

The Mass Media and the Privatization Campaign: A Survey of the Port Harcourt Public in Nigeria

Mbazie, Sunny, PhD

Department of Linguistics & Communications Studies
Faculty of Humanities
University of Port Harcourt
Port Harcourt, Nigeria.

OGBULU, Onyemachi Maxwell, PhD

Department of Banking and Finance
Abia State University
Uturu, Nigeria.

Abstract

This paper is concerned with the role of mass media in the information campaign on privatization. It seeks to determine the extent to which the media are a source of information and can create awareness on privatization as well as the influence the media exert on the public in terms of attitude and participation in the programme. To accomplish these objectives, a survey was conducted on a sample of 1016 of the public in Port Harcourt, using cluster sampling technique. The findings revealed that the media were a greater source of information, created awareness to above-average level and influenced attitude and participation. The study recommends that the government should re-plan and re-strategize on how to employ the media effectively in the subsequent campaign efforts, drawing from the findings of this work.

1.0 Introduction

Mohamradu (2004, p.1) defines privatization as a policy that “entails the sale, disposal, change or transfer of ownership, control of assets and contracts from government to a private investor or a consortium of investors”. Explaining further, he says that it involves a complete handover of certain state-owned enterprises to private firms that have the necessary resources and the managerial skills to meet the enterprises’ objectives. Bala (2004) also states that privatization is the transfer of government interest in public enterprises to private-sector operators, which, according to the international Financial Corporation, should not only be the transfer of ownership, but also substantive independence to the private sector.

Obinna (2001) defines privatization as the change of ownership from the public to private hands. He states that in some instances, it is the transfer of the management of a public firm to private hands, while its ownership remains public. He further explains that it refers to the breaking of public monopoly by allowing private participation and competition. On the transfer of such an ownership, Okenwa (2000, p.12) is of the view that “privatization is the process of changing the ownership of government companies or public enterprises to private ownership through the sale of their share to individuals who will manage the companies efficiently and profitably”. Clarke and Pitelis (1993, p.3) define privatization as “efforts to roll back the frontiers of the state and return to the market forces”.

Privatization could be traced to the emergence of public enterprises in the colonial era. Ake (1981) enumerates five reasons why public enterprises came into existence in Nigeria and the rest of Africa. First, public enterprises were established in pursuance of national needs for industrialization, diversification of the economy, economic growth and the development of productive forces. Second, there was the need for the state to struggle for economic independence. The economy was such that there was absence of indigenous enterprises that could compete with or displace those controlled by foreign capital. Only the state had the might or resources to do so.

Third, the state enterprises were also established to halt the declining of the economy by promoting exports and to realize import substitution. That accounted for state enterprises being given monopoly privileges in vital exports of the economy. The fourth reason was that some of the state enterprises came into being as a result of the indigenization of foreign-owned private enterprise. The indigenization process such that some of those foreign-owned private enterprise metamorphosed into state enterprises instead of private enterprises. The fifth reason was that certain services considered essential to the public interest were better left for the public enterprises or corporations to run and protect.

However, in the early 1980s, the negative effects of state enterprises became pronounced. Inefficiency, corruption, mismanagement and favouritism became the order of the day in the management and administration of the enterprises. Public opinion and media criticism were against them for their inability to perform.

All these resulted in a creeping economic recession. As a consequence, the government of Shehu Shagari through the National Assembly enacted the Economic Stabilization Act of 1982 and the Austerity Measure Programme of 1983 to revamp the economy (Ogbulafor, 2000). Another factor that led to privatization was the introduction of the Structural Adjustment Programme (SAP) in 1986 under the administration of Ibrahim Babangida. Privatization is one of the policies of SAP as directed by the International Monetary Fund (IMF).

Bala (2004) states that the government embarked on the programme by establishing a committee (a Technical Committee on privatization and Commercialization) in July, 1987. It was then backed up with a decree (Privatization and Commercialization Decree of 1990). Bala adds that the committee then fully privatized 88 companies out of the 111 state enterprises.

At the inception of the Olusegun Obasanjo administration, the Public Enterprises Act of 1999 was enacted. The act established the National Council for Privatization (NCP) and the Bureau of Public Enterprises (BPE). The NCP is a policy-making body for privatization and it supervises the BPE, while the BPE is the implementing agency of the policies. Other functions of the BPE, Bala (2004:3) says, include “advising the NCP on public enterprises that may be privatized and the capital restructuring needs of such enterprises”.

