

Maria WĄSICKA

Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań

Politicisation of the Polish media or mediatisation of Polish politics?

Where the worlds of the media and politics permeate

Introduction

All elements that form and build the modern world have an impact not only on the living and functioning society, but also on each other. Numerous relations among these elements could not be thoroughly understood if it was not for a systemic approach, which in the broadest sense is known as social system. This system is composed of numerous and mutually interacting subsystems, such as political, economic, and cultural (Dobek-Ostrowska, 2011, p. 92), and the media subsystem, which nowadays is of great importance. The relations among them are complex and result from the different tasks that have been assigned to these subsystems. Today, however, it is the relations between the political and the media systems that are the most turbulent and attention-grabbing. Mutual relations that exist between the media and politics sometimes resemble the struggle waged in order to prove the superiority and dominance of one of these worlds over the other, which gives rise to the following question: Which of these two is actually superior?

Observation of the world around us and the formation of relationships and dependencies which exist between the mass media, which should be deemed unbiased, independent and self-contained, and politics make one pose the question as to whether we are now dealing with the politicisation of the Polish media defined as “attempts of the realm of politics to dominate the media and use it to pursue their own, often purely partisan objectives” (Oniszczyk, 2011, p. 18) or with the mediatisation of Polish politics treated as “the process of imposing rules and logic that is typical of mass communication on the political system” (Oniszczyk, 2011, p. 14). In other words, who can exert greater influence – politics or the media? Such questions are legitimate since treating, and referring to, the media as the fourth

estate has become widespread and is currently occupying the public discourse, which in a way provides grounds for equating the position of the media and politics.

The problem

The purpose of this article is to attempt to answer the above-mentioned questions through outlining the origin and evolution of the relationships between the mass media and politics, and then through providing a detailed examination of these relations in the Polish context, which will be further supported by concrete examples. This will be shown based on separate levels on which, in the author's opinion, these worlds collide. These levels were isolated in a twofold fashion. When analysing the relationships from the perspective of politics and how it shapes the media, it was recognised that the strongest influence on the media occurs through legislation and media regulatory and supervisory bodies. In contrast, looking at the relationship from the perspective of the media and how they shape politics, it was assumed that the agenda-setting theory and personal dependencies and preferences existing between politicians and esteemed journalists are the biggest strengths of the media.

The mass media as the fourth estate

The mass media and politics are two spheres whose mutual relations have undergone numerous transformations. Initially, these two spheres existed independently, without interfering in the other's activities, which could be explained by a strong and well-established position that politicians once had and the fact that the mass media were just emerging at that time and therefore had little significance. Then the activity of the media "was inextricably linked with state governance [...], but in the twentieth century, with the development of modern liberal democracies, the media have become an integral part of politics, sometimes even fostering it" (Zurawski, 2010, p. 18), thereby becoming the subject of much interest. Referring to the media as the fourth estate shows that they hold a very strong position and makes them stand on an equal footing with the other three types of power. "The term 'fourth estate' is a neat, evocative slogan which is widely known in Poland and which is often cited in the public dis-

course” (Pisarek, 1995, p. 152). It has become a household name and has been used both by journalists in all news reports and politicians of different parties in their statements. However, despite being commonplace, it is not always accepted by everybody. It has been questioned by those pointing to the classic Montesquieu’s separation of powers into systemic, formal and legal understanding of governance, because “in the formal and legal sense the media have no power. In fact, they possess no political or economic power; nor do they have any form of legalised coercion or are able to enforce a specific behaviour. And they have no clearly dominant position in relation to the audience” (Dobek-Ostrowska, 2004a, p. 141). The media thus fail to meet the criteria for being called ‘an estate’ (Antoszewski, Herbut, 2004, p. 488–490). So if it is not a coincidence that the media are not a power *per se*, but are nevertheless referred to as such, it is worthwhile to consider how this metaphor has come into being and how it should be understood. Certainly it is appropriate to refer to the research on the influence of the media which has been in progress since the 1920s and which set out from the theory of the all-powerful media to continue by emphasising their moderate, often marginal significance, to finally arrive at the conclusion that the media actually have a strong impact on the society, yet the impact is not uncritical or boundless. In the legal sense, the media are not and never will be a power, but in a metaphorical sense they are seen as one of the main driving forces in a democratic system. Although they possess no mechanisms such as the true powers do, their power is paradoxically ensured by the same politicians who “adapt to the media, as these have become necessary for them” (Street, 2006, p. 2), and the power of the media in turn is manifested in that they “determine the fate of politicians and political aims as well as influence governments and electorates. They should therefore be classified as political institutions, along with parliaments, executive and administrative powers and political parties” (Street, 2006, p. 197). The power of the media comes down to the fact that it is them who have a real impact on the attitudes, behaviours and opinions of the society. This is what their power is all about and this is what makes them the fourth estate.

