

MEDIA AND DEMOCRATISATION: CHALLENGES FOR AN EMERGING SUB-FIELD

Nael Jebriil :: Matthew Loveless :: Vaclav Stetka

IZVORNI ZNANSTVENI RAD / UDK 316.774:321.7(4-11:8:6), 32:316 / PRIMLJENO: 28.01.2015.

ABSTRACT *This article seeks to compile an empirically-based understanding of the role of media in countries in transition. The study focuses on the processes of political socialization, behaviour and accountability, and gives examples from three regions: Central and Eastern Europe, Latin America, and the Middle East/North Africa region. We draw on some of the major works relevant to the study of mass media in these transitional contexts with the aim of discerning emergent theories available to the study of media and democratisation. While aware of the limitations posed by the nature and scope of the sample of the studies reviewed, we do identify and discuss some of the potentially key obstacles to theory-building and propose some alternative paths of enquiry.*

KEY WORDS

DEMOCRATISATION, TRANSITION, POLITICAL SOCIALIZATION, ACCOUNTABILITY, NEW MEDIA

Authors note

Nael Jebriil :: Bournemouth University, The Media School, United Kingdom ::
njebriil@bournemouth.ac.uk

Matthew Loveless :: The University of Kent, School of Politics and International Relations,
United Kingdom :: M.Loveless@kent.ac.uk

Vaclav Stetka :: Charles University in Prague, Faculty of Social Sciences, Czech Republic ::
stetka@fsv.cuni.cz

INTRODUCTION

The (potential) sub-field of “media and democratisation” presents several fundamental challenges to the scholarly work on the topics of both “democratisation” and the “media”. What lies at the core of these challenges is the (inherent) scattered nature of work on this topic. Attempts at understanding the role of not only the traditional mass media but increasingly also the newer media and social networks in countries in transition require both the knowledge of existing media theory as well as regional expertise. While media theory might seem to be a means of unifying or harmonizing the empirical work that has been done, work across different regions has instead revealed substantial limitations.

This article seeks to compile an empirically-based understanding of the role of media in countries in transition. Focusing on selected dimensions of the process of democratization, namely political socialization, political behaviour and accountability, the study draws on empirical examples from three different regions: Central and Eastern Europe (CEE), Latin America (LA), and the Middle East/North Africa region (MENA). These regions offer differing but still comparable insights into political socialization (arguably most developed in CEE), political accountability (which LA might be best illustrative of), and the political impact of “new media” (with visible examples coming in recent years from MENA).

This article, therefore, provides less of an overarching structure of theoretical work than a review of regional empirical enquiries investigating the processes of political socialization, behaviour, and accountability. It has to be stressed, though, that our article is not a substitute for a full-fledged comparative analysis across the different regions as that would necessitate a completely different type of study. Neither is it our intention to provide a comprehensive overview of the available literature, as that is well beyond the scope of this article. Instead, we infer from the existing – if fragmentary – empirical evidence about the prospects and limitations to theory-building in this emerging sub-field. Thus, our article is intended as an attempt to inform new directions for the study of media and democratisation both empirically and theoretically.

THE INTERPLAY BETWEEN MEDIA AND DEMOCRATISATION

Scholars have different understandings of democratisation as a process. This is not surprising as there are various – though not necessarily contradictory – ways of understanding what democracy is (e.g. Schmitter and Karl, 1991). Here, we define democratisation as “a complex, long term, dynamic, and open-ended process... [consisting] of progress towards a more rule-based, more consensual and more participatory type of politics” (Whitehead, 2002: 27).

Studies which have addressed the relationship between the media and politics in the context of democratisation usually have two major concerns: (1) democratisation *via* the media and (2) democratisation of the media itself (Hackett and Zhao, 2005). It is difficult to

identify a direct relationship of cause and effect between the media and democratisation as the available empirical evidence is anecdotal and so cannot be subjected to rigorous empirical testing (see Voltmer and Rowsley, 2009). This is the case as the media may be viewed either as dependent on society and mirroring its contours or as primary movers and moulders (McQuail, 2005). That is, media freedom has been perceived as an indicator of democratic reform, or as a precondition for democratic institutions to work properly (Berman and Witzner, 1997; Dahl, 1989).

In normative media theory, democratic political structures are often assumed to precede the growth of media markets. This assumption may not be accurate for some emerging democracies, but the proposition that democracy influences the functioning of the media is a plausible one (e.g. through legislation, protection, etc.). This is based on the long-standing theory of media and democracy in which there are normative expectations regarding the media itself (e.g. normative values) as well as regarding how other institutions should treat the media (e.g. structure). Overall, freedom and independence are the most universally endorsed ideal characteristics of the media. The normative functions of the media are often based on the characteristics of representative or liberal democracies (see Norris, 2000).

The relationship between the growth of free media and the process of democratisation is considered to be reciprocal. Once the liberalisation of the media has been achieved, democratic consolidation and civil society are strengthened as journalists in independent media facilitate greater transparency and accountability in governance through quality news reporting (Norris, 2009). This relationship is reflected in mobilisation theory which states that multiplying media potentially produces greater opportunities in terms of accessibility for more political engagement (Loveless, 2010). At the consumption level, it is suggested that, because of a 'virtuous circle', attention to the news gradually reinforces civic engagement, just as civic engagement prompts attention to the news (Norris, 2000).