The primary objectives in Nigeria, as outlined in the foregoing, include:

- i) To restructure and rationalize the public sector as well as increase private sector participation;
- ii) To improve the performance of public enterprises;
- iii) To reduce dependence on national treasury through the removal of subsidies, grants and other subventions as well as generate revenue, and
- iv) To increase the role the private financial institutions and agencies play in the growth and development of the economy (Bala, 2004)

Having given an overview of privatization in Nigeria, it is imperative to know the role of the media in this laudable and vital effort to revamp the Nigerian economy. Okigbo (1991) observes that every country, whether developed or developing, requires and employs media information at one time or another to mobilize its citizens for development purposes. Unfortunately, most past campaigns on development programmes initiated by the government failed in Nigeria because there was no defined role for the media, and even where it was defined, it was not studied, coordinated and effective.

Nkala (1990) considers these problems responsible for lack of effective publicity or information campaign of some past and present policy and programme implementations. For instance, many information campaigns are executed without research studies. In the case of privatization, Anichebe (2000, p.12) states that:

A coordinated and integrated communication programme has been developed to ensure that the concept of privatization, the processes adopted and the affected enterprises are marketed in such a way that all stakeholders participate effectively in the programme.

Judging from Anichebe's statement, an information campaign has been developed for the privatization of public enterprises. What needs to be principally investigated is the role the media have played. Have they been playing the role effectively? Jensen (2002) states that communication campaigns are of two types: commercial campaigns aimed at promoting a product or service, and social campaigns intended to promote public services. This study falls under the social-campaign category.

Wimmer and Dominick (1994) state that a communication campaign research could be a pretest (measurement before campaign), tracking-test (measurement effects at several points during the progress of the campaign) or a post-test (measuring effects after campaign). This work is a tracking-test study aimed at assessing the role of the mass media and their effects on the urban public about the on-going privatization of public enterprises. It was prompted by the public criticism of the media in not enlightening the public to participate actively in the programme, particularly the PSPLS.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Privatization is a development programme. Many development programmes are accompanied by information campaigns. Okunna (2002, p.297) states that

An information campaign is concerned with providing relevant information aimed at creating awareness and educating a target audience to make it knowledgeable about a development issue or programme.

The crux of the matter in this study is; what role have the media been playing? The mass media have been credited by scholars as a greater source of information, with capacity to create high awareness in information campaigns. Of recent, this view has been challenged by some change agents, scholars or studies.

For sometime now, the World Health Organization (2002) has been attributing more important and effective role to interpersonal media than the mass media in its public health campaigns. It has been encouraging a de-emphasis of the mass media and an emphasis of the interpersonal media in such campaigns. The Bureau of public Enterprises (2003) states that in its information campaign on privatization that it will place an emphasis on seminars, conferences and workshops as privatization is too technical to be properly understood on the pages newspapers or through other mass media. Mpi (2006), in a study on the information campaign on Free Medical Care Programme (FMCP) of the Rivers State Government, surprisingly finds out that a majority of people who are aware of the programme obtained the information from interpersonal media instead of the mass media. Some commercial organizations such as GNL, forever, foremore, etc, have been promoting their products through network selling (interpersonal) instead of advertising (using the mass media) and found the network selling very effective.

From these backdrops, one is impelled to examine the role of the mass media in information campaigns, particularly on the privatization of public enterprises in Nigeria which is an on-going campaign.

Moreover, many information campaigns had been conducted in the past and even at present in various development programmes, ranging from agricultural, political transition, right-hand-drive, environmental sanitation, HIV/AIDS, family planning, census to rural development programmes. Researches conducted on some of these information campaigns showed that the media have either failed or succeeded in enlightening the public on the development programmes.

In view of these, the aim of this paper is to evaluate the role of the media in the information campaign on privatization of public enterprises through the opinion of residents of Port Harcourt.

1.2 Objectives of the Study

This paper seeks to determine the role of the media in the campaign by establishing:

- i) The extent the media are sources of information in the information campaign on privatization;
- ii) The extent the media create awareness on privatization;

- iii) The manner of attitude the media exert on the public towards privatization.
- iv) The extent the media influence public participation in privatization in terms of purchase of shares in privatized public enterprises.