The aim of introducing the separation of powers is to ensure the separation on both personal and functional levels, which is to guarantee equality, independence, supervision and containment of entities exercising their assigned authority. Each authority has to fulfil certain tasks, both towards the society and other authorities. Although, as has already been demonstrated above, the mass media do not constitute formal authority and should not be put on a par with the legislative, executive or judicial powers, which are the

backbone of a democratic system, one must agree that they have become a powerful force now and treating them as merely symbolic power will not change the fact that they do have a real influence on the shaping of public opinion. Therefore, the political system has the obligation towards the mass media to fulfil particular functions. In a democratic system, the political system must ensure the freedom of the mass media, their pluralism and independence from any influence, be it economic or political, to which end the relevant provisions of law and an independent state authority which supervises the media serve best. It is all derivative understanding of the term 'democracy', because it is "the idea of a free democracy that is inextricably linked to the four principles: the division of power, change of government, political equality and freedom of the press" (Schultz, 1995, p. 65). The mass media are also obliged to carry out certain functions, such as: the informative function, namely "to provide citizens with current and important news events, situations, problems and phenomena occurring in viewers' local and global environment" (Dobek-Ostrowska, 2009, p. 74); the educational function, namely: "the media should analyse events and issues, educate citizens, explain the intricacies of the political processes and indicate the importance of facts" (Dobek-Ostrowska, 2009, 75); the function of a public debate platform enabling the confrontation of various visions and views; the watchdog function which "is to publicise the events and issues pertaining to, and activities of, institutions and members of the ruling elite and to monitor and observe politicians' actions" (Dobek-Ostrowska, 2009, p. 76), on the basis of which we refer to the media as the fourth estate that supervises and contains the actions of authorities. In addition, it should be stressed that the media also serve the function of "advertising" politicians, political parties and their views and finally, by "presenting political arguments and beliefs of all political actors, civil society organisations, minorities and other groups", the media perform the role of their advocate. The emergence of the above-mentioned functions determines and enforces the formation of the levels on which the media and politics cooperate and confront each other in order to carry out their tasks.

Politics and the media

There is no doubt that the greatest influence of politics on the mass media is manifested in legislation and the creation of a state institution which is responsible for monitoring and ensuring proper functioning of the media.

Polish media legislation

Among the Polish legal regulations which in their entirety deal with various aspects of social communication, the act to be described as the first is the Act of 26 January 1984 – the Press Law and the Broadcasting Act of 29 December 1992.

The Press Law was enacted already in the previous political system and has since been repeatedly amended and adapted to reflect the changing reality. It regulates the activities of the press, explaining basic concepts such as ‘newspaper’, ‘journal’ and ‘magazine’, and defines the responsibilities of journalists. However, the most important piece of legislation is the Broadcasting Act enacted on 29 December 1992. This act sets out the responsibilities of the electronic mass media. It specifies the rules for creating programmes for broadcast, the rules for placing advertisements and conditions to be met in order to obtain a broadcasting license by commercial radio and television channels. It further created Polish public television in the form of *Telewizja Polska S.A* (a joint-stock company – JSC), and Polish public radio – *Polskie Radio S.A.* (JSC). The Act also established the institution regulating and controlling the functioning of the media in the Polish media system – the National Broadcasting Council “as an authority that is competent in matters of broadcasting” (Act of 29 December 1992).