The democratisation literature rests on institutional foundations; yet a state of democracy is not realised unless citizens undergo socialisation to new values, attitudes, and behaviour norms of democratic culture (Almond and Verba, 1963; Putnam, 1993). Given the substantial body of work that has demonstrated mass media's influence on citizens' political attitudes (Lerner, 1958; McCombs and Shaw, 1972; Zaller, 1992; Norris, 1997; Newton, 1999; Putnam, 2000), it is not unreasonable to imagine that the mass media play an important role in political socialisation for the citizens of countries undergoing democratisation.

MEDIA AND POLITICAL SOCIALIZATION DURING DEMOCRATISATION

The study of political socialization during periods of transition refers to whether and/or how much citizens exhibited (normative) support for democracy (or at least the transition), generic democratic political attitudes (e.g. efficacy, trust, tolerance), and/or behaviours (e.g. voting, mobilization). Few would argue that mass media are the primary mechanism

for political socialization; however, given citizens' limited first-hand experience of politics, the mass media are a source from which individuals develop political understanding (Schmitt-Beck, 1998; Mutz, 1992). The reason to expect this is twofold. First, during periods of turmoil and transition, citizens are more likely to turn to the media as a source of reassurance and information (i.e. the theory of media dependency, Loveless, 2008; Voltmer and Schmitt-Beck, 2006). Second, the responsibilities of democratic citizenship are heightened during periods of democratisation (Almond and Verba, 1963; Dahl, 1989).

At the same time, media research in transitional countries has been dominated by examinations of the complex processes of liberalization and privatization of media institutions in non-Western regions via the remaking of media ownership, media legislation, economic freedom, *inter alia*. One reason for this may simply be the assumption that mass media would (naturally) play a positive role in democratic transition and political socialization. However, investigations into this process have not revealed a clear pattern of (positive) media effects on individuals.

There are a number of reasons why this sub-field may not have converged. At the theoretical and methodological level, the countries and regions of democratization have a varying level of comparability with one another, some have the physical infrastructure of modern media (e.g. the former Soviet Union) while others do not (e.g. sub-Saharan Africa). Transitions also take place in societies with cultural, historical, political, economic, and social profiles that differ not only from one another but also from the comparatively similar West (the origin of the vast majority of media theories). In conjunction with the first point, this undermines attempts at building a coherent picture across regions of transition. Finally, and at the most basic level, there is a lack of available data on transitioning countries.

In this study on media and political socialization we mainly draw on research conducted in Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) to explore the media as an instigator or determinant of changes in individuals' political attitudes or behaviour during periods of democratisation. One of the most widespread expectations here is that as 'Western media' diffuses into transitional countries, they raise expectations and aspirations, widen horizons, ultimately enabling people to demand better alternatives for themselves (Lerner, 1958; see also Huntington, 1991)¹. However, there is little evidence to support such expectations. In CEE, Matthew Loveless (2009) finds that those consuming international media do not exhibit higher levels of democratic values compared to those who do not. Holger Lutz Kern (2011), using recently released survey data in East and West Germany, also finds no evidence that television from West Germany affected the spread or intensity of protests in 1989 (see also Kern and Hainueller, 2009). This is congruent with work in other regions where foreign media are identified as a source of information – e.g. in the Middle East in the pre-pan-Arab satellite TV period (Ghareeb, 2000) – yet where there is no consistent evidence of these media having cultivated pro-democratic attitudes in citizens (for the 'Arab Spring' see Khamis and Vaughn, 2012). While possibly dispiriting,

¹ Western media are not the acme of media objectivity in a market of ideas, but in comparison with other media they have had more opportunities and longer time to achieve these normative goals.

explorations of the diffusion of democracy – via mass media – continue to suffer from a lack of usable data in pre-democratic or pre-transition countries.

For countries *in* transition, in CEE, Holli Semetko and Patti Valkenburg (1998) show that individuals in East Germany who paid initial attention to political news displayed higher levels of internal efficacy, although these declined steadily over the period under study (1991–3). Similarly, Katrin Voltmer and Rüdiger Schmitt-Beck (2006) find evidence for strong media effects in four democratizing countries in the areas of political knowledge, political participation, the evaluation of political parties, and preferences for democratic political order. Loveless has shown that ‘information-seeking’ media behaviour in CEE – the use of media for gaining political information during transition (2008) – has positive effects on individuals’ internal political efficacy (2010)².

These works represent a wealth of more focused studies in the fields of political science, mass and political communication, anthropology, and sociology. However, they do not provide an understanding of individual political socialization via mass media. That is, a potential coalescence is undermined by the wide swath of media (television news, electoral campaigns, public radio, *inter alia*), and political outcomes (personal efficacy, voting, political knowledge, etc.) in a variety of contexts. In addition, our understanding of democratisation is further complicated with the shift from theories and empirical research involving traditional research (i.e. print and broadcast media) to new media. Therefore, we next assess new media’s proclaimed revolutionary roles in regime changes with a particular focus on recent debates about the relationship between social media and the Arab Spring.