1.3 Research Questions

In order to accomplish the above objectives of the study, the following research questions are raised:

- i) To what extent are the media a source of information to the public in the privatization programme?
- ii) To what extent do the media create awareness on privatization?
- iii) What manner of attitude do the media exert on the public towards privatization?
- iv) To what extent do the media influence public participation in privatization in terms of purchase of shares of privatized public enterprises?

1.4 Hypothesis

The hypothesis below is apt for this study:

- H₁: There is a significant relationship between the direction of media information on privatization and the manner of public attitude towards privatization.
- H₀: There is no significant relationship between the direction of media information on privatization and the manner of public attitude towards privatization.

1.5 Significance of the Paper

Below is the significance of the paper:

- i) It would provide data for change agents particularly the BPE in re-planning their media campaigns.
- ii) It would help to determine the extent of mass media potency as a resource in the privatization campaigns.

2.0 Review and Theoretical Framework

A theoretical framework is important in a paper. It guides the researcher to explain and understand observable phenomena, the objectives, specified variables, patterns of findings and predictions relevant to his field. The theory that is apt to this paper is the **AGENDA SETTING FUNCTION THEORY**.

Larson (1986) posits that the Agenda-Setting Theory is about the kinds of issues people discuss, think worry about, which are determined by what the news media choose to publicize. Wimmer and Dominick (1994, p.353), in explaining the agenda – setting theory, say

This means that if the news media decide to give the most time and space to the budget deficit, this issue will become the most important item on the audience's agenda. If the news media devote the second most time and space to unemployment, audiences too will vote unemployment as the second most important issue to them, and so on.

What they mean is that there is a direct relationship between media priorities and audience priorities in favour of the media in terms of the importance of news topics. Jensen (2002) sums it up when he says that the media do not tell people what opinion to hold but what issue to hold opinion on. McCombs and Shaw (1972), contributing to the discussions much earlier on the theory, observe that members of the audience will not only learn about public issues through the media, they will also learn how much importance to attach to an issue or topic from the emphasis the mass media place upon it.

Furthermore, Okunna (2002, p.21), elucidating on agenda-setting theory, states:

This explains the power of the mass media to set agenda and raise issues of public importance. This function is closely related to public opinion generation, since it is often the mass media that raise issues upon which public opinions is expressed.

Okon (2001), while also contributing to the debate states that the media through selective presentation and emphasis set both political and social agenda for the members of the audience. Shaw and McCombs (1977, p.15) recognize the development tendencies of the theory and say:

Considerable evidence has accumulated that editors and broadcasters play an important part in shaping our social reality as they go about their day-to-day task of choosing and displaying news ... the impact of the mass media, the ability to effect cognitive change among individuals, to structure their thinking has been labeled the agenda-setting function of mass communication. Here may be the most important effect of mass communication – its ability to mentally order and organize our world for us.

The history of Agenda-Setting Theory can be linked to Lippman (1922) who reasons that the media are responsible for the opinions the public hold. Cohen (1963) however expresses the view that the media may not always be successful in influencing people's thoughts, but may be successful in influencing what the people think about. Lang and Lang (1966) write that the media are constantly presenting objects, suggesting what individuals in the mass should think, know, and have feelings about. McCombs and Shaw (1972) conducted the first empirical test of Agenda-Setting on the 1968 Presidential election on a sample of small North Carolina Community in the United States of America. The study establishes that there is a strong relationship between the emphasis placed on different campaign issues by the media and the judgment of voters regarding the importance of various campaign topics.

In conclusion, the Agenda – setting theory posits that the media determine the issues and their importance to the public, which the public worry about and discuss. Therefore, the media emphasis on certain issues in the privatization of public enterprises may likely determine the importance the public may attach to the issues, and the programme.

2.1 Communication and Development

Many scholars are of the view that there is a relationship between communalization and development. Vocal among them is Okunna (2002) who holds the view that communication and development are closely interconnected and that there can be no development without communication. Careful as not to over-generalize, Ekwelie (1999, p.6) remarks that:

We have proof that development and communication can be complementary. We know that communication may fail to generate development. But after making all the allowances for accident in nature and society, we are still left with a paradigm that links communication with development.

Rampal (1983) observes that communication researches conducted in the late 1950s and in the 1960s have much optimism for the positive role the mass media can play in promoting socio-economic development of the Third World. To lend credence to that, Opubor (1986) states that researches conducted about the media as tools for direct social change have found them invaluable in inducing development as a catalyst in the modernization process.

