

Thailand's Community TV Financing Models: What They Mean in Practice

Phattar Burarak^a, ^aNew Media Communication Department, University of Phayao, Thailand, Email: phattar.bu@up.ac.th

The objective of this research is to study the sources of income, financing models, and community-based fundraising approaches adopted by community TVs in Thailand, which operate amid challenging circumstances, such as the struggle to obtain a community broadcasting service license and financial management; both of which will guarantee a survival of community TVs. This research uses qualitative methods, including in-depth interview, observation, and document analysis to examine three community TV prototypes in Thailand. The results show that it is plausible that community TVs are able to take steps to earn income via community fundraising activities or direct financial support from communities; in fact, these have already happened. It also finds that there are two financing models adopted by community TV prototypes: 1) the single source of income model and 2) the mixed sources of income model. They differ because of different fundraising approaches used by each community TV operator. Financing models significantly affect the sustainability of community TVs' operations.

Key words: *Community TV, Financing model, Community service broadcasting media, Community media, Fundraising.*

Significance of Community Television

Community media is a concept based on the public philosophy reflecting a democratic society that wishes its citizens to be strengthened and able to express themselves through community media they own and manage (Rennie, 2016, p. 21 and Thomas, 2016, p.40). Community media was created to liberate the minority, people who have been oppressed, or people who are facing injustice in society (Internews, 2009 pp.7-9). Its unique features are presented in language, identity, and culture centred on the unique characteristics of the



community. Generally, community TVs operate as a non-profit organisation, emphasise localisation, have stations within community areas, encourage people to learn and participate in a democratic learning process, promote reconciliation and engagement among community members and connect the community with the broader societal context. Therefore, most contents aim at raising public awareness for local citizens (Carpentier, 2011 pp. 96-97). According to the concept, community media plays a crucial role in the modern political world and raises awareness of ordinary people who want to tell their stories to the public, especially during the transitioning period from analogue communication technology to digital .

Unfortunately, community media still faces challenges relating to resource constraints, media control schemes, and governments' negligence (Burarak, 2015, Benton foundation, 2007, Rennie, 2006 and Zhang, 2006). This is in line with the findings of a UNESCO study on laws related to community media in 17 countries (UNESCO, 2008). Only one country has granted community broadcasting licenses, while the rest have no legislative schemes in place. In the cases where community TVs are legalised, most legislations are parts of general conditions for the broadcasting business to operate in local communities and disseminate community-related programs.

Specific requirements in the laws conversely deprive community TVs' rights and exclude them from the normal frequency broadcasting system which has forced them to alternatively go online (Bingmann, 2014).

The television system in Thailand was digitised in 2015. Three types of licenses include 24 commercial channels (nine of them were terminated), 12 public channels (only four licenses granted), and 12 community service channels (no licenses granted). All of them are under the supervision of the National Broadcasting and Telecommunications Commission (NBTC). The committee has to allocate frequencies, issue business licenses, and supervise the broadcasting business, television business, radio communication business, and telecommunication business.

Throughout the seven years that this author has studied community TVs in Thailand, their sources of income and financial management models have often been questioned by regulators and society. These questions reflect the distrust regulators and the general public have against community-based organisations, which results in the hesitation to grant frequency access or let the high-value digital TV system fall in the hands of ordinary people. The community sector taking part in Thailand's broadcasting system is unprecedented and unfamiliar. Moreover, it is often seen as a penetrating step; particularly in the television broadcasting industry, which has always been monopolised by commercial media with advertising and profit-making activities – the only model of TV broadcasting operations that have financially survived over the course of 74 years since the emergence of television in

Thailand (Sitthirak, 2000) and 57 years since TV broadcasting reached people in the provincial areas of Thailand (Burarak, 2010).

According to the NBTC announcement on guidelines and procedures for broadcasting or television services B.E. 2555 (2012), community TVs with community service licenses are permitted to earn income from donations, subsidies, or other non-advertisement means. These financing models should not influence or interfere with the public administration. The guidelines also require that the names of their donors or subsidisers; either individuals or organisations, be clearly specified and announced apart from their program contents. Their contents must not contain any features associated with the commercial promotion and the revenue subsidised by the Broadcasting and Telecommunications Research and Development Fund for the Public Interest (BTFP). Nevertheless, up until now (2020), the BTFP has not yet established guidelines and models for subsidising community TVs.