NEW MEDIA AND THE ADVENT OF DEMOCRATISATION

“New media” refers to the internet and its extensions such as mobile technology and software/websites that instantaneously connect individuals (i.e. social network sites) via the internet. While there was no ‘new media’ in CEE in 1989, there has been an understandable rise in the study of the effects of individuals’ internet use on levels of political participation in recent years (Delli Carpini, 2000; Zúñiga, 2012; Baumgartner and Morris, 2010; Di Gennaro and Dutton, 2006; Ward et al., 2003; Zhang et al., 2010), emphasizing the causal precedence of social media (Boulianne, 2009; Jennings and Zeitner, 2003; Shah et al., 2002)³.

In the case of democratising countries, this has added to the ‘revolutionary’ promise of new media, particularly in regions that have been the focus of democratisation recently, such as the Arab World. As far as the role of social media in the 2011 Arab uprisings is concerned, scholars seem to adopt a dichotomous vision; either envisioning

² In LA, there is congruency to this. In Brazil and Mexico, media-intensive electoral campaigns provide information to low socio-economic-status citizens but fail to stimulate sufficient attention to politics among them (McCann and Lawson, 2006, for a similar study on Brazil and Peru, see Boas, 2005). Television news encourages party identification in the short run, although the development of television may weaken LA parties in the long run (Pérez-Liñán, 2002; see also Salzman and Aloisi, 2009).

³ Versus others who suggest an ambiguous or endogenous causal relationship (Lassen, 2005).

the 'revolutionary' role of social media in empowering people living in non-democratic societies or minimising its role (for a detailed review of both approaches see Comunello and Anzera, 2012; Joseph, 2012).

There exists a third approach that moves beyond the enthusiastic and the sceptical outlooks regarding the role of social media (i.e. contextualism) and uses comparative research to emphasise the impact that political, social, and economic variations have on the role of the social media in collective action (Wolfsfeld et al., 2013: 4). Here, social media are not likely to be interpreted as the 'main cause' of such complex processes, nor can they be seen as without any influence (Comunello and Anzera, 2012: 453).

Thus, generally, debates about the connection between social media and the Arab Spring suggest that, while social media can be effective in reshaping the public sphere and creating new forms of governance (e.g. Shirky, 2011; see also Etling et al., 2009, for the impact of social media on political and social organisation), they are not the cause of revolutions (e.g. Anderson, 2011; Papic and Noonan, 2011). This is reflected in the available empirical evidence which provides little support for claims about the significant impact of new media on the political protests that formed part of the Arab Spring (see Aday et al., 2012; Dajani, 2012).

The role of social media is thus seen to be facilitated by the presence of revolutionary conditions and the inability of the state apparatus to contain the revolutionary upsurge (Khamis et al., 2012). In fact, scholars note that a significant increase in the use of new media is much more likely to follow a significant amount of protest activity than to precede it (see Wolfsfeld et al., 2013). These outcomes are often drawn from comparative research on the role of social media in protests in Arab countries (e.g. Howard and Parks, 2012; see also Wolfsfeld et al., 2013 for a review).

Yet, there have been several attempts at systematising theoretical concerns and empirical research about the role of social media in political change. Some scholars suggest distinguishing between the internet as a *tool* for those seeking to bring about change from below, and the internet's role as a *space* where collective dissent can be articulated (see Aouragh and Alexander, 2011). Others have called for abandoning the technological deterministic framework and instead focusing on the complex interactions between society, technology, and political systems (Comunello and Anzera, 2012) as well as long-term social and cultural effects of internet and mobile phone use (Hofheinz, 2011). The nature of the political environment also affects both the *ability* of citizens to gain access to social media and their *motivation* to take to the streets (Wolfsfeld et al., 2013).

At this point, we move toward exploring the relationship between media reform and institutional change during democratisation periods, focusing on the contribution of media to institution building and democratic performance in Central and Eastern Europe as well as the relationship between political accountability and the accountability function of 'watchdog journalism' in Latin America.

MEDIA, INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE AND POLITICAL ACCOUNTABILITY

One of the main reasons why we focus on CEE countries when examining the roles of media in democratisation is that this region – or at least most of it – can be seen as representing a more or less ‘complete’ case of democratisation. We have witnessed the beginning, middle, and end of transition as many of the countries of this region have not only moved away from authoritarianism towards democracy but have succeeded in doing so (e.g. with membership of the European Union)⁴.

However, other regions seem to remain in a liminal state of soft transition from authoritarian regimes to democratic ones. Thus, Latin America (LA) offers a nuanced look at the role of media in political accountability which has traditionally been regarded as one of the most important functions of the press in a democratic society (Gurevitch and Blumler, 1990; Scammel and Semetko, 2000), this role “hinges on the combined actions of a network of institutions rather than on the solitary actions of one organization” (Waisbord, 2000: 229). However, even within these limits, the role of the press is indispensable in exposing facts and issues which either the state wants to keep secret or which involve corruption of public officials. Far from ascribing LA watchdog journalism an all-powerful status, Silvio Waisbord (2000) is nevertheless not nearly as pessimistic concerning its practical effects as many CEE media experts and journalists (Stetka and Örnebring, 2013).

