

Adaptations Of Reality
Television Programmes:
“The Big Brother Africa”
Reality Show

Sarah Lwahas, PhD

*Department Of Mass Communication, University Of
Jos, Nigeria*

ABSTRACT

From the 1990s, social and economic changes in the form of privatization, deregulation and trade liberalization particularly in the United States and Europe, laid the basis for various types of production environment in the media industry. The increasing focus on, and use of Information Communication Technology to generate programme concepts with wide appeal became the salient feature of contemporary television. Like other forms of globalization, media content transverse national boundaries easily. Television concepts are copied, modified and exploited by television stations globally as media producers juggle to keep viewers happy with entertainment and provide opportunity for advertizers to place their products in the programmes produced. This important development in the changing media industry over time, led to the phenomenon where viewers progressively display insatiable need for interactivity from the programmes watched. The viewer wants to make telephone calls and talk back on television or radio shows, send emails/SMS (Short Message Service), vote in audience polls as well as buy goods and request for services as advertized in programmes and on the Internet. These became extremely popular methods for comments and feedbacks for media producers. These participatory elements naturally become a vital part of television experience and heralded the emergence of what is known as Reality Television. This paper takes a look at the growing trend towards popular television format and content adaptation for international market with particular reference to “Big Brother Africa” Reality Show. The Big Brother format, which originated from the Netherlands in September 1991, is estimated to be franchised and adapted in over seventy different countries in Europe and the African continent. The paper examines “Big Brother” as the African participation in the globalization of media content and its implication for the local economy, cultural, social and television programming development. This paper particularly analyzes the structure of “Big Brother Africa” and what motivates viewers to watch the programme.

Keyword: Television, Globalization, Reality, Programme

1. INTRODUCTION

This study is situated within the framework of the Democratic Participation Theory which is concerned about the role of the media in social transformation. The media should provide a market place for the exchange of comment and criticism regarding public affairs. According to Vatikiotis (2005) the Information Communication Technology and especially the internet holds the promise of extending participatory opportunities to increasingly wide layers of society. This presupposes that the media should point to the needs that arise from the daily experiences of citizens to offer space to individual and minority expressions. In other words, the mass media should stress the importance of cultural diversity and make individuals socially engaged in their communities by producing persuasive and interactive programmes.

2. ADAPTATIONS OF REALITY TELEVISION PROGRAMMES

The prevalence of interactive programmes has changed the media landscape drastically. Production ideas and techniques are put together as a programme for television. The same concept is replicated in several settings to access domestic markets. In Nigeria, the airwaves are currently being barraged with several imported television formats which are sponsored by various companies and corporate organizations.

Local versions of international programmes like “Don’t Forget the Lyrics”, “Who wants to be a Millionaire”, “The Apprentice”, “Big Brother”, “Nigerian Idol”, “The Intern”, and “The Next Movie Star” are some examples. Though resembling well known international productions, producers prove they are original. This reproduction of international television formats is referred to as Programme Adaptation or Cloning.

Television programmes, more than in the past, are not simply created and produced only to be transmitted or broadcast but also to be sold elsewhere in the world. Keane and Moran (2006:3) argue that programmes “are consciously devised, developed and distributed with the deliberate intention of achieving near simultaneous international adaptation”. This explains why many kinds of adaptations are now familiar as could be seen in the last decade, where there has been a growing development and trade in television format across national boundaries from one region to another. This trade in format has brought about a hybridization of cultures and is appealing to various target audience around the world.

The fact that reality formats are sold and not simply imitated or cloned underscores an economic component that cannot be ignored. Producers always strive to maintain higher production value by adapting a show that has appealed to various target audiences around the world. Therefore, they utilise all available technology, technical support, training and supervision from licensors of such programmes. The economic considerations are also tied to rights which the licensor exercises to control the extent to which the programme can be adapted. Thomas (2006:35) summed up thus, “the transfers of technology, managerial expertise to an unfamiliar culture, ownership rights or intellectual property are all determinants to the success of programme format adaptations”.

