

In the search of identity: the Romanian journalistic discourse and the function of Europeanization of the public sphere

Gabriela GOUDENHOFT

Abstract. *This paper represents an introduction in the ongoing research on the search of identity of the journalistic discourse, identity able to contribute to the development of national public sphere and to its Europeanization.*

I presented some of the ideas and theories on modern and postmodern communication and public sphere trying to see how they create place to European issues and what status they have in contemporary journalistic discourse.

Media interaction with national public spheres and the role of media in their transnationalization process is a complex one. In research of representations about EU and about major European themes and issues, which media create or transmit is important to emphasize the role these representations play both in public discourse and in the comprehension process. This is an ongoing research and I have chosen only one example of representations, that of personalization, the antropomorphism of Europe image, the analogy with a human body, with its strengths and weaknesses, but also a body able to act in distress under the influence of diseases with significant effects on our lives.

Romanian media is looking for its own identity linked to the European communication flow while European issues hardly make their way to our public space where the actors are aware of the lack of popularity of this topics, a deficit explained almost by their technicality and by the lack of a genuine European public.

Key words: *public sphere, Europeanization, journalistic discourse, public comprehension*

This paper is part of a more extensive, ongoing research, where, based on the actual trend in exploring the role of media discourse on the Europeanization of the national public spheres, I am trying to identify and evaluate how the Romanian journalistic discourse participates in constructing the identity of the Romanian national public sphere and also if and to which extend the Roumanian press contributes to the Europeanization of the national public sphere.

About public sphere in recent years one writes and talks a lot but the hard core of discussions is the perspective of the German philosopher Jürgen Habermas so, without too much exaggeration, we can say that most theories on public sphere

are edified on Habermas' thinking line or critically distancing of one or another of his ideas.

In an attempt to categorize the perspectives and positions on the public sphere, Koller and Wodak, have found three main theories: a late-modern school, a postmodern school and a relational school. „The first one builds on Habermas by accepting Habermasian prerequisites such as general accessibility to information, eradication of privilege, the quest for truth and the quest for general norms, along with their rational legitimisation”. (2008: 3)

How the public sphere Habermas thought, as a realm of our social life, a place where public opinion can be formed, guaranteeing democratic access to all citizens. „The fully bourgeois public sphere was based on the fictitious identity of the two roles assumed by the privatized individuals who came together to form a public: the role of property owners and the role of human beings pure and simple” (Habermas, 1991: 56).

This is nothing else than a reconstruction of Kant's normative conception shaping the public sphere, a space based on a free and equal access to democratic deliberation, a space where communicative reason can be the force dominating both citizens' conduct and democratic government development.

From this perspective it is obvious how mass media play a prime role in the Habermasian communication sphere (Ward, 2002, Goode, 2005), even paying the price of power manipulation. Thus, safeguarding and promoting democracy and citizenship, the media can be looked at as depoliticisation agents and they are expected to „expose, hold to account and dilute power” in the public sphere where they have to mediate. According to the Habermasian model of public space, mass media abolish the distance between actors, between inbound and outbound, creating „new modes of interaction based on visibility: media personnel occupy the *specialist* role of selecting, processing and producing vast networks of symbols and significant information (they are gatekeepers and agenda setters), discursively interrogating decision makers (they serve as advocates), and making accessible the world ‘out there’ (or, rather, selecting segments and constructing versions of it) on behalf of a more or less diffuse audience”. (Goode, 2005: 93-94)

The idea of public debate and the necessity of finding consensus according to a communicative ratio is a major one of the Habermasian school: „Public debate was supposed to transform *voluntas* into a ratio that in the public competition of private arguments came into being as the consensus about what was practically necessary in the interest of all” (Habermas, 1991: 83).

The post-modern school, on the other hand, has intended to open the public sphere to plurality: „Instead of one consensus-driven public sphere, many so-called

subaltern counter-publics exist: Parallel discursive arenas where members of subordinated social groups invent and circulate counter-discourses. Reason can thus be broken down into a myriad of practical and habitual modes of regulating public dialogue. (...) a postmodern conception of the public sphere: 1) it must acknowledge that participatory parity [is] not merely the bracketing, but rather the elimination, of systematic social inequalities; 2) where such inequality persists, however, a postmodern multiplicity of mutually contesting publics is preferable to a single modern public sphere oriented solely to deliberation; 3) a postmodern conception of the public sphere must countenance not the exclusion, but the inclusion, of interests and issues that bourgeois masculinist ideology labels “private” and treats as inadmissible” (Wodak, 2008: 3-4).