Thus, it is important to examine how community TVs operating without a license currently finance themselves, what sources their incomes are derived from, and which approaches are used to raise them. The revenue donated by communities is especially interesting, because such locally-based sources of income are a genuine reflection of community TV philosophy, following the guidelines of the NBTC emphasising that community media must serve communities' purposes, be operated by communities, and belong to communities (Digital Broadcasting Bureau office of NBTC, 2018).

This research article aims to examine what sources of income the community TVs in Thailand rely on, whether or not they mainly generate income through a financial contribution from communities they serve, and how. The objectives of this study are to describe the sources of income and financing models among targeted community TVs and to examine specifically how they attract the community's financial contribution to their operations. Three community TV prototypes in the Developing Thailand's Community TV Prototypes Project funded by the BTFP are studied under three research questions: What are the community TVs' sources of income, what are their financing models, and how do they earn income from the community they serve?

Community TV Concepts

The concept of community broadcasting media; either community radio or community television, is based on the public philosophy and plays an important role in the modern political world (Rennie, 2006 and Thomas, 2016, p.40). Community media emerges alongside an increasing awareness among ordinary people wanting to access communication means and tell their stories to the public.



Its programs are centred on communities' language, identity, and culture, and focus on raising public awareness for citizens and developing a democratic society (Carpentier, 2011, pp. 96-97, Rodriquez, 2001). Community media, as opposed to the mainstream commercial media, mainly operates to drive community development and changes. Its contents and operational processes differ from the mainstream media, because they rather aim at accommodating communication access, use, and participation for people in the community (Burarak, 2015). Community media responds to the demand for liberation among minorities or people who have been oppressed or suffer inequalities persisting in society (Internews, 2009, pp. 7-9). Programs are diversified to cover various areas of society, culture, life, and religions (Fuller, 2007). Its administrative structure reflects the democratic environment of the society, for instance, recruiting station's management committee members from both station staff and audiences in the service community or operating voluntarily as a means to engage community members in the management of community TVs, rather than just a way to cut costs. Community media is essentially not for profit; hence, it relies on various sources of income to keep donors or subsidisers at arm's length and avoid depending on a specific source of funds. It may opt for a crowdfunding model such as membership fees or advertisements (Rennie, 2006, p.3). Regarding distribution channels, community media can serve only community areas which by definition may refer to both physical communities and interest-based communities via both offline and online channels. Physical communities are a focal point for nurturing a sense of community and weaving the relationships among people from both online and offline worlds (Robinson, 2014 p.117).

Thailand's Community TV Prototypes

Referring to the NBTC, community TVs service areas are divided by terrestrial digital television antennas into 39 zones covering 77 provinces of Thailand. Each zone can grant no more than 12 community service television licenses according to the Act on Organisation to Assign Radio Frequency and to Regulate Broadcasting and Telecommunications Services B.E. 2553 (2010) that require no less than 20 percent of spectrum be allocated to the public sector. However, the guidelines for granting licenses for community service television have not been issued. The NBTC commissioned a research project to experiment with three community TV prototypes; namely Phayao TV (Phayao Province in the North of Thailand), Ubon Ratchathani Community TV (Ubon Ratchathani Province in the Northeast of Thailand), and Andaman Community TV (covering 3 provinces: Krabi, Phang Nga, and Phuket in the southern region of Thailand) from 2017 to 2019, but during the two years of the pilot project these community TV prototypes were not allowed to broadcast on the radio frequency, so they had to operate on local cable channels and social media instead.

Phayao TV was founded by a group of people interested in media who came together for community communication work. Phayao Community TV was established and has operated



since 2014. In 2016, it was registered as a juristic person in the name of Phayao Community Media Association broadcasting through online channels. The station is located in the former school building owned by Buddhist University, located within a provincial temple in the municipality of Phayao Province.

Ubon Ratchathani Community TV was initiated by a local media group in Ubon Ratchathani Province. It operates under a juristic person named “Media for Happiness Foundation”, and went public as Ubon Ratchathani Community TV in online platforms in early 2017. Local cable TVs are its primary broadcasting channel, while social media platforms are the secondary ones. Its station is inside a commercial building where the Media for Happiness Foundation is situated.