Thomas’ position is predicated on the cases of blatant copying of programmes by some producers which necessitated the need for the protection of original material from plagiarism under a law known as Intellectual Property (IP). Intellectual Property remains the most relevant aspect of the law governing the sale of formats globally. Owners of television programmes have the right to safeguard and control content related ideas or their works from being exploited, therefore property laws such as trade mark, brand name, registered signs as well as copyright laws, allow them to prevent third parties from copying and using their works without consent and license of the right owner. Reality Shows are good examples in which such exploitation exists. According to Olumide (2010), some producers have experienced one form of litigation or the other arising from issues of violation of copyright laws.

Chmielewski (2010:1) equally observed that in 2004, Celador International sued Walt Disney Co. claiming that it had been denied its fair share of profits from the “Who wants to be a Millionaire”, a Reality game show which aired on ABC network for 3 years, beginning in the summer of 1999 and continued to appear on local TV stations.

It is obvious from this development that producers are inclined to take legal action not because consumers are being defrauded through an imitation which may also be of poor quality, but because they are losing significant income. Thomas (2006:7) is of the view that “producers can defend their actions only if they developed original creations and then be concerned about plagiarism of their efforts by others from within their country or beyond and the potential deprivation of revenue through royalties”. Discussions on format adaptations of some television programmes below provide further insight into the nature, growth and adaptation of reality programmes.

2.1 WHO WANTS TO BE A MILLIONAIRE?

The programme “Who Wants to be a millionaire?” is a game quiz show which made its first debut in 1998 and has been licensed to 105 countries worldwide. The programme originated in the United Kingdom, with a working title “Cash Mountain”. The programme offers large cash prizes to participants for correctly answering a series of consecutively multiple-choice questions (about twelve in number). It starts with mostly general knowledge questions and gets more difficult as the programme progresses. In the original British version, a cash prize of one million pounds was the maximum. However, most international versions offer a top prize of one million units of the local currency which varies depending on the currency’s value.

Only one contestant plays at a time and if he/she answers a question incorrectly, he/she loses all the money won except the questions that the prizes are guaranteed and pegged at N10, 000, N20, 000, and N250, 000 in the Nigerian version of the programme. The contestant can play for a higher cash prize (from N500, 000, N2, 000, 000 to N10, 000, 000) so long as he/she does not answer a question incorrectly. The game ends only when the contestant cannot answer a question and decides to walk away with the cash prize already won or when all questions are answered correctly and the jackpot prize won.

The contestants have to go through a preliminary round called “Fastest Finger First” where they are all given a question and four answers from the host. The person that gets the correct answer in the desired alphabetical order gets on the “hot seat”. The contestant is also given three life lines to choose from when he/she encounters difficulties in answering question. These are “Phone a Friend”, “50/50”, and “Ask the Audience”.

Celador International, producers of the programme, decided in 2006 to sell the rights or format of the show. The Dutch company 2waytraffic acquired the programme, and two years later Sony Pictures purchased 2waytraffic for one hundred and thirty seven point five million pounds. This development brought several variations and modifications to the programme. For instance in 2002, the syndicated US version eliminated the

“Fastest Finger First” and other formats from Australia, Italy and New Zealand emerged. The Nigerian version (which is being produced by Ultima Limited with MTN mobile network as major sponsor) had variations in some editions produced. These include, “Who deserves to be a Millionaire” and “Valentine and Children Specials”. According to Akinlabi (2009:1) “Ultima Limited bought the exclusive franchise for Nigeria from Celador International, and invested heavily in designing, developing and constructing a purpose built studio in line with the format handed down by the franchise owners”.