These regulations deal directly with the media, but provisions relating to and affecting the operation of the means of social communication have also been included in the most important legal document – the Constitution of the Republic of Poland adopted on 2 April 1997. Various articles of the Constitution include provisions directly or indirectly related to the media. For instance, Article 14 from Chapter 1 of the Constitution that outlines all the guiding principles of a democratic state states that “the Republic of Poland shall ensure freedom of the press and other mass media” (Constitution of the Republic of Poland of 2 April 1997), emphasising the importance and significance of the existence of free media in democratic Poland. Additionally, Article 54 Paragraph 1 guarantees the right to freedom of speech in terms of social communication – “Everyone shall have the freedom to express their opinions and to receive and impart information”. Similarly, Article 54 Paragraph 2 states that “Preventive censorship of the means of social communication and the licensing of the press are prohibited. The law may require the receipt of a license to operate a radio or television channel” (Constitution of the Republic of Po-

land of 2 April 1997). Yet another article of the Constitution, namely Article 61 Paragraph 1, also stipulates that “citizens shall have the right to obtain information about the activities of public authorities and persons performing public functions. This right also includes obtaining information about the activities of local economic and professional self-governments as well as other persons or organisational units to the extent that they perform the duties of public authorities and manage communal assets or property of the State Treasury” (Constitution of the Republic of Poland of 2 April 1997). Thus, this article highlights the need for proper regulation and functioning of the media sphere, which is obliged to inform citizens about the activities of the representatives of society. By contrast, Articles 213–215 of Chapter 9 of the Constitution called the Authorities of the State Control and the Protection of Rights legitimise the existence of the regulator – the National Broadcasting Council, whose mission is to “protect the freedom of expression, right to information and the public interest in broadcasting” (Constitution of the Republic of Poland of 2 April 1997). What follows from this provision is that the body which regulates and controls the Polish media is recognised as a constitutional body, which on the one hand is beneficial because it emphasises the role that the Polish media are to perform, but on the other hand it reinforces and strengthens the relationships that exist between the National Broadcasting Council and politics and, more precisely, the particular political party being in power.

Individual articles of the Election Code of 5 January 2011 contained in Chapter 13 – the Election Campaign in Radio and Television Programmes (Articles 117–122) also describe the nature and significance of the media in political communication. These articles require public radio and television broadcasters to provide free broadcasting of election programmes provided by all registered electoral committees and impose on the national Polish television “the obligation to carry out debates between representatives of the electoral committees which registered their lists of candidates in all constituencies in parliamentary elections or in elections to the European Parliament in the Republic of Poland, and in the case of presidential elections – between the candidates” (Act of 5 January 2011). It is extremely important at this point to draw attention to the fact that these requirements apply solely to public media, thereby clearly revealing a different approach that legislators have to public and commercial broadcasters. It results from the diverse types of media ownership. The rules governing public media have been regulated in detail in the above-cited Broadcasting Act. This type of broadcaster is the property of the State

Treasury and the whole society. Consequently, it was entrusted to carry out the public mission that has been boiled down to creating and broadcasting a variety of programmes both in the native language as well as in a foreign language, cultivating and popularising knowledge of the Polish language, technical and technological modernisation, and promoting Polish achievements in the field of sports, culture and science (Act of 29 December 1992). In contrast, since it is political parties that appoint the members of the National Broadcasting Council as well as supervisory, management and public media boards, these positions are filled by the loyal and trusted. The matters are quite different in the case of commercial broadcasters – private owners not responsible for the public mission. The provisions of the broadcasting law only impose the need to obtain a broadcasting license on the media of this type. That is all the influence that politics exerts on commercial media.

The controller and regulator of the Polish media – National Broadcasting Council

The National Broadcasting Council, which has often been mentioned here, was to be an institution free and independent from any influence, especially political. Due to the complete subordination of the media to the government at the time of the Peoples' Republic of Poland, it was repeatedly stressed, after the Republic of Poland had won independence that it was necessary to rebuild democracy with the help of an independent authority that would govern the Polish media system. Such at least were the original plans, which ultimately had to be confronted with the reality. For one thing, the need to ensure the independence and smooth functioning of the Council was often reiterated, and for another, politicians wanted to maintain some kind of influence on the functioning of the media regulator. This dilemma arose already at the time of establishing the Council and is present to this day. Although "the very Act clearly stresses the apolitical characteristics of the National Broadcasting Council, which apparently stemmed from the intention of the legislator" (Killias, 2000, p. 370), such as the appointment of the members of the Council by separate state authorities – the Sejm, the Senate and the President, the appointment of the chairman of the Council by its members, the requirement on the appointing bodies to issue three negative reviews of the report submitted by the regulator of the media in order to shorten the tenure of the members, and the

prohibition of holding the position of a member of the Council along that of a deputy or senator, the politicians' interpretation of the adopted solutions does not allow a completely independent functioning of the National Broadcasting Council. This follows from the fact that the persons serving on the Council determine the composition of the public media's boards. This ability of the media regulator is understood by the politicians who are interested in winning over both the Council and the broadcaster, because they realise that the media influence the attitudes and behaviours of viewers and listeners who are also the voters.

