with the following four basic rights and freedoms as the corner-stones of the generic right to communicate:

- (1) the right to publish opinions in the mass media, as an extension of the traditional freedoms of thought and expression;
- (2) the right to participate in the management of the mass media and communication organizations;
- (3) the right of free association and mutual interlinkage for realizing individual and common needs;

(4) equality of citizens in rights and duties of which the first requirement is that this equality is not dependent on their social position.

The right to publish opinions, as the central content of the right to communicate, implies equal value for or else a real importance given to all opinions in society, therefore eliminating the unequal distribution of "political competence" and privileged (ruling) opinions. This naturally concerns those opinions that determine the social hierarchy of values, on the basis of adherence to the same basic social values. All opinions must have equal significance in democratic discussion, reaching agreement and decision-making when they are based on evaluation, not on professional knowledge or professional capability in taking technical or instrumental decisions. Individual opinions with regard to objective circumstances have at any rate a different final probability of either ~~being affirmed as common or even of being "turned into effective action"~~ being affirmed as common or even of being "turned into effective action". However, the initial probability must be based on a genuine equal possibility of the public expression of opinions. In democratic discussion, the dominant opinion is constituted from opinions that are not subordinated to the intervention of organs of executive power. If, however, equal possibilities are only politically but not actually equal, the dominant opinion is then formed by power groups (elites), that likewise secure a posteriori publicity for it: the published opinion (of the elite) reduces autonomy of discussion and the possibility of response (criticism). To achieve an equal initial probability for all individual opinions, communications have to be

organized as a public good and managed and controlled neither by private nor state interests, but rather by society as a whole; i.e., they have to be socialized.

The process of socialization denotes the most radical revolution until the present in the development of communication activity. Historically, this revolutionary process is rooted in developed capitalism with the development of mass communication. It first appeared in the form of shareholding societies and trusts in the communication sphere and later under the leadership of the "collective capitalist" - the state. As with other sectors, the technical-economic organization of production in communication activity developed to such an extent that it could no longer be regulated by the anarchical competitiveness of individual capital. The organization of production has become so complex that it has excluded the possibility of further development without integration supervised by society. Low circulation opinion press (and with it the public as a social category) began to degenerate, while concentration and monopolization in the sphere of the press and electronic media increased. Hopes that the new media technology would by itself revolutionize communication relations were empty: once again it was shown that technology does not in itself have revolutionary power in the communication sphere but rather that the determining role is held by the dominant forms of social relations. As Williams wrote (1976: 70), all technological innovations in the communication sphere have been - either for political control (as in propaganda, or social profit (as in advertising).

The limits of the dominant mode of communication activity in capitalism are determined by its subordination to the structure of ownership in the social division of labour. These limits can be surpassed only by society taking direct hold of productive forces, by associated producers directly controlling socialised labour and the social product. The key for such a revolutionary transformation has already been discovered by the capitalist state. However, state ownership is still an instrument of the power of capital - one form of appropriating surplus labour is only replaced by another. A one-party etatistic system within the framework of state ownership, as was in principle developed elsewhere immediately after the proletarian revolution, in essence fulfills the same function as the centralized capitalist state. In state socialism, the basic forms of human alienation produced by the capitalist system are not eliminated. As historical experience shows, state ownership can - on the contrary - even increase human self-alienation in all activities and, hence, also in communication. True socialization actually begins when state ownership ceases to exist - by the actual socialization of management functions.

The socialization of mass media and communication organizations has three basic aspects:

- (1) social management and control of the communication media;
- (2) providing the financial resources for mass media operation on the principles of solidarity and reciprocity of citizens;
- (3) social influence on the formulation and implementation of communication policies, programmes, etc., of the mass media.

In a post-capitalist society, the social ownership of the means of communication production and distribution is considered as the basis of the socialization of the communication activity. Social ownership in the communication sphere should provide the basis for the optimum allocation of social, material and mental, "communication forces", in order to be used as effectively as possible for meeting the communication needs of the society.

Social influence means firstly a negation of the economic dependence of the communication activity on the State (budgetary financing) and on commodity production (market). Consequently, it cannot be reduced to political influence on the management of communication organizations and mass media. On the other hand, it is precisely the right to participate in the management of communication organizations and mass media which, together with the right to publish opinions, best indicates the specific and essential ~~preconditions of the self-management way of organizing relations in the communication sphere.~~ At the same time, ensuring the conditions for mass communication activity is also an obligation of the entire social community.