In support of these researches, Okigbo (1995) opines that the mass media have been very active promoting social development in Africa through public enlightenment and general education, and further attributes the attainment of national independence of African countries to them. Moge kwu (1995) also observes that the mass media have for long played roles in bringing about changes in society for good or evil and have been credited for accelerating the rate of development in many parts of the world. McBride et al. (1980) clearly demonstrate the fact that the mass media possess the capacity not only to reflect, but also to shape opinions and play a role in forming attitudes of the public.

Commenting on the importance of communication and development Nwosu (1990, p.17) observes that

...development experiences in other parts of development and less – developed world have continued to point to the fact that communication is central to rural and national development, and that its catalytic effect to the development of other sectors of a nation's economy should never be neglected or underplayed.

Highlighting more on the importance of communication, Lerner (1958) states that a communication system is both index and agent of change in a total system. This means that the state of development and capacity of the communication system in a society can tell and determine the society's rate of socio-economic development. In line with this, Okon (2001, p.137), therefore, says that

Sometimes, the effects exerted on the media by socio-economic variables are the same effect the media exert on the socio-economic subsystems. This is something that could be likened to a chicken and egg process because the continuing flow of information from the media can profoundly influence social change.

To drive home this point, McBride et al. (1980) write that information is now a special kind of economic resource which performs an essential function but which is today, unequally distributed and sadly used. To justify that communication is a resource, McBride et al. (1980, p.23) add:

...Both in its structure and its content, communication intermeshes with, and is dependent on the economy in many ways. A constant flow of information is vital for an economic force with incalculable potentialities.

...It is a decisive factor in development. As an element of increase importance in all national economies, communication represents a growing segment of a country's national product and has direct repercussions on productivity and employment.

From the views of these scholars, it will not be wrong to assume that communication is important in development efforts, such as privatization.

3.0 Research Design

The research design that was employed is survey, using a questionnaire.

3.1 Population

The population of the study consisted of all Nigerians of 18 years and above living in Port Harcourt who require education to at least primary school level. It consisted of people that have different religions, occupations, marital status and sex.

3.2 Sampling Method

The sampling method that was employed is cluster sampling. This type of sampling method is suitable to urban and household survey.

3.3 Sample Size

As Osuala (1982,p.104) suggests, "using a sample that is too small means getting results that are likely to be lacking in validity". Bearing this suggestion in mind, a sample size of 1016 was chosen from a population of 1016000. This represents .001% of the population. It means that in any one thousand adult of 18 years and above; a person is taken as a sample. Nworgu (1984) considers a sample of 1,000 and above substantial for a large population. Therefore, a sample size of 1,016 was considered adequate for this study.

3.4 Method of Data Analysis

The method of data analysis for this study was quantitative. It involved frequency of information provided by the respondents. Simple percentage and tables were used. It also used the chi-square statistical tool to test the hypothesis.

The chi-square formular is presented thus:

$$X^2 = \sum \frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$$

- O = Observed frequency
- E = Expected frequency
- X² = Chi-square

4.0 Thematic Analysis

A total of 1016 copies of the questionnaire were distributed. Out of this number, 904 copies were returned, representing 88.98% response rate. The respondents were asked the sources of their information on privatization (see table one). One hundred and fifty (150) respondents or 16.5% chose TV/Radio, 366 or 4.5% or 40.49% indicated billboards / posters, 66 or 7.30% pointed at handbills, 46 or 5.09% chose internet and 4 or 0.44% and they got from books. Also, 16 or 1.77% respondents got it from group (organizations, seminars, work shops, etc), while 220 or 24.34% got it from individuals such as friends, relatives, etc.

**Table one
Information sources on privatization**

MASS MEDIA			INTERPERSONAL MEDIA				
Source	Frequency	%	Source	Frequency	%		
TV/Radio	150	16.59	Group (organizations, Seminars, exhibition, etc)	16	1.77		
Newspapers/ Magazine	36	40.49					
Billboard/Posters	36	3.98	Individuals	220	24.34	GRAND TOTAL	
Handbills	66	7.30				GRAN	GRAN
Internet	46	5.09				D	D
Book	4	0.44				FREQ.	PERC.
Total	668	73.89	Total	236	26.11	904	100

Research question one

To what extent are the mass media a source of information to the public on the privatization programme?