According to the relational or institutional school, social relations are the key concept of the public sphere, relations which are to be developed in a more complex institutional framework of cultural, economic, social and political practices. There some arenas are built and the public sphere is one of them, a place of „contestation and participatory negotiations” over political and social life. The public sphere is a place of dialog and discussion, of networks between individuals, citizens, groups, political actors, states etc.

There are research perspectives where the concept of public sphere is put forward in a global context, so it became a global public sphere. New patterns are available in this globalised world, were exchanges of goods, services, information, capitals but also the possibility of a larger dialog increased more and more over the years. The increased role of global organisation as it is World Bank and IMF, ONU, UNESCO, EU’s institutions proves not only the institutionalisation of the global, but also the paradox of our existence where the need of autonomy and the total dependence on consumerism are overlapping in an ambivalent way.

In a global perspective the axis of communication in the public sphere has an expansion from the national level to a transnational one, in what is called now „lifeworld”¹ (Volkmer, 2014). In this global public sphere it has being created a space of „interdependent public reflection”, where new forms of civic and democratic participation are able to be between the classic nation-state establishment and the new globalized governance area. This new space can be described as a reformed but also a negative one; it is a space which denies the qualities of the previous one, which denies rationality itself: a “non-national” and „nonterritorial”

¹ „The lifeworld constitutes the space of interdependent ‘public’ reflection, enabled and sustained by subjectively selected ‘reflective’ networks.” (Volkmer, 2014: 163).

space, where „media scapes” populate the new communicative space by new structures and new networks.

On the other hand the idea of dispersion of power centers, of a polyarchy world, like Robert Dahl configured it, it is a fertile world for media to be revisited and reinvested with new functions including the one of rebalancing polyarchy where power is diluted and diffuse. Redressing the imbalance of power would be possible by “broadening access to public domain” all over the places where until now only privileged elites have had access and by rationalizing interests and resources invested in (Dahlgren and Sparks, 2005).

The press is an essential institution in cristalisation of the modern public sphere, even though commercialisation the flows of information, news and the communication space itself.

The history of press proves that „the press itself became manipulable to the extend that it become commercialized” (Habermas, 1991: 185). So here we go again revisiting Habermas’ perspective, because it is able to offer „a sounder basis for the critical analysis of current developments both in the media and democratic politics and for the analysis and political action necessary to rebuild systems of both communication and representative democracy adequate to the contemporary world” (Garnham, 1996: 364).

A specific form of transnationalisation the national public spheres make sense in Europe. It won the name of Europeanisation and it filled many pages of discussion, including the journalistic debate on the issue. If you want to discuss on international legitimacy, between global governance and EU governance it is easy to agree to the position that „the EU is by far the most likely candidate for democratic legitimation beyond the nationstate. And this is where the emergence of a corresponding *transnational public sphere* comes into play” (Wessler et al, 2008: 1). The greatest difficulty is that media have to mediate between the spheres, to be in the “forums”² and “arenas”, how we call the new forms of public spheres. Where does the difficulty stay in? It stays in the essence of plans which are fundamental different!

The possibility for a communication between different areas and systems, as is European institutional sphere and the national public sphere through the media and journalistic discourse is a very complex process; this possibility becomes a reality only in so far as it produces „cooperation” which is a prerequisite, „a precondition for all other forms of human cooperation”. But „what does it mean to

² „The mass media forum constitutes an *integrated* network precisely because issues and opinions constantly circulate between various subforums and because the leading media exert a structuring effect on public debates.” - Wessler et al, 2008: 5.

cooperate at the fundamental human level of linguistic communication, the precondition for all other forms of human cooperation?"(Chilton, 2004: 197).

For this purpose it is necessary cognitive representations to be formed, based on common signs, significations, symbols, meanings and common interpretations, following the conventions which represent a social consensus. Conventionalist thesis of communication is perhaps a vivid illustration and it has also a maximum success with regard to the public sphere, where the need for the handling of shared meanings should not leave too much room for speculation.