Andaman Community TV was initiated by core team members of civil society groups and academics in three southern provinces including Phang Nga, Krabi, and Phuket. The group gathered on behalf of Andaman Community TV to file a funding application for a community service television project from the BTFP under the Raks Thai Foundation; a juristic person which has been carrying out environmental activities in the community. Andaman Community TV uses online platforms to distribute all of its programs. Currently, the substations are operated in the three mentioned provinces. Wh the station in Krabi is located at the commercial building of Raks Thai Foundation, the other two are located on private premises.

Sources of Income in the Community Broadcasting Business

The income of the community service broadcasting media in other countries is derived from various sources; including tax revenues from government agencies, advertising activities and direct support from the private sector, and financial contribution from local communities. While the private sector is a major source of income for community media, revenues from the state agencies play an important role in their sustainability and development in the long run (UNESCO, 2019). License fees and parts of income collected from commercial licensees by government agencies or regulatory agencies become revenues for community media. For instance, community media in France is funded by tax revenues derived from commercial media advertisements through a regulatory agency in the Ministry of Culture and Communications. It determines that the agency provides subsidies for community media in many forms, such as funding for newly established stations or funds for the procurement and development of durable goods. Like France, in Germany, some of community TV's incomes come from the collection of license fees, receiver tax, and other sources such as donations and advertising revenue. However, the advertising revenue must not exceed 20 per cent of the station's total income. Similar to Germany, the advertising revenue of community TVs in the Netherlands should not exceed 15 percent of the broadcasting time and no more than 12



minutes per hour. Community media in Iceland, Spain, and Switzerland are subsidised by government agencies with funding derived from receiver tax and local government budgets. These countries allow community media to earn income from membership fees, donations, fundraising, advertising, and volunteers (not only monetary contribution but can also be contributed in the form of labour or time). In the United States, community media relies on three sources of income, including local institutions, audiences, and local businesses, but earning advertising revenue or receiving any federal funding is prohibited (Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission, 2009). In the United Kingdom, sources of income for community media consist of 1) funds provided by a regulatory agency (Ofcom) which can only be spent on station management, community access, and volunteer management, rather than program production costs and the station rental costs, 2) sponsors, 3) advertisements, 4) individual donations and 5) membership contributions. Each source of income should not exceed 50 percent of the station's total income (Ofcom, 2018).

For community TVs, accessing the governmental source of income is constrained by the competitive funding model. In the funding application process, community TVs have to compete with applicants from commercial broadcasting media or independent producers which eventually impedes the community TVs' access to government funding schemes. Unlike commercial media, community media's philosophy and practices incapacitate them to successfully compete in such circumstances (Haworth, 2013, pp. 17-18, cited in Gordon, 2016, p. 35 and Fuller, 2007). Furthermore, the amount of government funding for community broadcasting media tends to be reduced. For example, in the case of the United States of America, the Federal Communications Commission has continuously reduced the proportion of funding for community cable television to the extent which affects the community TVs' survival (Rosen, 2019 and Hersch, 2014). Meanwhile, community media in South Africa relies solely on government funding for both their establishment and operation. Such dependency puts them at risk because government funding always lacks certainty and continuity. Consequently, South African community media demand that the government establishes a representative agency or a funding agency which is able to raise funds for community TV subsidies. It is suggested that such funds should derive from tax revenues paid by commercial licensees (Naidoo, 2005). In this instance, it is clear that depending on a single source of income will not guarantee the sustainability of community TVs; thus, the government should not prevent community media from earning advertising revenue. Although community media are less likely to generate a large amount of advertising revenue from the private sector, entirely prohibiting commercial income or advertising revenue from their possible source of income may cause financial problems for them in the long run. However, regardless of how many sources of income the community media receive, they should provide financial reports to the community in order to demonstrate the transparency and credibility in their operations (UNESCO, 2019 and Gordon, 2016). Therefore, community entrepreneurs should take their financial management seriously, even though

community media is established under the concept of being non-profit (Gordon, 2016).