Two phenomena corroborate the thesis that the interest of politicians in the National Broadcasting Council has not waned.

The first one dates back to the initial period of the Council's existence and spans the period from its official formation in 1993 to the adoption of the amendment to the Broadcasting Act in 1995. The newly formed body was dependant on the then President – Lech Wałęsa. The president made no secret that both the media and the Council should be favourable to him (Markiewicz, 1994, p. 51). The lack of subordination of chairmen of the Council resulted in that, within two years, the President abused his rights and appointed and dismissed chairmen of the Council four times. This gave rise to the amendment to the Broadcasting Act on 29 June 1995 (the Act of 29 June 1995) which limited the powers of the head of state by entrusting the Council with the appointment of the chairman.

The second example comes from 2005, when *Prawo i Sprawiedliwość* [*Law and Justice*] came to power. At that time the Broadcasting Act was significantly amended. It had been the biggest change since 1992 as it reduced the number of members of the Council, abolished the principle of members' rotation which had previously been recognised as one of the most important features guaranteeing the independence of the body, reauthorised the President to appoint and dismiss the chairmen of the Council, and terminated the term of office of the current members of the Council. All of these changes were aimed to completely subordinate the Council and the public media by appointing the "right" people to the Boards of these institutions.

The media and politics

When looking at the relationships between the media and politics from the media's perspective, one needs to address some critical issues. If politicians are so keen on subduing the media, then their actions must be based

on the power they see in the media. The level on which the worlds of the media and politics confront each other and where the media seem to have a greater impact on politics than vice versa is in line with the agenda-setting theory and universal access of mass media to a wide audience as well as the relations between journalists, who are perceived as the representatives of society, and politicians.

The theory of agenda setting

The three sources of the power of the media were defined by Jay G. Blumler and Michael Gurevitch (1995, p. 12–13); these are: access to unlimited audience, credibility and trust enjoyed by the media, and the role of the media in ensuring the legitimacy of various competing political camps. With these elements, the media have the power to create events, select information and decide what is important and worth showing and what is not worthy of attention. Thus, they are able to set the agenda, which means that “the media are able to determine the list of the most important events” (Dobek-Ostrowska, 2004b, p. 61). This, in turn, means that despite the fact that “the mass media rarely determine the opinions of viewers and listeners, they have a huge impact on what audiences are thinking about” (Dobek-Ostrowska, 2004b, 61). It is their strength that is interesting and attractive for politicians, because “the main goal of political parties, leaders and candidates is gaining and maintaining power. In this context the mass media are perceived by politicians as one of the best and most effective marketing tools and means of communication that allow them to achieve their goal. For this reason, political actors so deeply desire to subordinate the mass media” (Dobek-Ostrowska, 2011, p. 164).

The relationship between journalists and politicians

People employed in the media are also a factor in the power of the mass media. Journalists and reporters are available to the public, they build relationships with the viewers and listeners, appear to care about the public interest and take the side of ordinary folks. Numerous studies have shown that the public perceive journalists and reporters as inquisitive, honest, reliable, impartial and objective (Strzeszewski, 2002; Omyłka-Rudzka, 2012), which is reflected in the peoples' trust. That is how they have ac-