As opposed to private ownership of the means of production in capitalism and state ownership in the (post)capitalist state, social ownership is more loosely determined. Where in the former cases the concrete subject is given and well defined (capitalists, the state), in the latter case, the subject is constantly in the process of formation and very differentiated. Social ownership as the elimination of all kinds of alienation is not a condition but a process.

We can only "measure" social ownership by the degree of elimination of human alienation, by genuine elimination of power over labour. Thus, the elimination of private and state ownership of the means of production constitutes only the first necessary step and not the sufficient condition of the socialization of communication. Social ownership is a necessary and essential, but not the only, condition for the liberation of the communication activity from subordination to entrepreneurial freedom or bureaucratic privilege, and therefore it is a precondition for the development of social communication as man's generic need and capacity. It would be naive to expect that statutory postulating the freedom of communication will alone make possible the elimination of all practical limitations of this freedom, emanating from insufficient economic development, fragmented consciousness, in short, from the actual level of (un)development of production forces and social relations, or that it would be possible to guarantee real freedom with normative voluntarism regardless of practical life and the real (im)possibilities which it contains.

Statutory Regulation of Mass Media Ownership and Operation in Yugoslavia

The Yugoslav departure from the model of state socialism was legalized by the Constitutional Law of 1953. In the legal sense, a break had already begun in 1950 with a basic law on managing economic enterprises and associations by workers' collective. This affirmed

the system of economic democracy as one of the cornerstones of the social and political system. Thus, actual producers received the right to manage social property in the enterprises and workers self-management came into existence. On the basis of the Constitutional Law, alongside state mechanisms (assemblies, people's committees and their executive organs as well as governmental and legal organs), a system of social institutions began to develop which did not execute authority but rather directed, managed and controlled social processes (economic organizations, social organizations, communities, institutes, unions, societies). Decentralization and democratization of state functions and their gradual transfer to economic and social institutions marked the beginning of the realization of self-management socialist democracy with an emphasis not only on economic but also on political self-management of people. Authority and responsibility was transferred from central state organs to economic organizations, local political organs and to different other forms of direct economic and political democracy. Likewise, all former state institutions intended for satisfying common needs were transferred from state management to self-management by direct employees - i.e. cultural, educational, social, health and research institutions and, not least important, also communication organizations.

The Yugoslav communication system experienced radical changes with the transfer of former state functions to economic and social organs of management. Communications activity became more differentiated in content and organized so as to enable the satisfaction and

expression of different interests. With the abolition of state tutorship, communication organizations also became more economically independent (although not all) and often also entered into a competitive position in attempting to gain the audience. This effected a rise in quality in communication production. During that period, as with Yugoslavia as a whole, the Yugoslav communication system also opened up to the international environment.

During that time, the communication system became an essential element of the development of self-management. The development of communication activity widened possibilities for the horizontal and vertical articulation of citizens' needs, opinions and interests as a basis for democratic decision-making. Mass media were to be transformed from transmitters of the centralized state administration into media of mutual mediation of information, ideas, and culture. In order to participate in self-management, in order to equally decide on the conditions and results of their labour, people would have to produce, receive and interiorize information and knowledge. Communication thus became an integral part of the development of new social relations, a necessary basis of self-management. Constitutional principles affirmed by the Constitutional Law on the Fundamental Social and Political Order of Yugoslavia and on the Federal Organs of Government (1953) were also further developed by special communication legislation - in particular by the Basic Law on Newspaper Enterprises and Institutions (1956), by the Law on the Press and Other Forms of Information (1960) and, after the 1963 Constitution, by the Basic Law on Radio Broadcasting Institutions (1965).

Hence, the law of 1960 determined that institutions and organizations concerned with publishing and broadcasting are independent in carrying out their activities and that their management is to be conducted in accordance with the principles of social self-management (Article 5). At least in an organizational sense, this meant the elimination of state monopoly within the communication sphere and the transformation of communication organizations into independent work organizations. Workers in communication organizations received the right of direct management of their working units and indirect decision-making in regard to the overall policy of their organization, by way of workers' councils elected by secret ballot. As with communication organizations in western parliamentary democracies, such organizations in the Yugoslav system also received special economic privileges. In order to affirm broader social interests in editorial policy and to curb particularistic (commercial) interests, media councils were established, ~~whose composition was~~ determined by the statutes of the communication organizations. The councils were not to be transmitters of the founders of the media, since representatives of the founders in the councils were to make decisions together with representatives of the workers in the communication organizations and with representatives of other socio-political, professional etc. organizations which, in accordance with the statute, had the right to nominate representatives.