This research uses the seven types of sources of income presented by Gordon (2016, p.30) as its analytical framework: 1) *Station's own community* in the media service area. It comes in the forms of advertising sales, sponsorships, volunteers, audience, monetary donations, and other forms, as well as membership subscription fees or fundraising activities. 2) *Patronage from a larger organisation*. This source is sponsored by large or specialised organisations including universities, libraries, or various religious organisations such as churches, temples, etc. 3) *Commercial advertising and sponsorship*. It includes revenues from advertising sales and commercial sponsors. They may contribute very little to the community media's revenue stream, and some community media managers still view these revenues as opposed to the principles of community media. 4) *Service contracts*. This source includes revenues from public service announcements or services for public institutions, rental fees for equipment and tools owned by the station, program production service, etc. 5) *Competitive grants* provided by large organisations. Community media will have opportunities to propose projects or activities that are consistent with the objectives of the funding agencies by competing with other applicants. This source of income is crucial in the setting up process of a community media organisation, but its discontinuity is a major constraint. 6) *Supported by NGOs*. This source is contributed by non-governmental organisations which eventually incurs financial constraints for community media. Rather than focusing on the sustainability of community media, these funding organisations often have specific agendas or issues that they need to promote and advocate. In this instance, community media would mostly close down after the end of the project. 7) *Supported by governmental agencies*. The subsidy scheme is in accordance with legal requirements or regulations of the broadcasting system of each country. A regulatory agency is responsible for determining criteria and guidelines.

The agency's revenues are mostly derived from a portion of household receiver tax revenue, another portion of commercial media's revenues, or a portion of license fees paid by commercial media. For community TVs in Thailand, the NBTC determines that sources of income for community service television be limited to; 1) subsidies from the BTFP as well as 2) donations and subsidies from any sources other than advertising revenues or commercial sponsorship or sources which may influence and interfere with the public administration. Therefore, it can be concluded that community TVs in Thailand must depend on the regulatory agency and their own community for their sources of income. The latter source involves some criticism, as it is uncertain to which extent local communities are capable of providing financial support to community TVs, especially in the context of a small and rural community.

Is financial support more limited in rural communities than urban communities with higher economic growth? Therefore, relevant agencies should consider the unique characteristics of

each community area. For instance, the subsidies may be proportionally allocated according to the populations and rate of urbanisation, therefore, community TVs in rural communities will be subsidised with a higher proportion accordingly (UNESCO, 2008 and Naidoo, 2005). In the meantime, such regulatory agencies should come up with measures to reduce costs by inventing a resource sharing system joined by community TVs to share expenditures, infrastructures, and production facilities as well as equipment used in the studios and programs (ITU, 2016).

Studying community TVs' financing models as well as their approaches of gaining financial support from their own communities is a necessary step in tackling challenges faced by community TV operators, especially in Thailand, where community TVs are still in the nascent stage and do not yet have a legal status despite having been operating in local communities already. These issues are all new and interesting for any empirical studies related to Thai broadcasting media. Untangling such complex issues is the goal of this article.

Methodology

This research uses qualitative methodology. Data collection methods include in-depth interviews, focus group discussions with station directors and the core team of each community TV station, and participatory observation conducted between September 1, 2016, and June 15, 2019. The analytical framework adopts Gordon's (2006) work on community media's sources of income. The research team conducted in-depth interviews with key persons and support networks of the three community TVs. A total of 16 people, as well as three regulators, were interviewed using semi-structured questions designed according to the community media concept. Interview sessions were arranged outside the work-related context in order to avoid interrupting the interviewees with organisational circumstances or other people. Four focus group sessions with core groups of the three community TV networks were conducted. These sessions were jointly arranged by researchers and community TV staff to create a friendly and comfortable setting for participants. As for participatory observation in each community TV operating area, the researchers have key issues listed in advance and then opt for note-taking, photographing, and video recordings instead of audio recordings. The schedule of participatory observation was mutually set by the research team and community TV teams. Participating in the activities and operation of each community TV, researchers are not seen as strangers, because community TV workers and researchers are familiar and have good relationships. Therefore, it reduced the chances of incurring an uncomfortable environment in the data collection process. Regarding non-participatory observation, researchers and research assistants observed the programs and activities disseminated via social media by each community TV and also participated in brainstorming sessions and workshops of all three community TVs for a total of 11 times. The observation

focuses on key issues related to community TVs' fundraising or financing models. In addition, researchers took part in the usual television operation of Ubon Ratchathani Community TV and Andaman Community TV; spending no more than one week each time, eight times on each Community TV. The observation at Phayao TV was done more often because the station is situated in the province where the researchers reside, and thus was more convenient to visit.