From table one, the mass media are a source of information on the privatization to 668 or 73.89% respondents while the interpersonal media serve as a source of information to only 236 or 26.11% respondents.

Therefore, the mass media are to the extent of 73.89% a source of information to the respondents.

Research question two

To what extent do the media create awareness on privatization?

Table two
Extent of Media Audiences' Awareness on Privatization

Options	Privatized Enterprises		About-to-be privatized Enterprises		AV. Frequency	AV. Percentage	Extent of Awareness
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage			
Yes	500	74.85	406	60.8	453	67.8	Ab.av.
No	108	16.17	202	30.2	155	23.2	
Uncertain	60	8.98	60	9	60	9	
Total	668	100.00	668	100.00	668	100.00	

Key (Extent of Awareness):

h [High (70 and above)]

ab.av. [above average (60 – 69%)]

av. [average (50 – 59%)]

be.av. [below average (40 – 49%)]

[low (39% and below%)]

To test the extent of awareness, created by the mass media on the public, the respondents were asked whether they knew of any privatized public enterprises. Five hundred (500) respondents or 74.85% said, yes, 108 or 16.17% said, no, while 60 or 8.98% said they were not sure (see table two). Also, to test the extent of awareness of the respondents of about-to-be privatized public enterprises, they were asked whether they knew of any about-to-be privatized public enterprises. Four hundred and six (406) respondents or 60.8% said yes, 202 or 30.2% said, no, while 60 or 9% said, they were not sure (see also table two). The data in table two show that in the average, 453 or 67.8% of the respondents were aware of the privatization, 155 or 23.2% were not while 60 or 9% were unsure. The table also shows that the level of awareness of media audience respondents was above average since the above average of awareness falls between 60 - 69%.

Research question three

What manner of influence do the media have on the attitude of the public towards privatization?

Table three
Manner of influence of the media on the respondents' attitude towards privatization

Attitude	Frequency	Percentage
Negative	596	92.3
Positive	50	7.7
Neutral	-	-
Total	646	100

From table three, the respondents with negative attitude to the programme, influenced by the media constitute 596 or 92.3%. While the respondents with positive attitude to the programme, influenced by the media were 50 or 7.7%. This altogether gives a total of 646 who had agreed earlier that the media influenced their interest on privatization while 12 disagreed and 10 were uncertain.

Therefore, a majority of the respondents show negative attitude towards privatization as a result of negative media publicity.

Research Question four

To what extent do the media influence public participation in terms of purchase of shares of privatized public enterprises?

Table four
Influence of media information on the purchase of shares of Privatized Public Enterprises.

Options	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	108	75
No	16	11.1
Uncertain	20	13.9
Total	144	100

The data in table four show that 108 or 75% of the respondents were influenced to purchase shares from the privatized enterprises by the media, 16 or 11.1% of the respondents were not influenced by the media in their purchase of shares of privatized public enterprises while 13.9% were not sure what type of information influenced their purchase of shares. This altogether gives a total of 144 respondents who had earlier admitted that they bought shares from the privatized public enterprises while 500 did not buy shares; 24 were unsure.

Therefore, a majority of the respondents who purchased shares from the privatized public enterprises were influenced by the media.

Test of Hypothesis

H_{01} : There is no significant relationship between the direction of media information on privatization and the manner of attitude of the public towards privatization.

Table Five
Direction of media information on privatization

Options	Frequency	Percentage
Positive	180	26.95
Negative	488	73.05
Neutral	-	-
Total	668	100

The respondents' opinion on the direction of media publicity in privatization was sought. From the table above, one hundred and eighty (180) respondents or 26.95% believed it was positive; 488 or 73.05% believed it was negative, while none was uncertain. Therefore, a majority of the respondents believed that the direction of media publicity was negative.

Table 6

Chi-square analysis of direction of media information on privatization and the attitude of the public toward privatization

Variables	Positive	Negative	Total (Row)
Direction	180	488	668
Attitude	50	596	646
Total (Col)	230	1084	1314

The Chi-square is defined as:

$$X^2 = \sum \frac{(O - E)^2}{E}$$

O = Observed frequency

E = Expected frequency

X^2 = Chi-Square = 83.96

The calculated X^2 value (83.96) is greater than the critical value (3.841) at $df = 1$ and at .05 level of significance. The null hypothesis is therefore, rejected (not accepted). The result is that there is a significant relationship between the direction of media information on privatization and the manner of influence of the media on the attitude of the public towards privatization.