In contrast to the press, radio and television broadcasting was centrally organized for much longer. This also has clear effects on their present position. In its socio-economic essence - as

elsewhere in the world - the income of Yugoslav radio and television organizations is derived more from budgetary or fiscal sources than those of the market. The administrative determination of radio and television licence fees is possible due to the relatively non-elastic demand (which is similar to the demand for health, educational, social and other services and goods for satisfying common needs) and to the almost monopoly position of central radio and television organizations in the Yugoslav republics. In the system of social management of communication organizations, in which management organs determine social needs without being able to control the conditions for receiving income, the contradiction is preserved between indifference to a given use value - as result of administrative financing or subordination to market laws - and the coordination of the goals of the communication organizations with social needs, independently of the economic sphere.

The task of these organs was primarily to secure a social influence over programme policy, in the production of use values. However the position of dependence of the media on both market laws and planned social orientation became contradictory and this was solved primarily with various forms of subsidies and advertising.

As far as income generation is concerned, the communication organizations do not greatly differ from other work organizations. Their most important sources of income are: (1) sales of products and services on the market, (2) participation in the jointly created income of a number of organizations on the basis of a pooling of

resources and labour, (3) free exchange of labour among communication and other ("users") organizations and communities, and (4) subsidies, donations etc. In addition, the legislation concerning communication organizations foresees two further sources of income which are especially important for the communication activity: (5) radio and television licence fees (which is independently decided upon in each republic), and (6) advertising.

After the constitutional changes in 1971 and 1974, the entire mass communication activity in Yugoslavia became organized according to the principle of self-management (except in cases concerning the specific execution of State tasks, such as the publication of official gazettes). The founders of media organizations, mostly the socio-political organizations, above all the Socialist Alliance, also assumed the responsibility of assuring material, financial and personnel conditions for the operation of the communication organizations. The most important change was introduced in the communication management, in which the social management organ, composed according to the principle of separate delegates of the employees of the communication organizations and delegates of the wider social community, has the dominant role.

Social management organs in the communication organizations became key instruments for fulfilling the social interest in the communication activity. They decide about the draft self-management agreement on association into a work organization and about the draft Statute of the work organization; i.e., about the proposals for

basic self-management enactments which are adopted by the workers of the communication organization by means of a referendum. They also decide on the appointment and recall of the director of the work organization and media editors, except the editor-in-chief and the managing editor, who are appointed and recalled directly by

the founder. The social management organs also decide about programme orientations, concepts and policies of the editorial boards, about important questions concerning the development and status of the communication organization and about the basic conditions for income generation and successful operation (e.g., prices, license fees).

The Yugoslav legislation does not recognise any limitations which could be considered as direct subjecting of the communication activity to the State concerning the founding of different media. The founder adopts the Foundation Act which determines the main objectives and tasks of the media, the concept of the programme, sources and means of financing, forms of representing a special social interest (e.g., composition of the Media Council), and the mutual rights and responsibilities of the founder and the media.

Provision for the wider social interest and for ensuring social influence over the editorial policies of the mass media is implemented through Social Management Organs of communication organizations and Mass Media Councils, whose composition (delegates seats and delegators) is determined by the founder. The members of these bodies are directly accountable to the institution, organization or community which has delegated or appointed them. Among the pre-

privileges of the Council, the most important ones are those concerning questions of editorial policies and the implementation of the programme concept which, like other questions, are a subject of joint decision-making by community delegates and by the self-management body of the communication organization (workers' council) or of a common management body composed of the community delegates and delegates of the communication organization.

The basic content orientation and programme of the media is decided upon by the founder. The latter, together with the council and the management editorial board, is also bound by Law to follow its editorial policy, and to appoint the Editor in Chief and the Managing Editor. If the founder is a communication organization itself, then the two Editors are nominated by the Social Management Organ. The Council of a newspaper, journal, radio or television organization is the key instrument for the ~~fulfillment of the special~~ social interest in the mass media. The composition of the Council is determined by the founder of the media except in the case of papers published by a group of citizens, when the composition of the Council is decided upon by the Assembly of the commune. The Council, which is accountable for its work to the founder, and its members also to the body, organization or community which has nominated or delegated them, has no decision-making power. The Council adopts proposals and recommendations and gives opinions to the founder and the Management Organ of the communication organizations as well as to the editorial board. Because the Council is only a non-professional advisory body, the intensity and quality of their activity

differ greatly from one communication organization to another, concerning the complexity and thoroughness of discussions on questions related to the media contents and programme orientation.