There are representations of Europe, of European Union institutions and policies. Themselves do not concern us as much as cooperation between the journalists and the public on the involved representations and the specific journalistic discourse that takes place through negotiation and agreement on such representations. There are theories claiming that the sense of negotiation is not a very peaceful proces. Philip Eubanks argues that trade and business itself are true wars of negotiation: "Trade is War", "Bussines is War" (2000: 141) as he is stating in a paper which itself is called *A War of Words ...*

Generally one apreciates that the national public sphere it is caracterized by a denser interaction than at the transnational level and this means at a national level there is a specific well formed audience for the journalistic discourse and public speech, generally. Here a legitimate question arises: Where in Europe do we find media that address a European audience with specifically European content? (Wessler and all). Does Europeanisation mean both a European audience and European journalistic themes and issues? National spheres tend to transcend borders increasing audience and interest in issues and topics that are farther and farther in distance but closer and closer in auditor's interest. Being an European citizen all European problems seem to become your problems. But does it really happen? To what extent?

„National public spheres transnationalize, first, when European or other international *governance* processes become visible on the national level and can thus be *monitored* by citizens. This is achieved mostly through coverage and discussion in the national news media of decision-making processes in, for example, the European Union, the World Trade Organization or the United Nations" (Wessler and all, 2008:10). But in this case we assist mostly to an Europeanisation by object, the press adressed to a national public with European issues and not by subject as long as they are not concerned in creating a European public, a European audience. In this purpose citizens are to be involved and informed and they are expected to scrutinize EU institutions and EU policies. Monitoring EU gouvernance the debate is moved into another sphere of non-privileged elites, of the citizens, rebalancing the acces to relevant information.

The role of media is fundamental in this process, bringing together in a debate decisionmakers and citizens and opening the political field to a real, exhaustive world, just by using simple instruments as news, commentaries, forums etc. This seems also to be a „domestication” process of politics where press doesn’t simply report post-factum the news but put things into debate while they happen.

Europeanization of national public spheres is a topic often addressed in the latest research and one of the comments that always appears is a dynamic of a simultaneous „segmentated Europeanisation” replacing the actual Europeanization. But first of all we have to notice that Europeanisation process means mainly the formation or strengthening of the European identity, a theme nowadays also greatly debated. We can easily find a public discourse about Europeans as community members of communication, also on an „European topos”, even when it is used in a negative sense. But „we, Europeans”³ hardly occurs in the public discourse, and the lack of the subjective identification and even the lack of a solidarity between „us, the Europeans”, the reluctance in taking and using this important "we" in the public discourse proves that the transnationalization of public spheres is slower than faster. That is the reason why a lot of authors (Wessler and all, 2008), have concluded that the transnational collective „we” is still hard to utilise even in public speeches of EU politicians, in the elite’s public discourse or even in quality newspapers. It seems to be more adequate to use the term *community*⁴ instead the one of *demos* addressing

³ „The Europeans’ exists as a topos in public discourse and gradually gains more importance, recorded as constituting 6 per cent of all collectives mentioned in 1982 and rising to slightly above 10 per cent in 2003. ‘The West’ (12 per cent on average) is more common than ‘the Europeans’ (8 per cent on average), but has declined since 1989. In general we find that unlike the increasing European trend, the demand for other transnational collectives such as ‘the Communists’ or ‘the Muslims’ rises and falls according to the agenda of world politics. ‘We Europeans’: words rarely used (...) showing the explicit use of ‘we Europeans’, hints at a nascent trend towards the Europeanization of public identities. While ‘we’ references to the West stagnate and identification with individual nations drops between 1996 and 2003, ‘we Europeans’ increases slightly, from below 1 per cent in 1982 to 5 per cent in 2003. Looking at the level of identification, however, the nation is still the most frequent point of reference (40 per cent of all ‘we’ references) together with a broad range of very specific collective identities such as ‘we, the government’ or ‘we, the farmers’. Identification with Europe stands at 3 per cent on average; identification with ‘the West’ is even weaker” - (Wessler and all, 2008: 49-50).

⁴ „Europe, even limited to Western Europe, is not a community of communications, barely a community of memory, and only a very limited community of experience’ (Kielmansegg 1994) - *Europa, auch das engere Westeuropa, ist keine Kommunikationsgemeinschaft, kaum eine Erinnerungsgemeinschaft und nur sehr begrenzt eine Erfahrungsgemeinschaft.*’ - Kielmansegg, P. G. (1994) ‘Lässt sich die Europäische Gemeinschaft demokratisch verfassen?’, in *Europäische Rundschau*, 22(2): 23–33, apud Bernhard Peters, (2005) „Public discourse, identity and the problem of democratic

Europeans. So post-Habermasian debates on Europeanization focused mainly on the crisis, the crisis of legitimacy of the EU targeting mainly European identity.