4.1 Discussion of Findings

The findings of this study produced in some cases startling revelations and in some confirmed the existing theories and opinions in communication studies. We shall examine and discuss the findings one after the other.

i) The mass media were a greater source of information on privatization to the Port Harcourt public than the interpersonal media.

This agrees with Schramm (1964), which states that the mass media can contribute substantially to the amount and kinds of information available to the people of a developing country. The shift from the stated backdrops in the statement of problem may be as a result of situational factors such nature of the development programme, information content, channel selection and scheduling strategy, unpredictable attitude and behaviour of the public towards a programme and the type of target audience among others.

ii) The extent of awareness the mass media created on Privatization to the Port Harcourt public was above average.

This finding provided the opportunity of determining the level of awareness on privatization among the mass media audience in an urban setting as Port Harcourt. The aim is to determine progress made in the information campaign on privatization. The finding which revealed that the level of awareness was above average, agrees with the view of Nwosu (1990) who states that the mass media in Nigeria are still very much an urban phenomenon. This means that the mass media are likely to make significant impact on the urban areas. The ability of the mass media from the finding of this study to attain above average in the level of awareness would not be of surprise, as Okunna (2002) is of the view that the creation of awareness is one function the media perform efficiently without mediation.

iii) The mass media helped in influencing negative attitude of the Port Harcourt public towards privatization.

The nature of media information accounted for the negative attitude of the public towards privatization in terms of many people not always paying attention or showing interest in it as revealed in this study. The public saw the information in the media on privatization as being negative, critical and condemning. It was also seen by the public as unexciting, unappealing and laddened with statistics. It, therefore, was not surprising that media information influenced the public's negative attitude to the campaign.

iv) The mass media helped in influencing the Port Harcourt public's participation in privatization in terms of purchase of shares of privatized public enterprises.

This finding established that media information influenced the respondents' purchase of shares in the privatized public enterprises. This finding is in contrast to the views of many scholars as expressed in Okunna (2002, pl.283) that "the mass media are not able on their own; to cause behaviour changes in one way or the other". Okunna states that:

It is not that they (mass media) do not contribute in any way; they efforts put into ensuring attitude and value change is more effectively done through interpersonal communication. It is people who change people, even though the mass media provide the facts and figures to make the effort less arduous.

The findings that media information influenced audience attitude to the campaign and the purchase of shares of privatized public enterprises have lent credence to studies conducted by some scholars, which reveal that the theory of the powerful media has been rediscovered. These studies singled out the arrival of television with its popularity and appeal, in 1950s and 60s as being responsible. Prominent among the scholars are Noelle – Neumann (1973), Lang and Lang (1981) and McQuail (1987). Perhaps, a further study on which medium is most responsible to the influence can douse any agitation on this finding.

v) There is a significant relationship between the direction of media information on privatization and the attitude of the public towards privatization.

This study proved this hypothesis. It means that if the information on privatization in the media is generally negative, the public will have negative attitude to privatization and if it is generally positive the public will have positive attitude to privatization. This study revealed that the direction of media information on privatization is negative and that the attitude of the public towards it is negative. It also revealed that media information influenced such negative attitude.

The validation of this hypothesis has therefore, provided a causal factor responsible for the negative attitude of the Port Harcourt Public towards privatization. This is a new finding and a contribution to knowledge. The implication of this finding is that the direction of media information on a subject or programme, determines the audience attitude towards the subject or programme.

5.0 Conclusion

In a nutshell, the role of mass media in the information campaign on privatization is that of being: a greater source of information; creating of awareness on privatization to an above average extent; influencing the attitude of the public towards the programme, and attracting its participation through influencing the purchase of shares of privatized public enterprises. The role of the media includes shaping the attitude of the public towards privatization by the direction of their publicity. The implication is that if the information in the media is negative to a programme, the attitude of the public will be negative, vice versa.

5.1 Recommendations

The findings of this study have necessitated these recommendations below:

- 1) The Bureau of Public Enterprises (BPE) should coordinate, enhance and supply information to the media for interpretation to the public to increase awareness of privatization as against BPE's erroneous view that interpersonal media are of much importance to the public than the mass media;
- 2) The interpersonal media such as seminars, conferences, workshops and religious, association, professional and club meetings, etc, should be encouraged by the BPE and the government as they are underutilized in media information campaign on privatization.
- 3) Media information on privatization should be favourably and properly packaged, creatively written and spiced with humour and colourful prose so as to generate interest and appeal to the public.