Results

Sources of Income of Community TVs

Analysing sources of income of the three community TV networks was based on Gordon (2016) in both setting up and ongoing periods, the results show that Phayao TV and Andaman Community TV in the setting up period initially generated income from individual contributions of core team members. Phayao TV was founded and operated two years prior to entering a governmental funding program, which aims to develop community TV prototypes in Thailand. Likewise, Andaman Community TV was established less than six months earlier than the commencement of the funding program. However, it was found that in both cases individual financial contribution decreased after the NBTC granted the said funds to them. Meanwhile, starting earlier as local media, the Ubon Ratchathani Community TV team only commenced as a TV channel in Ubon Ratchathani communities after requesting funding from the R & D Fund. Thus, it has spent such governmental funds during the ongoing period. Phayao TV earns income from other sources, especially community-based sources of income, which help it to diversify and mitigate the influence of external funding agencies, even though its current operations mainly are funded by external agencies. On the contrary, the Andaman Community TV and the Ubon Ratchathani Community TV rely on funding from government agencies or the R & D Fund only. See the following table.

Table 1: Financial Sources of CTVs in Two Periods (Based on Gordon's 2016)

Financial sources	Andaman Community TV		Phayao Community TV		Ubon Community TV	
	Setting up	Ongoing	Setting up	Ongoing	Setting up	Ongoing
Outside community						
Competitive grants from the regulatory agency (NBTC)	√	-*	-	√	√	-
Competitive grants	-	-	-	√	-	-*
NGOs	-	-	√	√	-	-
Inside community						
Station's own community donation	-	-	-	√	-	-
Patronage form larger organisations	-	-	-	√	-	-
Service contracts	-	-	-	√	-	-
Individual contribution from core team/group	√	-	√	-	-	-
Commercial advertising and sponsorship	-	-	-	-	-	-

*Funding covers a period of two years from 2017 to 2019.

According to the data, it can be seen that the competitive grants from external funding agencies are essentially the main source of income that community TV organisations need for their operation and management, including organisational management, program production, and communicative empowerment activities for communities.

Meanwhile, income derived within communities and income from outsiders such as non-governmental organisations and private businesses appear to stream in during the operational phase, which occurred only in the case of Phayao TV. However, there is no evidence of income derived from commercial advertising because it is against the principles and rules determined by the regulators. Moreover, the data shows that two financing models of community TVs are the single source of income model (Ubon Ratchathani Community TV and Andaman Community TV) and the mixed sources of income model (Phayao TV). Interviews' insights revealed that the two Community TVs, rely on a single source of income, lack of capacity, and readiness to fundraise especially income from the stations' own communities. This is due to the lack of confidence their own communities have towards the worthiness of community TVs and that both Community TVs' managers are not certain if community-based sources of income will provide sufficient funds for their operation (Prasan

Sathansathit, Interview, 21 February 2019 and Suchai Chareonmukhayananth, Interview, 17 July 2019).

On the contrary, Phayao TV realises that outside sources of income; although enabling its organisation to manage and operate, often come with conditions that may affect community TVs' purposes and characteristics. They furthermore impose restrictions on disbursement and accounting systems. He proposed that the regulatory agency should comply with the laws by continuously allocating direct subsidies for community TVs, instead of having them annually compete with commercial applicants. In addition, community TVs can and should obtain support from their own communities through community fundraising activities. However, this depends on the extent to which the community TV organisations can gain trust and faith from people in their communities. If communities perceive community TVs as a trustworthy organisation, the community fundraising approach is then highly possible (Chaiwat Chantima, Interview, 13 October 2016).