Discrepancies between Statutory Regulations and Media Practice

The statutory regulations for ensuring social influence over the mass media have not yet become fully implemented in practice, especially because of insufficient or non-existent operationalization of normative forms of socialization. In reality, these forms are still rigid and non-operational, so that they tend to limit rather than extend the space for socialization. A number of research results (Mircev, Spasov, Stojanovic, 1980) indicate that social management bodies and media councils have not yet become a form of delegate body, that their members are frequently not delegates of society, nor of users, nor even of the founders, and that the relationship between the media and the founders is usually very limited, even personalized. Social influence is particularly weak on those media which belong, through their programmes, organization and financing to the State, administration, or budget, or if they have (e.g. by means of licence fees) a relatively independent, constant and solid source of revenue such as television. The alienation from the social interest and needs is also strong in those forms of communication which develop as a function of a non-communication basic activity (e.g., in organizations of industrial production) without adequate legal regulations.

Research carried out in November 1981 on a representative sample of 769 radio listeners and 775 TV viewers in Slovenia indicated that citizens have little influence on the programme policies of the Ljubljana Radio and TV Broadcasting Organization. The question "Have you ever tried to influence radio or television programmes?" was answered "No" by 87.6 % respondents, 3.4 % did not answer, while the rest (9 % only) had used the following possibilities: 2.6 % had participated as respondents in opinion surveys about radio and television programmes according to random choice, 2 % had participated in a radio or a television programme, 2 % had participated in meetings discussing radio and/or television programmes, 0.8 % had participated in public discussion on the annual plan of the broadcasting organization, 0.4 % had written letters to the editorial boards, 0.2 % had participated in sessions of delegates assemblies when broadcasting programmes were discussed, 1 % had tried to exercise influence in some other way.

On the other hand, one third (32.7 %) of the respondents believe that broadcasting recipients have enough possibilities of influencing radio and television programmes, but that they do not use these possibilities, and 20.5 % do not have any opinion about this question. It is evident that the two categories (totalling 53.2 %) represent the uninterested, passive recipients (consumers) of radio and television programmes who, in the existing relations, do not have any real interest in influencing these programmes.

Among the more "critical" part of the population, the most numerous are those who see a possibility of increasing their influence over

the programmes in more frequent surveys carried out among listeners and viewers:

15 % are in favour of more opinion surveys,

11.9 % wish more discussions on future-programmes,

4.8 % wish more discussion on programmes already seen, while only

13.8 % feel that radio and television should provide for more frequent direct participation of the citizens in radio and television programmes, and

1.2 % indicate other ways of influencing.

The fact that neither the media nor the social environment act as a motivational factor for people's active participation in mass communication has also been proven by the findings of a research project carried out in 1973 on a representative sample of the population in Macedonia. The sample was asked how they react if they are dissatisfied with the media's programmes. The following answers were received:

41 % express their dissatisfaction among friends only,

38 % do not express their opinions, positive or negative, at all,

9 % stop using the medium in question,

7 % contact one of the socio-political organizations,

2 % only address their comments directly to the media,

3 % did not give any answer.

The most general conclusion, supported by the above findings, would be that the larger part of the population has not yet been sociali-

zed, i.e., really integrated in the mass communication activity.

The dominant form of active communication ("I think therefore I speak"), i.e., communication as an expression of one's life process, remains inter-personal communication. These findings clearly reveal the misconception that the mere beginning of the socialization of the means of production in the communication field could trigger off the real socialization of this activity as a whole.

The representatives of society who should directly articulate the social interest and integrate it into the operation of the communication organizations are aware of the inadequacy of the (new) instruments for the socialization of the communication activity. In an opinion survey among members of 10 Social Management Organs in communication organizations from all republics (Mircev, Spasov, Stojanovic, 1980), the largest influence was ascribed to the founder directly (Socialist Alliance of the Working People) - 33 %, followed by journalists and editors - 26 %, and by the organizations of the League of Communists in the communication organizations - 24 %. Consequently, 83 % of the respondents - members of the social management bodies - are convinced that the articulation, expression and implementation of the "social interest" in the mass communication activity bypasses the legally prescribed key instance of socialization.