References

- Ake, C. (1981). *A political Economy of Africa*. Essex: Longman Group
- Anichebe, C. (2000, June 26). Privatization: All you need to know. *The Tide*, p. 20.
- Bala, J. (2004, February). Privatization of Public Enterprises in Nigeria: The Journey So Far. Paper presented at a workshop on Privatization of Public Enterprises, held at Civic Centre, Port Harcourt. 15th
- Clarke, T. and Pitelis, C. (1993). *The Political Economy of Privatization*. London: Routledge.
- Ekwelie, S. A. (1999, March). Development Communication: Capacity Building. A paper presented at a seminar on Development Communication in Nigeria: Challenges of the Millennium, organized by PTF Zone II in Enugu, 16th.
- Lang, G. and Lang, K. (1981). Mass Communication and Public Opinion: Strategies for Research. In M. Rosenberg and R.H. Turner (Eds.). *Social Psychology: Sociological Perspectives (62 – 71)*. New York: Basic Books.
- Larson, C. U. (1986). *Persuasion* (4th ed.). Belmont, C.A.: Wadsworth.
- Lerner, D. (1958). *The Passing of Traditional Society*. New York: Macmillan.
- McCombs, M. and Shaw, D. (1972). The Agenda setting Function of Mass Media. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 36 (2), 176 – 187.
- McQuail, D. (1987). *Mass Communication Theory: An Introduction*. (2nd ed.). Beverly Hills, C.A.: Sage Publications.
- Merrill, J.C. (1974). *The Imperative of Freedom*. New York: Hastings Houses Publishers.
- Mogekwu, M. (1995). The Mass Media and Sustenance of Rural Development. In C. Okigbo, (Eds.). *Media and Sustainable development (33 – 35)*. Nairobi: Media Congress.
- Mohammadu, S. N. (2004, February). Privatization of Public enterprises: common Areas of concern. A paper presented at a workshop on Privatization, held at the Civic Centre, Port Harcourt, 4th.
- Mpi, Godwin (2006). Information Campaign on the Free Medical Health Care Programme of Rivers State Government. *Project Work. International Institute of Journalism. Unpublished*.
- Nkala, N.O. (1990). Traditional Channels of Communication and Rural Development Policy Implementation: The Neglected Symbiotic Relationship. In I. Nwosu, (Eds.) *Mass communication and National Development Perspective on the Communication: Environments of Development in Nigeria (33 – 53)*. Aba: Frontier Publishers.
- Noelle – Neumann, E. (1973). Return to the concept of Powerful Mass Media, *Studies of Broadcasting*, 9, 66 – 112.
- Nwosu, I. E. (Ed) (1990). *Mass Communication and National Development: Perspectives on the Communication Environments of Development in Nigeria*. Aba: Frontier Publishers.
- Obinna, J. (2001, December 20). Revisiting the Privatization Option. *The Tide*, p.11
- Okigbo, C. (1991). Is Development Communication a Dead Issue? *Media Development*, 32(7), 23 – 25.
- Okigbo, C. (1995). Media and Sustainable Development. In Okigbo, C. (ed.) *Media and Sustainable Development (5-19)*. Nairobi; Media Congress.
- Okon, G.B. (2001). *Basic Dimensions in Mass Communication*. Lagos: HDX Communications.
- Okunna, C. S. (20002). *Teaching Mass communication: A Multi-dimensional Approach*. Enugu: New Generation Books.
- Opubor, A.E. (1986). Mass Communication and Modern Development in Nigeria. In O. E. Onwuneli, Enugu: fourth Dimension Publishers.
- Osuala, E. C. (1982). *Introduction to Research Methodology*. Onitsha: African-Fep Publishers.
- Rampal, K. R. (1983). Mass Media role in the Third World. In J. L. Martin H. A. Claude (Eds.). *Comparative Mass Media System (85-98)*. New York: Longmans.
- WHO (2002). *Health issues in the World*. Abuja: Federal Ministry of Health, Publications Unit.
- Wimmer, R.D. and Dominick, J.R. (1994). *Mass Media Research: An Introduction*. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing company.