Other scholars have shared this “cautiously optimistic” perspective about the impact of LA media on political accountability. According to Sheila Coronel, LA represents “perhaps the most instructive case” of the watchdog role of media, as it is “widely acknowledged that sustained investigative reporting on corruption, human rights violations and other forms of wrongdoing has helped build a culture of accountability in government and strengthened the fledgling democracies of the continent” (2003: 9). Catalina Smulovitz and Enrique Peruzzotti (2000) argue that “the state of accountability in Latin America is not as bleak as most of the literature would suggest”, since “in several LA countries, the media are playing a central role in exposing abuses and keeping governments in check” (Smulovitz and Peruzzotti, 2000: 154) not just by damaging the political capital and reputation of public officials but, subsequently, also by triggering “procedures in courts or oversight agencies that eventually lead to legal sanctions” (Smulovitz and Peruzzotti, 2000: 151).

The analysis conducted by Juliet Pinto (2008) in Argentina has, however, provided a notably more critical picture of the current state of watchdog journalism. She concluded that after two decades of being part of the mainstream, “watchdog press had lost its bite by 2005”, which, the author argues, was caused by the economic crisis as well as by the changing organizational culture of news media which favoured corporate interests (Pinto, 2008: 751). This trend of gradual diminishing and weakening of investigative journalism – never particularly strong to begin with, as it has been pointed out above – has been observed in many CEE countries as well, especially since the beginning of the economic

⁴ This certainly does not mean democratization is a linear process, or that the initial success of democratization cannot be reversed again, as shown e.g. in recent trends in Hungary (see Bajomi-Lazar, 2013).

crisis in 2007/2008 which has put news media organizations under unprecedented pressures and often resulted often in the trimming down of investigative departments (Rudusa, 2010; Salovaara and Juzefovics, 2012; Stetka and Örnebring, 2013). Such tendencies further underscore the necessity of examining the media's – and specifically journalism's – role in fostering the democratization process within the broader societal and economic frameworks of consolidating democracies.

The process of media liberalization from state- and party-control has been seen as the basic precondition for the media to become a proper forum for pluralistic public debate and to facilitate greater transparency and accountability in governance through quality news reporting (Norris, 2009). However, subsequent processes of commercialization and tabloidization of content which have quickly followed the growth of media markets in the newly democratizing countries have been viewed as obscuring and – at least partly – inhibiting the democratic roles that normative media theory has associated with the free press⁵. Based on the literature, one might plausibly argue that the contribution of the media to democratization might well be at its strongest during regime change – including mobilization against the old regime. In the later stages of democratic consolidation, media are often weakened as a result of market pressures and (newly emerging) political constraints.

Nevertheless, the above quoted examples of research from LA suggest that there is at least some evidence of an effective contribution of media to institutional change during the consolidation phases of democratization as well, particularly in enforcing political accountability through watchdog journalism, which is something that research from CEE has not (yet) been able to document. It is also possible, however, that the overwhelmingly sceptical assessment of the impact of media on the building and performance of democratic institutions in CEE, as demonstrated in the literature, might simply reflect the high normative expectations concerning media reform which was expected to replicate established Western models (Jakubowicz, 2006; Splichal, 2001). In this respect Peter Gross (2002) characterizes the evolution of media in CEE as “unperfect”, as opposed to the more common term “imperfect”, suggesting a possibility of further improvement until the envisaged “perfect” state is achieved. According to Gross, such a goal can never be accomplished, and should therefore not be used as a measure for the assessment of media's democratic performance (*ibid.*: 169).

NEW DIRECTIONS FOR THE STUDY OF MEDIA AND DEMOCRATISATION

Our examination here aims to compile an empirically-based understanding of the role of media in countries in transition. By aligning existing work and empirical evidence on this subject from a number of regions, and in relation to various democratisation processes, we argue that a state of the discipline for the study of media and democratisation is

⁵ Some scholars contend that the media, by being over-critical and excessively negative, may lead to political cynicism and the erosion of fragile governments that are struggling for legitimacy (Voltmer and Rownsley, 2009; see also Bennett, 1998).

difficult to outline. Here we point toward some of the reasons why this sub-field remains inchoate, we identify key limitations to theory-building, and propose some alternative paths of enquiry.

What we have sought to elicit here are generalizable findings that differentiate the study of media during periods of democratisation from the study of media in established democracies. We have also considered works that are characterized by a higher degree of nomotheticism (vs ideographic work) as they are more often indicative of a higher level of innovation and/or generalisability. The existing evidence points toward the conclusion that a sufficient basis for a theory of media and democratisation does not yet exist. There are a number of potential reasons for this and we offer an outline of these and potential means of addressing them.

First, scholars have different understandings of democratisation. The parameters of democratization are contested and vary: When does democratisation start? When does it end? What sufficiently indicates the completion of transition? Media scholars must confront the troublesome reality that elements of *both* democracy and authoritarianism may coexist in countries in transition. In this context, the simple and normative assumption of a positive relationship between changes in the quantity and quality of information sources (and the expansion of freedom of expression) and successful political socialization can be misleading. Investigations into media effects (at the individual level) may find the formation and change of individuals' attitudes a more fertile area of research as well as one that is more closely related to democratisation theory (Bennett and Iyengar, 2008, 2010; Holbert et al., 2010). At the same time, the current literature's focus on an exposure-effect framework (such as agenda-setting and priming) is an eventual investigative avenue in democratizing and transitional states.