Community Fundraising Approach by Community TVs

The community fundraising approach of three community TVs has both similarities and differences. Considering the Phayao TV's financing model as a baseline, the study found that all three community TVs were similar in the aspects of being a community media which encourages community participation in the programs through live broadcasting of community activities or events, adopting community media production process, promoting community members as the program hosts, operating based on the idea that community members be of a content producer and TV operators be of a content curator (user-generated content), and conducting workshops on media production skills for people in the community. Unlike the two Community TVs with a single financing model, what enables Phayao TV to earn income from their own community and use the mixed source of income model is the trust-building approach adopted in its operation which includes; 1) opening its physical space as a community space for media education, 2) encouraging the community's own programs and production, and 3) creating community engagement activities such as organising community forums that meet the community's needs, social responsibility activities, and community training activities. Organising community forums to discuss controversial issues in the community is one of many ways for the Phayao TV to build relationships with their communities in addition to its program production and distribution. Furthermore, transforming the station's physical space into a public space has created a sense of belonging to the community and thus resulted in constant interaction and social exchange among community members without any sense of alienation or inferiority. For instance, Phayao TV has opened a community media school and provided meeting rooms or recording facilities for community programs. This increased awareness, access and sense of ownership among community members differs from the other two community TVs, whose stations are located

on private premises. Since space sharing to the public is not allowed, people lack the sense of ownership of the two Community TVs. The interesting and challenging issue is the fact that Phayao TV can gain community support by openly arranging community fundraising activities in their own community. See details in Table 2.

Table 2: Community TVs' Approaches to Create Values and Faith in the Perspectives of People in their Communities

Approaches	Andaman Community TV	Phayao Community TV	Ubon Community TV
1. Define and design a TV organisational structure which accommodates participation of people in the community	-	√	√
2. Create and specify details of concrete participatory measures	-	√	√
3. Create activities which connect community TVs with communities			
3.1 Live broadcasting for community activities or events	√	√	√
3.2 Community forums that meet the community's needs	-	√	-
3.3 Community fundraising activities for community TVs	-	√	-
3.4 Social responsibility activities	-	√	-
3.5 Community training activities	-	√	-
3.6 Media production workshops	√	√	√
4. Adopt community media production processes	√	√	√
5. Transform the station's physical space to public learning space for communities	-	√	-
6. Adopt user generated contents	√	√	√
7. Establish substations in order to get acquainted with the community	√	√	
8. Community members as owners, producers, and hosts of community TV programs	-	√	-
9. Community members perform hosting of programs which are produced by TV operators	√	√	√

Approaches	Andaman Community TV	Phayao Community TV	Ubon Community TV
10. Community members to appear in community TV programs	√	√	√

Discussion and Conclusion

The study of sources of income for three community TVs in Thailand shows that their mainstream funds derive from competitive grants provided by the regulatory agency which is an outsider organisation. Nevertheless, Thailand's national funding models differ from other cases in foreign countries, since its criteria are very generic, open and the fund is discontinuous. Although the laws determine that community TVs will receive subsidies under the regulatory agency, there is no tangible enforcement accordingly. Consequently, community TVs in Thailand have to operate under discontinuous and uncertain sources of income. As for other sources of income from both inside and outside communities, the study found that among three community prototypes, only Phayao TV has mixed sources of income which primarily derive from competitive funding programs subsidised by the regulatory agency and project-based supports from non-governmental organisations. Secondly, Phayao TV also relies on community-based sources of income which include patronage from larger organisations, service contracts, and income directly donated by their own communities respectively. Meanwhile, Ubon Ratchathani Community TV and Andaman Community TV adopt the single source of income model which put the two community TVs at risk and may have to close down if their only funding source ceases to support or terminates funding programs. Evidently, the Ubon Ratchathani Community TV ceased operations after the end of the funding period, while the Andaman Community TV, even though maintaining online communication channels, became very discontinuous in its operations after the end of the funding period. On the contrary, Phayao TV, with a mixed financing model, is able to continue their broadcasting operation until present. In addition, it found that income from personal sources was crucial for community TVs during the establishment/ setting up period as it paves a way for them to develop further into an organisation with a capacity to compete for funding from government agencies and other sources in the later period.