The fact that the programme is licensed to 105 countries indicates a wider spread than BBA which is only licensed to over 70 countries. The programme provides opportunities for the studio audience to win a cash prize of N20, 000 (in the Nigerian version), for correctly answering a general question given by the host. The fastest among the audience to text in his/her number within 60 seconds is announced and rewarded with a cash prize of N20, 000. In most cases, more than one member of the audience who texts in the right answer within the time limit get N20, 000 each. Similarly, audiences at home are equally given an opportunity to answer a question correctly and text in their answers before the next edition of the program. The first ten to do so each receive a cash prize of N20, 000 each. Their names are announced at the beginning of the next edition of the programme.

The phone- a- friend component of the programme also gives the individual audience members at home an opportunity to participate on the programme, thus increasing the direct and immediate interactive element of the programme. Therefore these reasons probably explain why the programme “Who Wants to be a Millionaire” is more popular and has a wider spread than “Big Brother”. It could also be that the programme still powered by a television anchor/ professional and getting the reward is much quicker. It may also be because much of the material is gotten or produced for the show ahead of time unlike ‘Big Brother’ which is entirely a participant audience concept.

2.2 SLUMDOG MILLIONAIRE

As part of the licensing of the programme, “Who Wants to be a Millionaire” was adapted in Hindi version as “Kaun Banega Crorepati” (popularly referred to as KBC) in India. It was the first Millionaire clone in collaboration with StarTV, a subsidiary of News Corporation Hong Kong and co- produced by Celador films, owners of the rights of the original show. According to Thomas (2006:2):

StarTV spent US \$1.75 million dollars for the production of KBC, US \$ 1 million for its off- air promotion and US \$ 500, 000 for its on-air promotions...StarTV was estimated... to have raised a total of Rs.120 crore (US \$3million) income and gained Rs. 50 crore (US \$1.3 million) in net profit.

This provides us clear evidence that, programme adaptation and cloning is a profit maximising business. Justifiably therefore, it is economically advantageous to control both the production and distribution of programmes, leaving enormous amount of room for even more profits to be made.

“Slumdog Millionaire”, shot in India, is a British film directed by Daniel Boyle in 2008 based on the concept of “Who wants to be a Millionaire”. It is written by Simon Beaufoy and co-directed by Loveleen Tandan. It is an adaptation of a Commonwealth Writers Prize nominated novel Q&A by Indian Author and Diplomat, Vikas Swarup, in 2005.

Inspired by Indian cinema, the film was set and filmed in India and is said to transcend all boundaries; race, gender, regions and class, owing to its strong dramatic elements which tells a compelling story of the challenges faced by ordinary people in a globalised world. The film was projected to cost US \$ 15 million and has currently grossed over US \$377 million. It is a film whose genre is comedy, drama, romance, and won eight Oscar Academy Awards including Best picture, Best Director, and Best Adapted Screen play in 2009. It also won seven (British Arts Film and Theatre Awards) BAFTA Awards.

The plot tells a story of eighteen year old Jamal Malik, a street boy from the Juhu slums of Mumbai, who appears on the Indian version of “Who Wants to Be a Millionaire” (Kaun Banega Crorepati). Jamil exceeds the expectations of the people with one correct answer to the grand prize of Rs 20, 000, 000, thereby arousing suspicions of the game’s show host and law enforcement officials. He is detained on the suspicion of cheating because they believed an ordinary street boy cannot have all the answers to the questions asked. The incidents in his life presented in flashbacks, provide the answers.

Reviewers of the show have described the show as a hard hitting melodrama which however, lacks recognizable stars and has a problematic title. What remains significant in examining the film “Slumdog Millionaire” are some of the issues that help in the understanding of components of Reality Television, namely the difficulty of tying Reality Television to a particular genre-the use of ordinary people rather than professional actors and circumstances faced by contestants which are manufactured by producers.

There is also the exposure of human experiences in a broader context that enables the audience to connect with the contestant in a more personalised way, due to the similarities in the challenges faced by all human beings. Like Reality Television, “Slumdog Millionaire” features the desire to excel, make instant wealth, transform or change individual status.