Second, as we have seen in the cases discussed here, there appears to be less analytical coordination across democratizing regions than there is between individual regions and established democratic countries. That is, instead of identifying similarities across democratizing regions, researchers tend to attempt a confirmation of existing media theories which may or may not have a meaningful relevance to institutional or behavioural patterns in countries in transition and their citizens. We could transform this challenge into an opportunity by asking, 'what do we expect the media to do and can they reasonably achieve this?' Opportunities for researchers exist in the form of new data collection, inductive theorizing, and drawing together cultural knowledge to make sense of the role of media in fluid societies. For those prepared to do so, this sub-field offers the prospect of genuine comparative research that forces researchers to leave behind the narrow confines of well-established paradigms and venture into an unfamiliar – albeit exciting – theoretical territory.

This requires a break away from deductive approaches. We should stop thinking about the media in terms of static, traditional models which are inadequate for explaining the dynamic processes of democratisation. We may well need more inductive research that is *theory-generating* rather than *theory-testing*. To put this slightly differently,

there is a need to enhance our knowledge about the dynamics of media landscapes and media audiences in transitional contexts. Future studies need to enhance our understanding of how information-seeking behaviour and/or preferences for political information consumption are affected by rapid changes to political and information environments, and how audiences make sense of complex media transformations that accompany political transitions. This may require integrating theories of non-mechanical media effects and democratisation in order to shed light on the relationship between individuals' media behaviour and choices and the subsequent take-up of democratic values following regime changes. Therefore, future research should further explore media use, contextualise analyses that are conducted at various levels (cross-nationally or ideally with times series/panel data), and ensure that inductive, systematic, and investigative analysis takes precedence.

Third and finally, although we have restricted our investigation into mass media as the instigator (i.e. an independent variable), there is no limitation in thinking of mass media as merely following the change to democracy. The notion of the media as "adjuncts to the transition" rather than agents of change has been taken up by other authors, highlighting the interdependence of particular actors in the political process (Jakubowicz, 2006; Voltmer, 2006). Quoting Morris and Waisbord, Marta Dyczok summarizes that "there seems to be an emerging consensus on the fact that 'paradoxically, the media's ability to uphold democratic accountability eventually depends on the degree to which political institutions have adopted democratic structures and procedures'" (Morris and Waisbord, 2001, quoted in Dyczok, 2009: 32). Similarly, in CEE, Karol Jakubowicz talks about a model of "non-equivalent or asymmetrical interdependence" between socio-political factors and media systems in which social conditions, including social change, create conditions for or trigger media action to influence society (2006: 5, see also Jakubowicz, 2012).

CONCLUSIONS

In this article, we have explored what existing research can teach us about the role of media in the process of democratization, focusing on the dimensions of political socialization, behaviour and accountability, and drawing on examples from Central and Eastern Europe, Latin America, and the Middle East/North Africa. While our choice has admittedly been arbitrary, and we have deliberately excluded such important regions for the study of media and democratization as Asia or Africa, we believe our probe into the literature has given us sufficient insights to formulate some general comments about the state of this emerging sub-field, as well as to sketch some directions for future enquiry.

Whatever we know, or assume to know, about the roles of media in the process of democratisation today might be challenged in democratisation processes in the future, simply because of the velocity and scope of the transformation of digital media environments. It is quite probable that future democratic revolutions 'won't be televised', as the political impact of television will gradually subside in favour of the internet and social media, or even newer communication technologies yet to emerge. The greatest

challenge for research on media and democratisation might therefore be how to avoid the immersion in a conceptual framework that is inadequate for the given social and technological circumstances. Future research will certainly need to broaden its scope and incorporate analyses of non-institutionalised forms of communication, as well as civil society actors which thrive in the rhizomatic structure of cyberspace (e.g. WikiLeaks, Anonymous, etc.), challenging not only traditional modes of communication but ultimately also the notion of the process of democratisation as such.

Margaret Scammell and Holli Semetko have reminded us of two things: “first, the central importance of media for democracy is [...] virtually axiomatic [and] second, the model of democracy which media are supposed to serve is also largely taken for granted” (Scammell and Semetko, 2000: xi–xii). Although formulated fifteen years ago, this observation seems still valid today in the face of most of the research we have surveyed in this article. The potential sub-field of mass media and democratisation may (finally) offer an occasion for us to confront these foundational assumptions by unmooring both democratic and mass media institutions from their rigid and fixed normative locations. If we instead take into account that the two do not so easily – and inevitably – coordinate, we may begin to unpack the complexities that lie at the heart of this area of study.