According to the respondents, the citizens, as members of the audience of individual mass media, do not have any influence on the programme policies of the media. The following reasons have been identified as the most important ones: (1) material, personnel and

organizational problems - 36 %, (2) insufficient institutional development or inadequate forms and institutions of social influence - 33 %, and (3) bad organization of users and of the society in general - 9 %. This would mean that members of the audience are not organized and have no experience in expressing attitudes and needs as well as not being acquainted with ways of influencing the mass media.

The communication activity remains to a large extent an activity producing services for mass consumption or (re)producing the political power or ideological forms of domination. To change the prevailing relations in the communication field, two things are needed: (1) full recognition of the social character of communication (i.e., production) means by abolishment of all forms of fiscal, parafiscal, or market financing of the communication activity, and (2) creation of preconditions for the abolishment of bureaucratic authority over the mass communication activity by developing methods and mechanisms of democratic decision-making about all essential dimensions of the communication activity, as well as in the field of social superstructure.

The real process of socializing the communication activity depends on the provision of the practical possibility for workers to decide about the distribution of the surplus value which is created by themselves in the production process, with respect to the joint satisfaction of common needs and communication needs in particular. The feasibility of this possibility is in direct relation to the integration of communication into man's production and self-manage-

ment (decision-making) activity and with the degree of direct satisfaction of his actual needs and interests. Socialization can only be carried out as a two-way process: (a) as individual and collective development of communication needs, which are a precondition for the development of the communication activity, and (b) as individual and collective development of a communication activity which satisfies and develops these needs. Or, in other words: socialization of communication can only be achieved by a social man. Alienated labour leads to fragmented consciousness; the fragmented interests and needs (re)produce deformed, alienated communication, so that the entire system of communication becomes a system of coordination of the consciousness with the alienated social relations. As long as an individual has no real interest in the management of communication organizations, since the communication activity is alien to his own life activities, the socialization of communication will remain an illusion. It cannot reach beyond that level of centralization which is a result of contradictions between the old forms of exchange and new ways of production which have been brought about by technological development.

The further process of the socialization of the communication activity which started with the abolition of private property and the introduction of self-management in the first years following the revolution, is fatally dependent on the development of instruments and mechanisms for the direct, active participation of the population in the communication activity, and which would thus promote initiatives of a public nature from below. At the normative level, such possibilities are already provided in all essential

dimensions (activization of the individual in the communication processes, pluralism of opinions in the media and democratic decision-making about the activity and development of mass media and communication organizations). However, in practice, these possibilities are far from being used. In addition to the insufficient economic basis of the communication activity, the basic reason for the discrepancy between what is legally proclaimed and what is actually happening lies in inadequate solutions or insufficient opportunities provided or allowed by the legislation and the self-management acts of the communication organizations and mass media, for the materialization of the freedom of communication. In general, it could be said that much too much of the entire social energy has been used in creating the most perfect and most comprehensive laws and much too little of this energy has been spent in the development of concrete instruments and mechanisms of socialization ~~of the communication-activity.~~

The question is not only how best to fulfill the collectively transmitted social interest in the field of mass communication through social management bodies or how to make these bodies independent and responsible, but also how to use the positive experience of the democratization of mass communication in the development of Western democracies and how to develop new methods of actively integrating the population into the communication processes themselves - not only in their management and control. The opportunities that Yugoslav society provides, in spite of numerous contradictions, concerning the establishment of social property and the development of self-management in the field of mass communication, have remained to a large extent unused.

References:

- Brecht, Bertolt (1983) "Radio as a Means of Communication", in A. Mattelart, S. Siegelau (eds.), Communication and Class Struggle - 2. Liberation, Socialism. New York - Bagnolet: IG, IMMRC.
- Downing, John (1980) The Media Machine. London: Pluto Press.
- Habermas, Jürgen (1969) Javno mnenje (Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit). Beograd: Kultura.
- MacBride Report - Many Voices, One World (1980). Paris: Unesco.
- Masterman, Len (1985) Teaching the Media. London: Comedia.
- Marx, Karl; Engels, Friedrich (1969) Pressefreiheit und Zensur. Wien - Frankfurt: Europäische Verlagsanstalt, Europa Verlag.
- Mills, Wright (1964) Elita vlasti (Power Elite). Beograd: Kultura.
- Mirčev, ~~Đaniro Stanić (1982)~~ Podrštvljavanje informativne delatnosti u samoupravnom društvu. Skopje: Institut za sociološka i pravno-politička istraživanja.
- Williams, Raymond (1976) Communications. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Wright, Charles (1966) Mass Communication. New York: Random House.