Equally observed is the market significance of television programme formats, a phenomenon and strategy employed by media giants and producers of finished programmes, whose motivations for cloning or adapting programmes are tilted more towards profit making rather than the recognition of creativity. This is evident in box office ratings with “Slumdog Millionaire” reputed to have taken about 21 million pounds at the box office and 91 million pounds globally. (Rupert Gavin- cited in The Sunday Times Online 2009).

2.3 THE “BIG BROTHER” REALITY SHOW

“Big Brother” is a Reality Television format adapted from George Orwell’s novel *Nineteen Eighty-Four* written in 1948 in which Big Brother (where the show got its name) is the all seeing leader of the dystopian Oceania.

It narrates a nightmare vision of a future, in which people's liberties are taken away by the presence of 'Big Brother', a surveillance system which relies on a two way screen to monitor people all the time. The show has been described as an international multimedia phenomenon by media analysts around the world. The show, which combines games, soap and documentary into one hybrid performance genre was created by a Dutchman, John de Mol and developed by his company Endemol.

The basic premise of the show is the confining of a group of contestants, usually not fewer than twelve at a time, for about three months. Their movements are watched twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week by strategically placed video cameras and microphones from bedrooms to bathrooms and everywhere else in the Big Brother house.

According to Mathijs and Jones (2004: 1), the inspiration of the show was the Arizona Biosphere project of the 1990s in which participants (8 men and 8 women) were confined within a dome, effectively becoming their own isolated society for a period of two years. The first series of "Big Brother" was aired in the Netherlands in September 1999, and subsequently made headlines as it was adapted to virtually every other part of the world with changes to the format, revealing the reality of each country. As observed by Pomewozik, (2000: 40) the first edition:

Captured 53% of the national audience with an amazing 73% of Dutch viewers tuning in for the last show...given such popularity, English and American clones quickly followed...CBS reportedly paid \$20 million for the rights to produce an American version of the show. The show is now franchised to over seventy countries.

This shows that the programme was well received maybe because it heralded the emergence of something entirely new to the audience where it premiered. The clones that quickly followed are an indication that producers have witnessed the success of the format and are willing to try it elsewhere.

2.3.1 "BIG BROTHER" FORMAT AND STRUCTURE

The contestants, who are referred to as 'Housemates', are virtually strangers before their confinement and are not permitted any contact with the outside world for the duration of their three months (between 91-100 days) in the house. Some critics opine that the prolonged stay in the house without any contact with the outside world is an illustration of inhumane experimentation on people's psychological health. This can also be analyzed in the context of assessing how people react when brought into contact or forced to live with strangers outside their comfort zone. Naturally, there will be outbursts, violent reactions and retaliations.

During their stay, the housemates are governed by strict rules, live under dire circumstances and on a strict budget, with a limited ration of food. They are required to complete specific tasks given by 'Big Brother'. This element of survival increases the tensions as well as test housemates' team and community spirit.

While contact is generally not allowed with the outside world, some versions have made exemptions and allowed some contact with the outside world. For instance, the American version of "Big Brother" in 2001

provided information to housemates about the attacks on the World Trade Centre in the US and the “Big Brother Africa”.

Similarly, the Revolution in 2009 in South Africa brought in a Nigerian male Musician D'Banj and former M-Net face of Africa winner, Kate Mensah of Ghana to entertain and interact with the housemates. In both circumstances, the visits were planned and intended to break the pressure of the confinement. This is because the housemates had the rare privilege of hearing about events and happenings outside the house as well as getting to interact with someone like them who was successful because of hard work and determination. Besides this, the housemates were able to loosen up from the tension and routine of the game to enjoy the entertainment provided. Obviously, the ‘voluntary’ confinement though difficult, has some intrinsic value – fame, money and career opportunities-for which the housemates are willing to condition and endure the psychological stress in order to win.

Skinner (1953), in his explanation of Operant Conditioning sometimes referred to as Instrumental Conditioning, stated that when behaviours are tied to a reward it is likely for people to repeat those behaviours willingly. These rewards are a consequence for a certain way of behavior therefore, people are likely to condition themselves (or reinforce their behaviour freely) by obeying given rules and laws.