quired the power to influence the audience. This has been equally recognised by the very same journalists as well as politicians. And although both professions should be clearly separated from each other in order not to create doubts and suspicions of bias and dependency, the line between them has become blurry, and this is increasingly noticeable. An example of such ever so close relations between journalists and politicians was an article by the deputy director of the Polish national television channel 1, *TVPI*, Stanisław Janecki, which was published in 2010 (Wąsicka, 2013, p. 303) in a tabloid called “Fakt. Gazeta Codzienna” entitled “Kaczyński must win”, in which the director provided a detailed list of reasons why Jarosław Kaczyński should be the new President of the Republic of Poland, indicating that the President of *Law and Justice* “is the most experienced politician currently active on the Polish scene. He probably had the greatest influence on the shape of free Poland also as Prime Minister. [...] He has been an independent politician. This cannot be said not only about Bronisław Komorowski, but also about Donald Tusk. [...] Jarosław Kaczyński is a brave politician, [...] a statesman, [...] a political animal. Not only does it mean that he devoted his entire adult life to politics, but he also knows and understands the underlying mechanisms governing the world of politics. In Poland we have a lot of accidental politicians. [...] The commonly elected president cannot be a product of marketing, a loser, a puppet or always a runner-up, always in shadow. In this respect Kaczyński beats Komorowski hands down” (Janecki, 2010). Other examples include Aleksandra Jakubowska (A biographical entry on Alexandra Jakubowska, no year indicated), a journalist of *TVPI*’s news programme “Wiadomości”, or Wiesław Walendziak (A biographical entry on Wiesław Walendziak, no year indicated) – Chairman of the Board of *TVP*, who made political careers already in the 1990s, and confirm how easy it is to take advantage of the trust and popularity gained in the media and transform it into a political career. A newscaster and journalist Tomasz Lis did not seize such an opportunity, although in 2004 he was ranked by the Polish edition of “Newsweek” as a serious presidential candidate to take part in the upcoming elections (Stasiuk-Krajewska, 2007, p. 91–105).

The above examples of journalists and their involvement in politics, about which they should write and speak following the principles of journalistic ethics, confirm the existence of a very thin line between journalism and politics. Therefore, there is no doubt that the relations between journalism and politics influence society’s perception of particular politicians.

Conclusion

Two issues need to be emphasised when recalling the objective that underlies this article, i.e. the search for answers to these questions: Are we currently dealing with the politicising of the Polish media or the mediatisation of Polish politics? In other words, who has greater power – politics or the media?

When taking a general look at the media and politics one may say that both these spheres impact each other to a comparable extent because “the political system needs the legitimacy of its actions, which the mass media can provide by delivering and explaining policy decisions, and by informing the political system about their reception in the eyes of the public, and about the needs and expectations of the public as well as social reality; by the same token the mass media need information, i.e. content. The primary providers of political messages are the government, the parliament, the institutions of political power as well as political parties and organisations” (Dobek-Ostrowska, 2004a, p. 109–110). Therefore, one can talk about the mediatisation of politics and about the politicisation of the media.

Polish political system ensures the existence of the mass media which are free, pluralistic and independent from economic and political power through the Constitution, the Election Code, the Press Law and the Broadcasting Act, and in this way fulfils the requirements of a democratic system. On the other hand, however, the legal provisions regarding the media supervisory body, i.e. the National Broadcasting Council, whose members are appointed and dismissed by the legislative power and the President of Poland, and which therefore relies on politicians currently being in power, which determines the leadership of the public media, and which shapes the form and content of programmes broadcast by public media through its regulations on the air time allocated to broadcast election advertisements free of charge, procedures regulating the air time allocation, the scope and methods of recording and airing election advertisements on public TV and radio (Regulation of the National Broadcasting Council of 6 September 2011), and through detailed regulations on the debates conducted by Telewizja Polska S.A (Regulation of the National Broadcasting Council of 6 July 2011) as well as on the presentation of the opinions of political parties, trade unions and employer organisations in essential public matters on public TV and radio (Regulation of the National Broadcasting Council of 21 February 2012). Doing so, the Council adapts programmes to the currently prevailing trend, that is, to those currently in power. It further-

more binds and promotes closer relations between the public media and politics and the subordination of the media to the party in power.

In contrast, due to selective treatment of information, and thus, to deciding what is conveyed to an unlimited audience as well as thanks to journalists, who should be responsible for their words, for impartial observation of the surrounding world and reliable provision of information, the mass media increase their significance. Typically, the media take advantage of these attributes, but it is more evident in the case of commercial media. Public media, due to the structure of ownership, remain in continuous sphere of political influence. This is a result of the staff of public media being appointed by members of the National Broadcasting Council, who themselves are in turn dependent on the politicians who appoint them. Indeed, a strong desire to subordinate the public broadcaster stems from the belief that “the one who has television, has the power”, which made public media a “political payoff” or “prize” meant for the political party which wins elections. The situation is different in the case of commercial media. Their only relation to the National Broadcasting Council is the need to renew their broadcasting license every few years. It follows that the answer to the question as to whether we are dealing with the politicisation of the media or the mediatisation of politics depends on what kind of media we are talking about – public or commercial.