In all this process, media plays a distinctive role, using EU's topics in articles, talking about EU's policies, quoting EU politicians, reporting EU's institutions concluding documents, submits declarations etc., being actor of Europeanisation of the public spheres. An important question arises: is there a transnational media in Europe as a factor of Europeanization, participating in a European space of communication?

Eastern European Media had to face two relevant challenges: on the one hand to overcome their conservative frames and to define and revisit their own values and to adapt, jumping phases or burning stages, to a post-modernism communicational trend and to a liberal and neo-liberal ideology without experiencing it as much as the Western Europe did and, on the other hand to adapt and absorb, to accommodate with the values, aims and objectives of the European Union. This process sometime means to filter and interpret values through national vision and ethical philosophy when possible. This aspect, together with the maintaining even at a conceptual level of the segregation Est-West made possible a segmented European public sphere. National traditionally public spheres have difficulties in overlapping the frontiers of their communicative space, limited by language, values, interests and they tend to remain captive to these limits. While European Union development requires a new and common communicative space based on its integration policy and supranational structure, we assist to a fragmentation and segmentation of the public sphere caused by very regional and sub-state level which became increasingly distinctive (Eriksen, 2007).

Given the fact that Europe „has no essence *per se*”, being eventually „a discursive construct and a product of many overlapping discourses. Such hegemonic narratives (discourses) serve as part of the search for national (and European) identities” (Stråth and Wodak, 2009: 15) Over all of this the current crises overlap bringing with it a very complex situation which blocks communication in topics related to this. Sometimes even media contribute to a fragmentation of public sphere by promoting static images and events, serving or being captive to economic or other type of interests.

Among other risks and limits, emphasised above, we have to outline the risk of populism and the need of audience, which is a major one for media dynamic. The tendency of political journalism is to be more analytical and more interpretative than it

legitimacy” in E.O. Eriksen (ed.), *Making the European Polity Reflexive integration in the EU*, London and New York, Routledge, pp. 84-123.

use to be in the past, but also „less substantial”, more speculative, presenting opinion as facts sometimes, more „Americanised”, personalised, adversarial, sometimes hyperadversarial, in other words we assist to a general tabloidization of journalistic discourse. (Mc Nayr, 2002) We don't know if democratisation of the journalistic discourse should be accompanied by being „less deferential towards political actors” like McNayr has noticed, should be such commercial, should be more about persons instead about policies, but massification is a risk that political discourse, even in the shape of journalistic one, must challenge. The unprecedented mass participation on the political arena is reflected in the public sphere as a discursive mass representation, transforming media in what McNayr called „*media-ocracy*” with all the irony we can feel in the expression. These refer to a less quality in the public discourse generated by the phenomenon of unprivileged the public sphere. Of course there is an opposite reaction: a further and stronger conservative position, a claim for elite's need in the public sphere, *le connaisseur* should populate the communicational field in order to increase quality and to reestablish a desirable order in time of crisis. But the information, as a result of communication process must be in the ownership of the public in this democratic world. But „what do they do with it?” There are some legitimate questions occurring from this finds, on the possibility and will of public receptors and also about the limits of democracy.⁵

Turning to the pressure that need of audience and popularity media exerts, we must specify some findings. Along with a decline of ideologies, also reported by the political analysis, we can see an attempt of compensating the decline and, in order to clear the gap created by this sort of leaving legitimacy through populism, via political marketing or using instruments like campaign strategy, all of these generate a diminishing of elite media standards rather than increase or maintain them. They work merely to grow audience than to inform "(Blumer, 2005). So contemporary media, trapped in populism, on behalf of the need for high ratings and audience is compromising its quality wrapping information, especially when it is difficult and arid, in easily digestible packages.

In the news area about the EU legislative agenda, journalistic styles vary from the descriptive style to the interpretative style. Descriptive journalistic approach is governed by the 'facts' and events, while the interpretive approach

⁵ „ • what *can* they, and what should they *want* to do with it, given what is politically possible in current conditions?