A special feature in the activities of the ‘Big Brother’ house is the ‘Diary’ session. This features a chat session with ‘Big Brother’ by an external moderator who acts here as a psychologist and helps the audience to understand the character, attitude, thoughts, feelings and frustrations of each housemate.

A host anchors the one hour programme edited for television broadcast. At the beginning of each edition, he/she provides information on contestants, nature of the show and how the audience will vote. He/she also anchors the live audience event on eviction nights, narrating the experiences of the housemates within the week.

Every week, the housemates must nominate two housemates in their midst to be evicted. The housemate with the most nomination points is announced and viewers are given the opportunity to vote via SMS messaging using mobile phones and website, for who they wish to see evicted. After the votes are collated, the evictee leaves the house immediately and is interviewed live by the host of the show, in front of a live studio audience. In some cases, two evictions take place within a week.

The show enables interactive possibilities whereby the audience can make comments online on the interaction with other housemates and reasons why they are voting for a particular contestant through Short Message Service (SMS) and votes are cast. This online interaction is transmitted twenty- four hours a day and seven days a week through a dedicated TV channel and an edited version on African Magic and M-Net stations.

At the end of the game, the last remaining housemate is declared the winner and presented with a prize which is usually a large sum of money and other perks. In Britain it has been 100,000 pounds (US180, 000), while in

Africa, the prize money was \$100, 000 but in 2009 edition, it was raised to \$200, 000. In 2011, it was \$200, 000 each for two housemates rather than the advertized single winner.

There are variations in the format of the show which can be seen as twists from one country to another. For instance, in France and Canada, the format has been developed using couples. In the US version, voting for the housemates is entirely the job of fellow housemates. The public is not allowed to vote, while in the Dutch version there was an introduction of a “Battle” which enables housemates to fight for the luxuries available in one demarcated half of the house. Sometimes housemates are switched from either side of the house. In some instances, there has been ‘House Swap’. In 2003, one housemate, Johan, was swapped from the ‘Big Brother’ house in Netherlands to the ‘Big Brother’ house in Africa. This swap extends the broadcast and conversations on the programme beyond specific boundaries and increases interest.

The set design and construction of the “Big Brother” house also varies in terms of colour and aesthetics. What, however, is standard is the use and placement of large mirrors on strategic places in the house with the design of the eye and eye brow, emphasizing George Orwell’s omnipresent eye watching every move in the house.

In spite of its acclaimed commercial success, the show has generated a lot of controversy, especially in the academia and in the countries it is aired. Remarkable attention has been drawn in the area of its voyeuristic nature, cultural values and the changing face of the media, in general.

2.3.2 ADAPTATION OF “BIG BROTHER” IN AFRICA

The increasing variations of the programme “Big Brother” reality show, such as “Celebrity Big Brother” and others opened up opportunities for people in different parts of the world to the concept of Reality Television for the first time in a global dimension. In Africa, the show was first aired in a television series in South Africa, named “Big Brother South Africa”. It was produced by Endemol in 2001 for 106 days and 2002 for 79 days. In seasons 1 and 2, White South Africans rather than blacks, won from the twelve housemates each that entered the ‘Big Brother’ house.

While reviewing these two editions, critics opine that the contestants were not a sampled representation of the African continent. A pan-African regional version was subsequently introduced, known as “Big Brother Africa” in 2003. It was produced by Endemol in collaboration with South Africa-based satellite television company M-Net. Since then “Big Brother Africa” has been greeted as a revolution for its effort in attempting to create an African Union by using the television medium. This implies that, Africa as a continent, can engage in discussions in more organised and meaningful manner, on common problems affecting the continent, and as exemplified in the formation of African Union (AU), New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD). It is also a lively engagement of Africans in a world without borders and watched by audiences across large landmass with several differences.