References

- >Aday, Sean, Farrell, Henry, Lynch, Marc, Sides, John and Freelon, Deen (2012) *New Media and Conflict After the Arab Spring*. Washington: United States Institute of Peace. <http://www.usip.org/files/resources/PW80.pdf> (02.03.2015).
- >Almond, Gabriel and Verba, Sidney (1963) *The Civic Culture: Political Attitudes and Democracy in Five Nations*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- >Anderson, Lisa (2011) Demystifying the Arab Spring. *Foreign Affairs* 90 (3): 2–16.
- >Aouragh, Miriyam and Alexander, Anne (2011) The Egyptian Experience: Sense and Nonsense of the Internet Revolution. *International Journal of Communication* 5: 1344–1358.
- >Bajomi-Lázár, Peter (2013) The Party Colonisation of the Media The Case of Hungary. *East European Politics & Societies* 27 (1): 69–89.
- >Baumgartner, Jody and Morris, Jonathan (2010) MyFaceTube Politics: Social Networking Websites and Political Engagement of Young Adults. *Social Science Computer Review* 28 (1): 24–44.
- >Bennett, Lance (1998) The Media and Democratic Development: The Social Basis of Political Communication, pp. 195–205 in O’Neil, Patrick H. (ed.) *Communicating Democracy: The Media and Political Transitions*. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- >Bennett, Lance W. and Iyengar, Shanto (2008) A New Era of Minimal Effects? The Changing Foundations of Political Communication. *Journal of Communication* 58 (4): 707–731.
- >Bennett, Lance W. and Iyengar, Shanto (2010) The Shifting Foundations of Political Communication: Responding to a Defense of the Media Effects Paradigm. *Journal of Communication* 60 (1): 35–39.
- >Berman, Jerry and Witzner, Daniel (1997) Technology and Democracy. *Social Research* 64 (3): 1313.
- Boas, Taylor C. (2005) Television and Neopopulism in Latin America: Media Effects in Brazil and Peru. *Latin American Research Review* 40 (2): 27–49.
- >Boulianne, Shelley (2009) Does Internet Use Affect Engagement? A Meta-Analysis of Research. *Political Communication* 26 (2): 193–211.
- >Comunello, Francesca and Anzera, Giuseppe (2012) Will the Revolution be Tweeted? A Conceptual Framework for Understanding the Social Media and the Arab Spring. *Islam and Christian–Muslim Relations* 23 (4): 453–470.

- >Coronel, Sheila (2003) *The Role of the Media in Deepening Democracy*. United Nations Online Network in Public Administration and Finance. <http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/un/unpan010194.pdf> (05.07.2013).
- >Dahl, Robert A. (1989) *Democracy and its Critics*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- >Dajani, Nabil (2012) Technology Cannot a Revolution Make: Nas-book not Facebook. *Arab Media and Society* 2012 (15). <http://www.arabmediasociety.com/?article=782> (05.03.2015).
- >Delli Carpini, Michael (2000) Gen.com: Youth Civic Engagement, and the New Information Environment. *Political Communication* 17 (4): 341–349.
- >Di Gennaro, Corrina and Dutton, William (2006) The Internet and the Public: Online and Offline Political Participation in the United Kingdom. *Parliamentary Affairs* 59 (2): 299–313.
- >Dyczok, Marta (2009) Do the Media Matter? Focus on Ukraine, pp. 17–42 in Dyczok, Marta and Gaman-Golutvina, Oxana (eds) *Media, Democracy and Freedom: The Post-Communist Experience*. Germany: Peter Lang.
- >Etling, Bruce, Faris, Rob and Palfrey, John (2009) Mapping the Arabic Blogosphere. *New Media and Society* 12 (8): 1225–1243.
- >Ghareeb, Edmund (2000) New Media and the Information Revolution in the Arab World: An Assessment. *Middle East Journal* 54 (3): 395–418.
- >Gross, Peter (2002) *Entangled Evolutions: Media and Democratization in Eastern Europe*. Washington, DC and Baltimore: Woodrow Wilson Center Press and Johns Hopkins University Press.
- >Gurevitch, Michael and Blumler, Jay (1990) Political Communication Systems and Democratic Values, pp. 269–289 in Judith Lichtenberg (ed.) *Democracy and the Mass Media*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- >Hackett, Robert A. and Yuezhi, Zhao (eds) (2005) *Democratizing Global Media: One World, Many Struggles*. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman and Littlefield.
- >Hofheinz, Albrecht (2011) Nextopia? Beyond Revolution 2.01. *International Journal of Communication* 5: 1417–1434.
- >Holbert, Lance R., Garrett, Kelly and Gleason, Laurel S. (2010) A New Era of Minimal Effects? A Response to Bennett and Iyengar. *Journal of Communication* 60 (1): 15–34.
- >Howard, Philip and Parks, Malcolm (2012) Social Media and Political Change: Capacity, Constraint, and Consequence. *Journal of Communication* 62 (2): 359–362.
- >Huntington, Samuel (1991) *The Third Wave: Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.
- >Jakubowicz, Karol (2006) *Rude Awakening: Social and Media Change in Central and Eastern Europe*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press.
- >Jakubowicz, Karol (2012) Post-Communist Political Systems and Media Freedom and Independence, pp. 15–40 in John Downey and Sabina Mihelj (eds) *Central and Eastern European Media in Comparative Perspective: Politics, Economy and Culture*. Farnham, Burlington: Ashgate.
- >Jennings, Kent M. and Zeitner, Vicki (2003) Internet Use and Civic Engagement: A Longitudinal Analysis. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 67 (3): 311–334.
- >Joseph, Sarah (2012) Social Media, Human Rights and Political Change. *Boston College International & Comparative Law Review* 35 (1): 145–188.
- >Holger Lutz, Kern and Hainmueller, Jens (2009) Opium for the Masses: How Foreign Media Can Stabilize Authoritarian Regimes. *Political Analysis* 17 (4): 377–399.
- >Holger Lutz, Kern (2011) Foreign Media and Protest Diffusion in Authoritarian Regimes: The Case of the 1989 East German Revolution. *Comparative Political Studies* 44 (9): 1179–1205.
- >Khamis, Sahar and Vaughn, Katherine (2012) "We Are All Khaled Said": The Potentials and Limitations of Cyberactivism in Triggering Public Mobilization and Promoting Political Change. *Journal of Arab and Muslim Media Research* 4 (2–3): 145–163.
- >Khamis, Sahar, Gold, Paul B. and Vaughn, Katherine (2012) Beyond Egypt's "Facebook Revolution" and Syria's "YouTube Uprising": Comparing Political Contexts, Actors and Communication Strategies. *Arab Media and Society* 15 (2012). <http://www.arabmediasociety.com/?article=791> (11.05.2015).