• and is there, from the point of view of the efficiency and integrity of the democratic process, an optimal upper limit, as well as a lower, on the quantity of information flowing in a society, and on the amount of critical scrutiny exercised by the media over elites and their rhetoric?” (McNayr, 2002: 179).

focuses on topic around the story is built and this gives the journalist more control over messages. Using descriptive approach, journalists are primarily mediators, information providers, policy, events, news providers, while addressing an interpretative approach journalists become trully political actors involved in the debate and represented in the public sphere by their own voice (Patterson, 1997) .

But European topics aren't treated only in the intended news area, but sometimes in the editorials area, making room for opinions and journalistic commentaries on these issues.

Ensuring comprehension one is to structure a favorable relationship between the journalist and the receiver of journalistic discourse through a specific linguistic code of press.

EU issues must be known, they need visibility. This is ensured by the media. EU elites believe that a better coverage in the national media would increase the legitimacy of public institutions, especially since it is very obvious a perception of a lack of legitimacy in the European Union, owed also to the weak meadia's performance, this being an important factor for EU's image. It is known and accepted that the role of journalists as actors providing information on EU's issues in the public sphere is extremely important. We are talking about political journalism and coverage of European legislation, which opened a new horizon and new career opportunities for European journalists. In this perspective, journalists as professionals could have a better chance to educate and inform readers, especially about those events and policies dynamics that are unfamiliar like the EU issues are. Some issues are maybe intentionally left in a shadow zone by national governments, so this situation opens the possibility for journalists to shape political messages and to act as true leaders (Statham, 2010).

In order to familiarize the public with the subjects situated at a considerable distance from the public interest, as EU issues, journalistic language approach uses specific tools, creating specific representations, customizing, using metaphors, all in order to facilitate the transition from the unfamiliar to the familiar.

A constant journalistic language method applied on the European Union issues is the use of metaphor, analogy and personification. The European Union has the media image of a politial body endowed with political and institutional powers and capable of action likely to affect European peoples. If traditional political body representations were made especially on the nation-state and socio-economic systems involved, the European Union is a more complex and ambiguous case, given its confederalist status, supra-statal level and its political and legislative controversial system (Musolff, 2004). The idea of representing the state as a political body is quite old and it emerged a series of metaphors, analogies,

personifications; so did the idea that being an alive body, like a living human being the state also can be healthy or sick, he may suffer of many diseases like corruption, anarchy and the illness can lead finally to collapse. Also another idea resulted from the one of state personification, that of State's speech or public speaking, as the one of public policy as strategies of the national or supranational entities in their quality of political bodies. In journalistic discourse generator of strong representations, political bodies are endowed with powers and qualities of human beings: they can talk (they use to have public discourses), make decisions, they can get sick and recover, briefly they are invested with features, powers and weaknesses that human beings have.

Political discourse reflected by the European press is replete with examples of metaphorical concepts of "European body", its "organs" with its health problems they face: the formula "*the sick man of Europe*" with its German version "*der kranke Mann Europas*" it is already well-established even if used as a stigma sometimes against Great Britain, Germany or Greece, and even on Spain. But which is the virus in this viral process? The virus carrier is no one else but the „untimely born child of Europe”, Euro currency, accompanied by all the crisis that he could cause.

The entire Europe is sometimes represented as a human being hit in the heart of a fatal disease and gained names, stigmatized by the press: *Eurosclerosis*, *eurosis* or *Anorexia Europa*. The terms began to be taken over the major European politicians discourse. And even if Helmut Kohl proclaimed that "Europe has healed Eurosclerosis" in the late 80s, following decades of the century proved that things are not just so well and what Kohl had called „healing” was nothing else but an illusion, something that *Der Spiegel* confirmed and a few years later the British press (*The Economist*, 1993), showed that the disease was contagious including state by state, labor market, financial market and monetary ones together in this morbid process. (Mussolf, 2004)

The Romanian media also uses the method mentioned above. Here are some examples in Romanian journal's titles:

1. Taken from the European press, translated in Romanian - *Deutsche Welle*: "Schengen topic - symptoms of ill Europe"⁶;
2. *Romania Libera* – „China: America is sicker than Europe”⁷;
3. *Ziarul Financiar* - „Europe is out of intensive care, but still sick”⁸;

⁶ „Subiectul Schengen - simptom de Europă bolnavă” – *DW* din 14 octombrie 2011, online on <http://www.dw.de/subiectul-schengen-simptom-de-europa%20bolnava%20ca-europa/a-15460804>

⁷ „China: America e mai bolnavă ca Europa” - *Romania Libera* din 8 decembrie 2010 online on <http://www.romanialibera.ro/economie/finante-banci/china--america-e-mai-bolnava-ca-europa-209031>

4. *Ziarul Financiar* - „World leaders are concerned about the economic health of Europe”⁹;

5. *Capital* – „Sick Romania annual loses 2.5 billion Euro”¹⁰.