2.3.3 TAMING THE TIGER: "BIG BROTHER" NIGERIANISED

Following the wide popularity gained by the pan African version of "Big Brother" Africa show, an adaptation of the show made in Nigeria, broadcast on March 5, 2006 and ended on June 4 on DSTV Channel 37. It was tagged 'Big Brother Nigeria'.

The house was located in Lagos and designed to reflect the dominant colours of the Nigerian flag; Green, White, Green. The programme was aired live for 20 hours a day with 68 microphones and 27 cameras to capture the activities of twelve contestants. All contestants were over 21 years of age and were chosen from 13, 000 contestants from auditions held in several Nigerian cities. The cash prize was \$100, 000.

The show was produced by a Nigerian production company- Storm Vision Limited, in association with Endemol Nigeria (owned 100% by Endemol South Africa). The Nigerian production team totaled 80 and the 16 South African crew members. The four million US Dollar cost of production was estimated to be the biggest production budget ever in Nigeria.

The Chairman of Storm Vision Limited, Obi Asika cited in Miller (2005:1) observed that the Big Brother concept was received:

...well across the globe with audiences tuning in to follow the romances, conflicts and joys of the contestants. I am extremely proud, that a Nigerian company is at the fore front of bringing this phenomenal TV concept to the country. We will create a production mindful of our audiences' needs and will aim to always entertain them. I believe this production can unify Nigerians and can give others a better understanding of Nigeria.

Obi Asika adds

We wanted to do this specific show because...it's the ultimate spotlight experience- to be famous, to be noticed, to be appreciated for your [SIC] abilities...personality, the whole package. Contestants seek this and audiences understand this...this is the appeal of Big Brother.

On the kind of people the show looked for, Carl Fischer, director of M-Net Local Productions cited in Miller (2005:2) notes:

Big Brother contestants are generally enthusiastic, outgoing, diverse people who are not afraid to speak their minds. They are vibrant, energetic personalities living live to the full, who are open to new experiences and who believe in themselves.

At the end of the show, 26 year old Aduak Katung won the \$100, 000 cash prize being the last person standing after the evictions. The show followed the format of "Big Brother Africa" version.

The concept was a success in terms of quality of content, and Nigerians were fully represented in the execution of the production. The show put Nigeria on the world map once again as being the first African country to adapt the Big Brother show after South Africa. Big Brother Nigeria, as it was called, served to create further awareness and generate interest about the show. It also provided numerous employment opportunities for Nigerian professionals in the television industry.

However, the South African partners, of the Big Brother Nigeria, Endemol, failed to invest some of the huge production budget into infrastructure in Nigeria. The budget did not give account of actual investment and creation of local assets within the country, to the detriment of the local partner Storm Vision Limited. According to the Managing Director of Storm Vision Limited, Remi Ogunpitan, Nigerian economic policy was undermined along with those of the local film and video industry and that of the Storm Vision. Endemol had facilitated in its partnership with Storm Vision, more than N660 million production budgets from M-Net in 2005, but did not have any investment nor employed any, in Nigeria. According to Iwenjora (2005:1):

More than N27 million was spent on accommodation, feeding and other SA crew costs in five months and about N11 million just on car hire and transportation for SA crew, which at the end did not return any viable asset to its Nigerian partner.

Storm Vision Limited felt there was high cost of imported labour, equipment and logistics from South Africa which jeopardized the survival of the show. The issue was clearly that both parties could not agree on the manner the production was executed indicating that there was lack of interest by the South African partners, which was seen as an attempt to dominate the entire production process.

This invariably portrays the fact that there is no functional institutional framework that would enable Africa market its local content even among African countries. Idachaba and Dandaura (2010) contend that over the years, Africa has made itself a huge market for Western and European content instead of marketing its own local content. Therefore, it subjects itself to perpetual cultural imperialism through the continuous movement of products from the West to Africa. They advocated for a home-grown Production Company that originates authentic African programmes for the international market that makes provision for sustainability. In other words, Africa needs to collaborate and strategise to meet the challenges of the global markets.