- >Lassen, David Dreyer (2005) The Effect of Information on Voter Turnout: Evidence from a Natural Experiment. *American Journal of Political Science* 49 (1): 103–118.
- >Lerner, Daniel (1958) *The Passing of Traditional Society: Modernizing the Middle East*. Glencoe: Free Press of Glencoe.
- >Loveless, Matthew (2008) Media Dependency: Mass Media as Sources of Information in Democratizing Countries. *Democratization* 15 (1): 162–183.
- >Loveless, Matthew (2009) The Theory of International Media Diffusion: Political Socialization and International Media in Transitional Democracies. *Studies in Comparative International Development* 44 (2): 118–136.
- >Loveless, Matthew (2010) Understanding Media Socialization in Democratizing Countries: Mobilization and Malaise in Central and Eastern Europe. *Comparative Politics* 42 (4): 457–474.
- >McCann, James A. and Lawson, Chappell (2006) Presidential Campaigns and the Knowledge Gap in Three Transitional Democracies. *Political Research Quarterly* 59 (1): 13–22.
- >McCombs, Maxwell C. and Shaw, Donald (1972) The Agenda Setting Function of the Mass Media. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 36 (2): 176–187.
- >McQuail, Denis (2005) *McQuail's Mass Communication Theory*. London, Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- >Mutz, Diana C. (1992) Mass Media and the Depoliticization of Personal Experience. *American Journal of Political Science* 36 (2): 483–508.
- >Morris, Nancy and Waisbor, Silvio (2001) *Media and Globalization: Why the State Matters*. Lanham: Rowan & Littlefield Publishers.
- >Newton, Kenneth (1999) Mass Media Effects: Mobilization or Media Malaise? *British Journal of Political Science* 29 (4): 577–599.
- >Norris, Pippa (1997) Political Communications, in Dunleavy, Patrick, Gamble, Andrew, Holliday, Ian and Peele, Gillian (eds) *Developments in British Politics*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- >Norris, Pippa (2000) *A Virtuous Circle: Political Communications in Post-Industrial Societies*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- >Norris, Pippa (2009) Comparative Political Communications: Common Frameworks or Babelian Confusion? *Government and Opposition* 44 (3): 321–340.
- >Papić, Marko and Noonan, Sean (2011) Social Media as a Tool for Protest. <http://www.stratfor.com/weekly/20110202-social-media-tool-protest> (24.02.2013).
- >Pérez-Liñán, Anibal (2002) Television News and Political Partisanship in Latin America. *Political Research Quarterly* 55 (3): 571–588.
- >Pinto, Juliet (2008) Muzzling the Watchdog: The Case of Disappearing Watchdog Journalism from Argentine Mainstream News. *Journalism* 9 (6): 750–774.
- >Putnam, Robert (1993) *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- >Putnam, Robert (2000) *Bowling Alone*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- >Rudusa, Rita (2010) *Footprint of Financial Crisis in the Media*. Open Society Institute Media Programme. http://www.opensocietyfoundations.org/sites/default/files/aa-overview-20091201_0.pdf (20.03.2015).
- >Salovaara, Inka and Juzefovics, Janis (2012) Who pays for good journalism? Accountability journalism and media ownership in the Central and Eastern European countries. *Journalism Studies* 13 (5–6): 763–774.
- >Salzman, Ryan and Aloisi, Rosa (2009) News Media Consumption and Political Participation in Central America: Causation and Explanation. *Journal of Spanish Language Media* 2: 46–75.
- >Scammell, Margaret and Semetko, Holli (eds) (2000) Introduction, pp. iv–xxii in *The Media, Journalism and Democracy*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- >Schmitt-Beck, Rüdiger (1998) Of Readers, Viewers, and Cat-Dogs, pp. 222–246 in van Deth, Jan W. (ed.) *Comparative Politics: The Problem of Equivalence*. London, New York: Routledge.
- >Schmitter, Philippe C. and Terry Lynn, Karl (1991) What Democracy is ... and is Not. *Journal of Democracy* 2 (3): 75–88.