The above examples illustrate the idea that there are common representations in the space we started to call the transnationalised public sphere. Conveying common representation on this space, media not only inform but also contribute in creating a specific public structures adapted to the "communicative reason" as Habermas used to call. Of course all this effort is banned by constrains and limitations, affecting journalistic performance and superposing to the Europe's supposed communication deficit. As researchers have concluded it seems easy but also simplistic to lay responsibility upon this phenomenon entirely on journalists, even they are affected more or less by editorial policy, by media organisations, political parties influences etc.

They acknowledge, however, that EU issues are not easily to approach. It is not easy to write news about the European values and standards. However, despite the constraints, sometimes coming from exactly the journalistic organizations, journalists do not hesitate to write reviews and comments about the EU, especially since the readers are not as competent and well informed as they probably are on domestic policy issues and, on the other hand, the political groups are not so clearly defined as the national ones are. One of the aims and goals of the journalists is to raise awareness and to open up debates over Europe (Statham, 2010: 149). The formative role of the press is here, from this point of view, very strongly.

So we can emphasise that the media is one of the most relevant actor concurring to Europeanization of national public spheres, making its own contribution to the public debate on European issues: „the press contributes as political actor to the Europeanization of national public spheres”. (Phetsch, Adam and Eschner, 2010: 151). By writing opinion articles and commentary, journalists want not only to express their identity through a certain political stance towards EU policies and measures, in their autonomous actors quality, a role played on the stage of the public debate, but also to exert a certain influence as opinion leaders recognized together with politicians, with activists etc., which was registred in

⁸ „Europa a ieșit de la terapie intensivă, dar e încă bolnavă” *Ziarul Financiar* - 6 martie 2012 – online on <http://www.zf.ro/business-international/europa-a-iesit-de-la-terapie-intensiva-dar-e-inca-bolnava-9372976>

⁹ „Liderii lumii sunt îngrijorați de sănătatea economică a Europei” - *Ziarul Financiar* - 13 octombrie 2014 – online on <http://www.zf.ro/business-international/liderii-lumii-sunt-ingrijorati-de-sanatatea-economica-a-europei-13378328>

¹⁰ “România bolnavă pierde anual 2,5 miliarde de euro” – *Capital* – 3 mai 2013, online on <http://www.capital.ro/romania-bolnava-pierde-anual-25-miliarde-de-euro-181437.html>

critics about the quality media by researchers as Benjamin Page, Robert Shapiro and Glenn Dempsey¹¹.

EU topic press stimulate awareness and development of European identity, so the national media are important actors on integration and Europeanization. Providing editorial space and including on agenda topics about EU integration media help the proces of creating and strengthening transnational communication flows, on condition that in all countries the themes should to be treated in a similar semiotic aspect, meaning a common sense system with referential base and common understanding of facts: „Regarding the congruence of European debates, the question is not only whether media mention common issues, but also whether they discuss them with respect to similar political interpretations” (Phetsch, Adam and Eschner, 2010: 153).

Romanian media has developed, as well, a number of strategies in order to participate in European communication flow. We have to mention, though, that neighter Romanian journalists nor the public easily manage difficulties in presentation and comprehension of European issues. A research in progress tries to determine discursive strategies of adaptation to European communication flows and difficulties faced by actors playing in Romanian national public sphere. We also want to determine a model of media involvement in the formation of European public simultaneously with its own training as a communicator and European player of the European public sphere.

We appreciate the positive attempt to introduce European issues in the public debate and to realise a public education in order to obtain enough audience for these themes, but including these formative strategies in journalistic discourse obviously require longer practice, exercise and improvements.

REFERENCES

Blumer, Jay, (2005), "Political communication systems all change: a response to Kees Brants", în De Bens, E., Golding, P. & McQuail, D., (eds.), *Communication Theory and Research*, Sage Publication, London, pp.118-125

¹¹ Benjamin Page, Robert Shapiro and Glenn Dempsey conducted a study on the influence that various intervening from the televisual media space, journalists, politicians, experts, etc. have on public opinion, how and to what extent these changes affect opinions on various topics under discussion. The research results were published in an article entitled "What Moves Public Opinion" in the American journal *The American Political Science Review*, vol.81, no.1 (March 1987), pp.23-44.