As has been shown above, politicians have greater opportunities to influence the public media through the regulation and activity of the National Broadcasting Council. In the case of commercial media, these capabilities are very limited. The most important, however, is that the interdependence between the media and politics is an undeniable fact.

References

- Antoszewski A., Herbut R. (eds.) (2004), *Leksykon politologii [Lexicon of Political Science]*, Atla 2, Wrocław.
- A biographical entry on Alexandra Jakubowska published on the website: <http://ludzie.wprost.pl/sylwetka/Aleksandra-Jakubowska/>, accessed on 23 September 2013.
- A biographical entry on Wiesław Walendziak published on the website: <http://ludzie.wprost.pl/sylwetka/Wieslaw-Walendziak/>, accessed on 23 September 2013.
- Act of 29 June 1995 amending the Broadcasting Act and some other Acts, Journal of Laws No. 142, item 701.
- Act of 5 January 2011 – The Election Code, Journal of Laws 2011, No. 21, item 112.

- Blumler G. J., Gurevitch M. (1995), *The Crisis of Public Communications*, Routledge, London–New York.
- Chruściak R. (2007), *Krajowa Rada Radiofonii i Telewizji w systemie politycznym i konstytucyjnym* [*The National Broadcasting Council in the Political and Constitutional System*], Dom Wydawniczy [Publishing House] Epilsa, Warszawa.
- Constitution of the Republic of Poland of 2 April 1997 which was passed by the National Assembly on 2 April 1997, approved by the Nation in a constitutional referendum on 25 May 1997, and signed by the President of the Republic of Poland on 16 July 1997, Journal of Laws 1997, No. 78, item 483.
- Dobek-Ostrowska B. (2011), *Komunikowanie polityczne i publiczne* [*Political and Public Communication*], Polish Scientific Publishers PWN, Warszawa.
- Dobek-Ostrowska B. (2004a), *Media masowe i aktorzy polityczni w świetle studiów nad komunikowaniem politycznym* [*The Mass Media and Political Actors in the Light of Political Communication Studies*], Wrocław University Press, Wrocław.
- Dobek-Ostrowska B. (2004b), *Podstawy komunikowania społecznego* [*The Basics of Social Communication*], Wydawnictwo [Publishing House] ASTRUM, Wrocław.
- Dobek-Ostrowska B. (2009), *Porozumienie czy konflikt? Politycy, media i obywatele w komunikowaniu politycznym* [*Agreement or Conflict? Politicians, the Media and Citizens in Political Communication*], ParkEdukacja, Bielsko-Biała; Wydawnictwo Szkolne PWN [School Publishers PWN], Warszawa.
- Janecki S. (2010), *Kaczyński powinien wygrać* [*Kaczyński should win*], “Fakt. Gazeta Codzienna” [“Fact. A Daily Newspaper”], June 08, <http://www.fakt.pl/Kaczyński-powinien-wygrac,artykuly,73962,1.html>, accessed on 6 April 2013.
- Killias J. (2000), *Krajowa Rada Radiofonii i Telewizji – instytucja kultury czy polityki?* [*The National Broadcasting Council – an institution of culture or politics?*], in: *Kultura narodowa i polityka* [*National Culture and Politics*], ed. J. Kurczewska, Oficyna Naukowa [Scientific Publisher], Warszawa p. 359–392.
- Ociepka B. (2003), *Dla kogo telewizja? Model publiczny w postkomunistycznej Europie Środkowej* [*Who is Television for? The Model of Public Television in Post-Communist Central Europe*], Wrocław University Press, The Willy Brandt Center, Wrocław.
- Omyłka-Rudzka M. (2012), *Opinie na temat dziennikarzy* [*Opinions on journalists*], BS/164/2021, Survey Report No. 4744, http://www.cbos.pl/SPISKOM.POL/2012/K_164_12.PDF, accessed on 5 April 2013.
- Oniszczyk Z. (2011), *Mediatyzacja polskiej polityki i polityzacja mediów. Dwa wymiary wzajemnych relacji* [*Mediatisation of Polish politics and politicisation of the media. Two dimensions of the relationship*], “Studia Medioznawcze” [“Media Studies”], No. 4, p. 13–21.