Financing Model

The research was conducted during the two-year period (2016-2019), when Thailand was under a coup; therefore, it is not surprising that media which reflect democracy and delegate broadcasting power to ordinary people are very rare. Since Thailand began the transition from analogue television to digital, community service television embedded in the public sector has always been ignored by the regulator. This goes on despite the laws determining the NBTC representative agency (the R & D Fund) to provide community TVs with

subsidies, which is an important source of income for their long-term operations. However, even though community TVs in Thailand are still unable to receive financial subsidies and business licenses, the results indicate that they have financial management capabilities which are tantamount to those of community media in many countries such as the United Kingdom, the United States, or Iceland, Spain, or Switzerland (Gordon, 2016, p.30, Ofcom, 2018, Canada Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission, 2009). That is a capability to adopt a mixed source of income model. The results of this study also show an approach of earning income from the station's own community through trust building measures in accordance with the Thai context. The enhancing trust forms some sorts of values which then can turn into monetary values. In doing so, the approach follows principles of community media which not only focuses on producing community programs for the community, but also performing as an organisation or an institution working both online and offline for community development, incorporating with the community as if community media were one of the community members who experience the same pain and happiness, and taking parts in the solution of community problems. If community TV still does not build enough faith and credibility in the perspective of community members, any supports and monetary or non-monetary donations from the community are hard to come by. However, to raise funds from people in the community, the core team of Community TV operators must conduct a situational assessment and initiate fundraising activities in the community at an appropriate time. Unless community TVs initiate community fundraising or ask the community for financial support, the community may not aware of its roles or may misunderstand that community TVs can operate with other sources of funding. Although asking for money directly from the community is awkward for community TV operators, this approach will let community members recognise their important roles in the survival of community TVs.

The study of financial management of community TVs in Thailand revealed that the two Community TVs adopt a single source of income model because both are still in the early stages, and are having to foster credibility and worthiness in the perception of community members before being able to convert non-tangible values into monetary values. However, both financing models adopted in Thailand show that community TVs cannot rely on a single source of income and deny other sources both inside and outside communities. Community TV managers should manage and determine the proportion of each source appropriately, without affecting the values and principles of community media. Meanwhile, government criteria and procedures for granting community TV subsidies must be made clear. The government agencies may adapt some models from foreign countries, such as determining the proportion of sources of income derived from governmental agencies, local organisations, and local business sectors (United Kingdom), determining the proportion of government support through regulatory agencies, defining the proportion of advertising revenue or commercial support, and specifying the amount of funds allocated for the management and development of community TV personnel (Canadian Radio-Television and

Telecommunications Commission, 2009, Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission, 2009). These models should be considered together with Thailand's social and cultural context; for example, to allow community TVs to have local sponsors because local business groups have a mission to improve the well-being of the community as well. Such instances will lower the barrier once created to protect community TVs from any outsider intervention, but may undermine opportunities to foster the financial security of the community media (Gordon, 2006, P.30). In addition, the results suggest that external or government supports are very important to the community TVs' management and capacity building (UNESCO, 2019), which will enhance trust and faith in community media among community members. However, in order to fundraise from communities, community TV operators must constantly evaluate the perception of their viewers or people in their own communities, and must be culturally and socially aware of an appropriate timing for fundraising activities or financial discussions within communities. However, community TVs should increase the proportion of income derived from other sources by diversifying them, because the pursuit of diverse funding sources is a model that will guarantee the long-term survival of community TVs.

This study of the financial management of community TVs in Thailand is conducted in their early stages; hence, it found that the community TVs are still struggling to stand for their identity and having to deal with limitations imposed by the negligent regulatory agency. Therefore, the conclusion on whether community TVs in Thailand is successful or a failure may be premature, because they are still eligible for financial support and legal business licenses granted by the regulators in the future. The least the results of this study can do is to provide guidelines for regulators in designing fair and inclusive supporting criteria, rather than playing a prohibitive role on the sources of income or financing models of community TVs. Also, this study provides insights on community TV's past experiences and lessons learned, which will be useful for their operations, especially with regard to financial management.

Acknowledgement

This work was supported by the Thailand research fund (TRF) and the University of Phayao under Grant [RSA5980005].