- >Semetko, Holli A. and Valkenburg, Patti M. (1998) The Impact of Attentiveness on Political Efficacy: Evidence from a Three-Year German Panel Study. *International Journal of Public Opinion Research* 10 (3): 195–210.
- >Shah, Dhavan, Schmierbach, Michael, Hawkins, Joshua, Espino, Rodolf and Donavan, Janet (2002) Nonrecursive Models of Internet Use and Community Engagement: Questioning Whether Time Spent Online Erodes Social Capital. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly* 79 (4): 964–987.
- >Shirky, Clay (2011) The Political Power of Social Media: Technology, the Public Sphere, and Political Change. *Foreign Affairs* 90 (1): 28–41. <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/2010-12-20/political-power-social-media> (22.02.2013).
- >Smulovitz, Catalina and Peruzzotti, Enrique (2000) Societal Accountability in Latin America. *Journal of Democracy* 11 (4): 147–158.
- >Splichal, Slavko (2001) Imitative Revolutions: Changes in the Media and Journalism in East-Central Europe. *Javnost/The Public* 8 (4): 31–58.
- >Stetka, Vaclav and Örnebring, Henrik (2013) Investigative Journalism in Central and Eastern Europe: Autonomy, Business Models, and Democratic Roles. *The International Journal of Press/Politics* 18 (4): 413–435.
- >Voltmer, Katrin (ed.) (2006) *Mass Media and Political Communication in New Democracies*. Abingdon, New York: Routledge.
- >Voltmer, Katrin and Rowsley, Gary (2009) The Media, pp. 234–248 in Haerpfer, Christian W., Bernhagen, Patrick, Inglehart, Ronald W. and Welzel, Christian (eds) *Democratization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- >Voltmer, Katrin and Schmitt-Beck, Rüdiger (2006) New Democracies without Citizens? Mass Media and Democratic Orientations – a Four Country Comparison, pp. 228–245 in Voltmer, Katrin (ed.) *Mass Media and Political Communication in New Democracies*. Abingdon, New York: Routledge.
- >Waisbord, Silvio R. (2000) *Watchdog Journalism in South America: News, Accountability, and Democracy*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- >Ward, Stephen, Gibson, Rachel and Lusoli, Wainer (2003) Online Participation and Mobilisation in Britain: Hype, Hope and Reality. *Parliamentary Affairs* 56 (4): 652–668.
- >Whitehead, Laurence (2002) *Democratization: Theory and Practice*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- >Wolfsfeld, Gadi, Segev, Elad and Sheaffer, Tamir (2013) Social Media and the Arab Spring: Politics Comes First. *International Journal of Press/Politics* 18 (2): 115–137.
- >Zaller, John (1992) *The Nature and Origins of Mass Opinion*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- >Zhang, Weiwu, Johnson, Thomas J., Seltzer, Trent and Bichard, Shannon L. (2010) The Revolution will be Networked: The Influence of Social Networking Sites on Political Attitudes and Behavior. *Social Science Computer Review* 28 (1): 75–92.
- >Zúñiga, Homero Gil de (2012) Social Media Use for News and Individuals' Social Capital, Civic Engagement and Political Participation. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 17 (3): 319–336.

MEDIJI I DEMOKRATIZACIJA: IZAZOVI S KOJIMA SE SUSREĆE POTPODRUČJE U NASTAJANJU

Nael Jebriil :: Matthew Loveless :: Vaclav Stetka

SAŽETAK *Ovaj članak nastoji prikazati na istraživanju utemeljeno razumijevanje uloge medija u tranzicijskim zemljama. Naše se istraživanje fokusira na procese političke socijalizacije, na političko ponašanje i vjerodostojnost te daje primjere iz triju regija: središnje i istočne Europe, Latinske Amerike te Bliskog istoka i sjeverne Afrike. Pozornost smo skrenuli na neke od glavnih radova relevantnih za studije masovnih medija u tranzicijskom kontekstu s ciljem uvida u važne teorije dostupne u studijama o medijima i demokratizaciji. Svjesni ograničenja koja postavlja priroda i opseg uzorka pregledanih studija, identificirali smo i raspravili neke od potencijalnih ključnih prepreka razvoju teorije o političkoj socijalizaciji, političkom ponašanju i vjerodostojnosti u navedenim područjima te predložili alternativne pristupe u istraživanju.*

KLJUČNE RIJEČI

DEMOKRATIZACIJA, TRANZICIJA, POLITIČKA SOCIJALIZACIJA, VJERODOSTOJNOST, NOVI MEDIJI

Bilješka o autorima

Nael Jebriil :: Sveučilište Bournemouth, The Media School, Ujedinjeno Kraljevstvo ::
njebril@bournemouth.ac.uk

Matthew Loveless :: Sveučilište u Kentu, School of Politics and International Relations,
Ujedinjeno Kraljevstvo :: M.Loveless@kent.ac.uk

Vaclav Stetka :: Karlovo sveučilište u Pragu, Fakultet društvenih znanosti, Češka ::
stetka@fsv.cuni.cz