3. CONCLUSION

There have been several conceptions of the term 'Reality Television', its history, definition and classification as a genre in television and popular culture. What has emerged from this research is that Reality Television has made a grand entrance into the landscape of programming in the twenty first century. This is evidenced by the fact that Reality Television phenomenon has entered the mainstream of television programming, providing relatively cheap entertainment (using ordinary people, no scripts and replicated format).

Its growing popularity is exemplified by how accepted it has been in many countries. By adjusting the format, Reality Television Shows can be localised and made more appealing to local markets. In other words, the format can be reproduced or adapted to fit many countries with few changes from originals which are already successful. Examples have been provided using, "Who Wants to Be a Millionaire?" with reference to the film "Slumdog Millionaire" and "Big Brother" to "Big Brother Africa" and "Big Brother Nigeria"

The increasing adaptation of such shows, the involvement and participation of people, especially youths, are indicative of the fact that Reality Television is a real part of contemporary global popular culture in the emerging process of globalisation. The various forms of adaptations of Reality Shows will equally continue to provide a platform for a number of high profile debates on the authenticity of the performance of participants and appeal on the public.

Locally, the adaptation or cloning of television programmes promotes small and medium business development. There will be recognition of innovation, creativity and excellence by producers who want to provide local content to available markets both at international, regional and sub-regional levels. What poses a threat to this attempt in Africa are issues of poor infrastructure, limited capital and restrictive broadcast laws which do not advocate for competition in the international market.

4. RECOMMENDATION

Research the world over indicates that there is an increasing demand and participation of the audience in interactive television programmes. It would be beneficial to have in-depth investigations of productions, particularly because Reality Television is contested. This would provide important perspectives regarding challenges of inequalities, with respect to gender, class and sexuality. To add another dimension to the study of BBA, researches should be carried out to demonstrate how cultural objects could have much to tell about the social life of Africans, values and ideologies.

New television technologies provide remarkable changes in the relationship between the medium and the audience. Therefore, television professionals should cash in on the changing paradigm of media convergence in television programming through quality programming. This will enable the viewer to access information and services, particularly issues that relate to the right of the public to express their opinions freely in the way they are governed. This holds the potential of improving audience participation in democracy, because of the promise of fuller interactivity in the production of television programmes, particularly for developing countries.

5. REFERENCES

- Akinlabi, O (2009) Behind the 'Who Wants to Be a Millionaire Set'. From Guardian life Magazine online Accessed on 7th June 2010
- Aspinall, J. (2007) *Shilpa: The Biography*. UK. John Black Publishing Limited
- Andrejevic, M. (2004) *Reality TV: The Work of Being Watched*, Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers.
- Adekunle, T (2007) Big Brother Africa: Between Decency and Consumers, *THISDAY Inside Business*
- Baltruschat, D. (2009) Reality TV Formats: The Case of the Canadian Idol. *Canadian Journal of Communication* Vol.34, 41-59.
- BBC News (2007) "Big Brother Nigeria Goes on Air. News.bbc.co.uk Accessed on 6th March 2006 from <http://News.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/Africa/4778036.stm>
- Brenton, S, & Cohen, R. (2003) *Shooting People: Adventures in Reality TV*. London. Publisher Verso
- Clark, B (2002) *The Box of Tricks, Reality TV, How Real is Real*. London. Hodder & Stoughton