REFERENCES

- Benton Foundation. 2007. What's going on in Community Media. Retrieved July 7, 2015. Form www.benton.org/node/6172.
- Bingemann Mitchell. 2014. Turnbull pushes community TV off airwaves and onto internet. The Australian Business Review. (10 September 2014). Retrieved 14 May 2015. Form <http://www.theaustralian.com.au/business/news/turnbull-pushes-community-tv-off-airwaves-and-onto-internet/story-e6frg906-1227053763033>.
- Canadian Radio-Television and Telecommunications Commission. 2009. International Approaches to Funding Community & Campus Radio. Retrieved September 9, 2019. From <https://crtc.gc.ca/eng/publications/reports/radio/connectus0903.htm>.
- Carpentier, Nico. 2011. Media and participation A site of ideological-democratic struggle. USA: The University of Chicago Press.
- Digital Broadcasting Bureau. 2018. Guideline for implementing community TV broadcasting services in Thailand. Bangkok: Office of the National Broadcasting and Telecommunications Commission.
- Gordon, Janey. 2016. How community broadcasting is funded-a useful resource for community broadcasters. 3CMedia. 8(2016): pp. 29-39.
- Fuller, Linda. K. 2007. Top-down community media: A participant observation from Singapore. In L. K. Fuller (Ed.), Community media: International perspectives (pp. 129–138). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan US.
- Jermittiparsert, K, Sriyakul, T., & Pamornmast, C. (2013). Quality of Thai Media: Empirical Proposals on “Prime Minister’s Eggs” Discourse. *Asian Social Science*, 9(17), 209-217.
- Ofcom. 2018. Community Radio Fund Guidance Notes. 7(2018): pp. 1-7
- Hersch, Joel. 2013. Changing the Channel. Retrieved December 30, 2019. From <http://goodtimes.sc/santa-cruz-news/changing-the-channel/>.
- International Telecommunication Union Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (ITU). (2016). Framework for Deploying Community Television Broadcasting Services in Thailand. Retrieved December 30, 2019. From <https://broadcast.nbt.go.th/data/academic/file/600300000003.pdf>.



- Naidoo, Andrei. (2005). Is community TV sustainable in South Africa? Identifying its challenges and building a viable business model of CTV in SA. Master of business administration, University of Cape Town, South Africa.
- Burarak Phattar. 2015. Community TV managements. *Journal of Journalism*, 8 (3): pp.40-79
- Burarak Phattar. 2010. Regional Television: Origins, Existence and Development. *Journal of Communication Arts*, 28(1): pp.36-51.
- Rennie, Ellie. 2016. Community media: Institutions, trust and groups. *Journal of Alternative and Community Media*, 1, pp. 33–35.
- Rennie, Ellie. 2006. *Community Media: a global Introduction*. USA. Rowman & Littlefield Publisher, Inc.
- Robinson, Sue. 2014. Introduction: Community journalism midst media revolution. *Journalism Practice*, 8(2): pp. 113–120.
- Rodriguez, Clemencia. 2001. *Fissures in the Mediascape*. Cresskill, N.J.: Hampton Press.
- Rosen Andy. 2019. Cable access stations are facing a financial reckoning. Retrieved December 30, 2019. From <https://www.bostonglobe.com/business/2019/03/17/cable-access-stations-are-facing-financial-reckoning/SbflfcRr4womaG0OZzLXHJ/story.html>.
- Sitthirak Sinit. 2000. The origin of Thailand's Television B.E. 2493-2500 (A.D.1950-1957). (3rd published). Bangkok: Thammasat University.
- Thomas Pradip. 2016. The state and community media. *Journal of Alternative and Community Media*. 1(2016): 39-40.
- UNESCO. 2019. UNESCO Community Media Sustainability Policy Series. Retrieved April 4, 2020. From <https://en.unesco.org/community-media-sustainability/policy-series>.
- UNESCO. 2013. UNESCO's Media Development Indicators introduced in China to support local media. Retrieved June 14, 2015. From <https://en.unesco.org/news/unescos-media-development-indicators-introduced-china-support-local-media>.
- UNESCO. 2008. *Media Development Indicators: A Framework for Assessing Media Development*. Paris: UNESCO,
- Internews. 2009. *Community Media Sustainability Guide: The Business of Changing Lives*. USA: Internews network.



International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change. www.ijicc.net
Volume 13, Issue 8, 2020

Zhang Xin. 2006. The Concept of 'Local' in Chinese Television: a Case Study of Southwest China's Chongqing Television. *Communication and Culture*, 3(1): pp. 28-41.