- Chilton, Paul, (2004), *Analysing Political Discourse. Theory and Practice*, London and New York, Routledge.
- Dahlgren, Peter and SPARKS, Colin, (eds) (2005), *Communication and citizenship: journalism and the public sphere in the new media age*, London and New York, Routledge.
- Eriksen, Erik Oddvar (2007), *Conceptualising European public spheres*, in FOSSUM John Erik and SCHLESINGER Philip (eds.), (2007), *The European Union and the Public Sphere A communicative space in the making?*, London and New York: Routledge, pp.23-44.
- Eubanks, Philip, (2000), *A War of Words in the Discourse of Trade The Rhetorical Constitution of Metaphor*, Southern Illinois University Press, Carbondale and Edwardsville.
- Fossum John Erik and Schlesinger Philip (eds.), (2007), *The European Union and the Public Sphere A communicative space in the making?*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Garnham, Nicholas (ed.) (1996), „The Media and the Public Sphere” in Craig Calhoun (ed.), *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, Cambridge, Massachusetts and London: MIT Press, pp.359-376.
- Goode, Luke, (2005), *Jürgen Habermas : democracy and the public sphere*, London, Ann Arbor: Pluto Press.
- Habermas, Jürgen, (1991), *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere*, translated by Thomas Burger, Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Kielmansegg, Paul G. (1994) „Lässt sich die Europäische Gemeinschaft demokratisch verfassen?“, in *Europäische Rundschau*, 22(2): 23–33
- McNair, Brian, (2002), *Journalism and democracy*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Musolff, Andreas, (2004), *Metaphor and political discourse: analogical reasoning in debates about Europe*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Page, Benjamin, Shapiro, Robert and Dempsey, Glenn, (1987), ”What Moves Public Opinion” in *The American Political Science Review*, vol.81, nr.1/martie 1987, pp.23-44.
- Patterson, Thomas, (1997), ”The News Media: An Effective Political Actor”, in *Political Communication*, vol.14, nr.9/1997.
- Peters, Bernhard (2005) „Public discourse, identity and the problem of democratic legitimacy” in E.O. Eriksen (ed.), *Making the European Polity Reflexive integration in the EU*, London and New York, Routledge, pp. 84-123.
- Pfetsch, Barbara, Adam, Silke and Eschner, Barbara, (2010), ”The Media’s Voice over Europe. Issue Salience, Openness, and Conflict Lines in Editorials”, in

- Koopmans, R. & Statham. P. (eds.), *The Making of a European Public Sphere*. Media Discourse and Political Contention, Cambridge University Press, New York, pp.151-170.
- Statham, Paul, (2010), "Making Europe News. Journalism and Media Performance", in Koopmans, R. & Statham. P. (eds.), *The Making of a European Public Sphere*. Media Discourse and Political Contention, Cambridge University Press, New York, pp.125-150.
- Stråth, Bo and Wodak, Ruth, (2009), „Europe – Discourse – Politics –Media – History: Constructing ‘Crises’?” in Triandafyllidou, Anna, Wodak, Ruth, Krzyzanowski, Michal, (2009), *The European public sphere and the media: Europe in crisis*, New York: Pallgrave MacMillan, pp.15 -33.
- Triandafyllidou, Anna, Wodak, Ruth, Krzyzanowski, Michal, (2009), *The European public sphere and the media: Europe in crisis*, New York: Pallgrave MacMillan.
- Volkmer, Ingrid, (2014), *The Global Public Sphere. Public Communication in the Age of Reflective Interdependence*, Cambridge and Malden: Polity Press.
- Ward, David, (2002), *The European Union Democratic Deficit and the Public Sphere An Evaluation of EU Media Policy*, Ios Press, Amsterdam.
- Wessler, Hartmut, Peters, Bernhard, Brüggemann, Michael, Kleinen-Von Königslöw, Katharina and SIFFT, Stefanie (2008), *Transnationalization of Public Sphere*, New York: Pallgrave MacMillan.
- Wodak, Ruth and Koller, Veronika (eds.), (2008), *Handbook of communication in the public sphere*, Mouton de Gruyter (formerly Mouton, The Hague)/ Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co. KG, Berlin.