- Pisarek W. (1995), *Czwarta władza czy czwarty stan?* [*The Fourth Estate or the Fourth Power?*], in: *Czwarta władza? Jak polskie media wpływają na opinię publiczną* [*The Fourth Power? How the Polish Media Influence Public Opinion*], ed. W. Nentwig, Oficyna Wydawnicza "Głos Wielkopolski" [the Publishing House of the "Głos Wielkopolski" newspaper], Poznań, p. 149–155.
- Regulation of the National Broadcasting Council of 6 July 2011 concerning detailed regulations on the debates conducted by Telewizja Polska S.A., Journal of Laws No. 146, item 878.
- Regulation of the National Broadcasting Council of 6 September 2011 amending the regulation on the air time allocated to broadcast election advertisements free of charge, procedures regulating the air time allocation, the scope and methods of recording and airing election advertisements on public TV and radio, Journal of Laws No. 193, item 1146.
- Regulation of the National Broadcasting Council of 21 February 2012 amending the regulation on presenting the opinions of political parties, trade unions and employer organisations in essential public matters on public TV and radio, Journal of Laws, No. 0, item 242.
- Schultz W. (1995), *Polityczne skutki działania mediów* [*The effects of the media on politics*], "Zeszyty Prasoznawcze" ["Press Notebooks"], No. 1–2, p. 65–79.
- Stasiuk-Krajewska K. (2007), *Polityk dziennikarzem, dziennikarz politykiem? O wzajemnych relacjach polityki i dziennikarza (studium przypadku)* [*A politician as a journalist or a journalist as a politician? On the relationship between politics and journalists (a case study)*], in: *Media a polityka* [*The Media and Politics*], ed. M. Szpunar, Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Informatyki i Zarządzania [The Publishing House of the University of Information Technology and Management in Rzeszów], Rzeszów, p. 91–105.
- Street J. (2006), *Mass media, polityka, demokracja* [*Mass Media, Politics and Democracy*], first edition, The Jagiellonian University Press, Kraków.
- Strzeszewski M. (2002), *Jacy są, a jacy powinni być dziennikarze?* [*What are, and what should, journalists be like?*], BS/68/2002, Survey Report No. 2692, http://www.cbos.pl/SPISKOM.POL/2002/K_068_02.PDF, accessed on 5 April 2013.
- The Broadcasting Act of 29 December 1992, Journal of Laws 1993, No. 7, item 34.
- Wąsicka M. (2013), *Idealny model dziennikarstwa w zderzeniu z rzeczywistością* [*The ideal model of journalism versus reality*], "Środkowoeuropejskie Studia Polityczne" ["Central European Political Studies"], No. 2, p. 295–310.
- Żurawski J. (2010), *Internet jako współczesny środek elektronicznej komunikacji wyborczej i jego zastosowanie w polskich kampaniach parlamentarnych* [*The Internet as a Modern Means of Electronic Communication and Its Use in Polish Parliamentary Campaigns*], Księgarnia Akademicka [Academic Library], Kraków.

**Polityzacja polskich mediów czy mediatyzacja polityki w Polsce?
Przenikanie świata polityki i mediów**

Streszczenie

Obecnie środki społecznego przekazu określa się mianem tzw. „czwartej władzy”. Do takiej rangi media masowe urosły w stosunkowo krótkim czasie i nazywając je tym terminem stawia się je na równi z trzema pozostałymi rodzajami władzy. Tym samym wskazuje się na silne zależności występujące między systemem medialnym a systemem politycznym. Dlatego zasadne wydaje się postawienie pytania – czy obecne silniejszy jest wpływ mediów na politykę, czy może polityki na media? Czy mamy do czynienia z mediatyzacją polskiej polityki, czy z polityzacją polskich mediów? To tylko niektóre pytania nasuwające się w odniesieniu do relacji występujących między tymi dwiema sferami życia. Celem artykułu jest wyróżnienie i ukazanie płaszczyzn, na których dochodzi do zetknięcia, konfrontacji oraz współpracy między światem polskich mediów a światem polityki. Dlatego niezbędne jest przeanalizowanie: regulacji prawnych dotyczących mediów masowych, ingerencji polskich polityków w kształt i funkcjonowanie instytucji kontrolującej i reglamentującej polskie media – Krajowej Rady Radiofonii i Telewizji, a także zwrócenie uwagi na tzw. teorię porządku dziennego oraz rolę jaką odgrywają dziennikarze w stosunkach z politykami.