- Clayton-Miller, K (2005) Big Brother' watching you- from Nigeria. Accessed on 5 December 2005 from www.independent_news-media
- Chmielewski, D (2010) Federal Jury Awards \$269.2 Million in Damages in "Who Wants to Be a Millionaire" Suit. Company Town Los Angeles Accessed 11th August 2010 from <http://lastimesblogs/lastimes.com>
- Cummings, D (2002) Reality TV: How Real is Real. London. Publisher Atlantic.
- Dandaura, S.E & Asigbo, C.A (2010) Theatre, Culture & Re-Imaging Nigeria. Proceedings of the 23rd Conference of Society of Nigeria Theatre Artists (SONTA). Keffi. Published by SONTA
- De Jager, C. (2002) It's Big on the Continent. Variety Vol. 388, Issue 6. Accessed on from <http://support.epnet.com>
- Dovey, J (2000) 'Freak show'-First Person Media and Factual Television London, Pluto Press Dutton, E.C (2006) Big Brother, Pilgrimage and the Ndembu of Zambia: Examining the Big Brother Phenomenon through Anthropology of Religion. Journal of Religion and Popular Culture Vol. X11
- Ekisola, O. (2010) Issues of Copyright Arising from Reality TV. Accessed on 6th March 2010 From BusinessDay online
- Iwenjora, F. (2006) Big Brother Nigeria Fall Out: How Endemol Raped Storm Vision, Nigerians. Accessed on 16th July 2010 from Vanguard Online
- John, F (1991) Media Matters Everyday Culture and Political Change. London. University of Minnesota Press.
- Kalango, K (2007) Big Brother: The Role of TV in Society. Sunday ThisDay Newspaper.
- Keane, M & Moran, A. (2005) (Re) presenting Local Content: Programme Adaptation in Asia and the Pacific. Accessed on 23rd July 2009 from <http://www.eprints.qut.edu.au>
- Lal, R (2007) Goody vs Shetty. What Went Wrong on Channel 4 Guardian Newspaper
- Mathijs, E, & Jones, J. (Eds) (2004) Big Brother International: Formats, Critics and Publics London & New York Wall Paper Press
- McQuail, D. (2005) Mass communication theory. 5th edition. London. Sage Publications.
- Montemurro, B. (2008) Toward a Sociology of Reality Television. New York. Blackwell Publishing.
- Montemurro, B (2007) Surveillance and Power: The Impact of New Technology on Reality Television Audience. A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Sociological Association TBA, New York. Accessed on 5th July 2010 from http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p183054_index.html
- Murray, S & Ouellette, L (Eds). (2004) Reality TV: Remaking Television Culture. New York. New York University Press.
- Nwankunor, G (2007) This 'Thing' Called Big Brother. The Guardian Newspaper
- Robinson, S. (2003) Reality TV, African Style. TIME Magazine Vol.161 No. 25
- Scannell, P. (2002) Big Brother as a Television Event. New York. Television and New Media
- Skinner, F.B . (1953) Science and Human Behaviour. New York. Macmillan
- Sykiewicz, J (2008) Why Big Brother Fascinates the Nation: An Exploration of the Appeal of Reality TV Accessed on 16th July 2010 from <http://realitytvsuite101.com/article.cfm/why-big-brother-fascinates-the-nation>
- Thomas, A, M (2006) Cultural Economics of TV Programme Cloning: or Why has India Produced Multi- "Millionaires". International Journal of Emerging Markets. Vol.1 No.1 Emerald Group Publishing
- Vatikiotis, P (2005) Communication Theory and Alternative Media. London Westminster Papers In Communication and Culture Vol 2 (1)
- Wikipedia, (2008) Reality Television. Accessed on 28th January 2008 from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Reality_television
- Wikipedia, (2008) Big Brother Africa. Accessed on 10th July 2008. Accessed from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Big_Brother_Africa
- Wikipedia, (2008) Who Wants to Be a Millionaire Accessed on the 11th August 2010 from <http://mediawiki.org>
- Wikipedia, (2008) Slumdog Millionaire Accessed on 13th August 2008 from <http://en/Wikipedia.org/wiki/slumdogmillionaire>
- Wong, J. (2001). Reality TV, Big Brother and Foucault. Canadian Journal of Communication Vol. 26. No 4.
- Yoon, M & Garma, R. (2006) Reality Television Programmes in Malaysia: A Dream come true? Sunway Academic Journal.