

them seem to be significant for developing states, which should create their own ways to improve the life of their citizens. It is important to note too that there are many costs which accompany these mechanisms. They should be a part of discussion, too.

Referances

1. Andreski S. (1992). *Maxa Webera olśnienia i pomyłki*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa.
2. Anievas A., Nisancioglu K. (2015). *How the West Came to Rule: The Geopolitical Origins of Capitalism*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
3. Christensen N.P., Rothgerber H., Wood W., Matz D.C. (2004). "Social Norms and Identity Relevance: A Motivational Approach to Normative Behavior", *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 30, pp. 1295-1309.
4. Hofstede G., Hofstede G.J., Minkov M. (2011). *Kultury i organizacje*, Polskie Wydawnictwo Ekonomiczne, Warszawa.
5. Hogg M.E., Reid S.A. (2006). "Social Identity, Self-Categorization, and the Communication of Group Norms", *Communication Theory* 16, pp., 7-30
6. Novak M. (1993). *The Catholic Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, The Free Press, New York.
7. Ostrom E. (2000). *Collective Action and the Evolution of Social Norms*, "Journal of Economic Perspectives", vol. 14(3).
8. Samuelsson K. (1992). *Religion and Economic Action. The Protestant Ethic, the Rise of Capitalism, and the Abuses of Scholarship*, University of Toronto Press, Toronto.
9. Weber M. (2010). *Etyka protestancka a duch kapitalizmu. Wyznania protestanckie a duch kapitalizmu*, Wydawnictwo „Aletheia”, Warszawa.

Marcin Kotras

Assistant Professor

Department of Sociology of Politics and Morality

Faculty of Economics and Sociology, University of Łódź POLAND

FRAMING AND RE-FRAMING PRACTICES IN DISCOURSE ABOUT TRANSFORMATION IN POLAND

After more than 25 years since the beginning of the regime transformation in Poland, there is a need for identification and description of the present socio-political cleavages in Polish society. Presented paper is the result of the research on the discourse analysis of

Polish weekly opinion magazines. It also deals with the problem of different argumentation strategies inside the discourse about the great change in Poland. The objective of this research was to find and describe the framing practices concerning regime transformation.

The media working formula is still changing, but the journalists can still be regarded as the representatives of the symbolic elites. According to this statement, it can be assumed that they organize (or using Foucault's view they reproduce) political discourse by defining «correct» ways of perceiving and interpreting reality. Moreover, journalists, as well as politicians, represent different sides of the political conflict and as a consequence, they transmit their 'visions' to (their) audience. Political parallelism is a feature of Polish media system because media reflects political divisions. Inside the transformational discourse contradictory and antagonistic framing practices can be identify. They are addressed to different receiver because the discourse participants should share their common register of socio-cultural beliefs. Both, the author (producer) and the recipient (consumer), should share the common understanding of social and political reality.

The dynamics of the discourse is affected by disputes concerning problems, which could be considered as 'controversies' and thereby understood as referring at the same time to the communication and the metacommunication level (definition of the problem, attaching acting motives to the other side of the dispute) (Marek Czyżewski). In the public discourse, the reciprocity of perspectives is increasingly rarely the rule which organizes the political communication processes. The dispute issues are concerning the community symbolism, agreement values and the meaning and understanding of critical and decisive events like e.g. the Round Table agreement or Smolensk catastrophe. Using the concepts of Jeffrey Alexander, it can be said that the parties and media involved in the discourse assign a democratic code to themselves and undemocratic one to their adversaries. It is a kind of a 'blame game' what characterizes dichotomic diverse societies.

Two types of framing practices which dominated the media discourse in Poland are antagonistic and mutually exclusive. The assumption that only two interpretations of transformation are functioning in the society would be an oversimplifying idea. Nevertheless, the context of two competing political and cultural worlds and unambiguity expectation enhance social cleavages and cause that the 'grey zone' is shrinking.

References

1. Alexander J. C. (2003). *The Meanings of Social Life. A Cultural Sociology*. Oxford: University Press.
2. Benford R. D., & Snow D. A. (2000). *Framing Process and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment*. *Annual Review of Sociology*, (26), 611–639.
3. Benhabib S. (2003). *Trzy modele przestrzeni publicznej*. *Krytyka Polityczna*, (3).
4. Burszta W. (2013). *Kotwice pewności. Wojny kulturowe z popnacionalizmem w tle*. (I). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Iskry.
5. Czyżewski M. (2014). *Praca pośrednicząca w debatach publicznych*. [w:] M. Czyżewski, K. Franczak, M. Nowicka, & J. Stachowiak (ed.), *Dyskurs elit symbolicznych. Próba diagnozy* (pp. 380–409). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Akademickie Sedno.
6. Dijk T. A. van (ed.) (1997). *Discourse as a structure and process* (1). SAGE Publications
7. Fairclough N. (2001). *Language and power* (2nd ed). Harlow, Eng.; New York: Longman.
8. Franczak K. (2014). *Perspektywa framing analysis — oferta analityczna dla badań nad dyskursem?* *Przegląd Socjologiczny*, 63(3/2014), 135–156.
9. Hall S. (2005). *The rediscovery of „ideology”: return of the repressed in media studies*. [in:] M. Gurevitch, T. Bennet, J. Curran, & J. Woollacott (ed.), *Culture, society and the media*. London; New York: Routledge.
10. Hallin D.C., Mancini P. (2004). *Comparing Media Systems. Three Models of Media and Politics*. Boston: Cambridge University Press
11. Moscovici S. (1984). *The Phenomenon of Social Representations*. [in:] R. M. Farr & S. Moscovici (Red.), *Social representations. Cambridge [Cambridgeshire]*; New York: Paris: Cambridge University Press; Editions de la Maison des Sciences de l’Homme.
12. Ost D. (2005). *The Defeat of Solidarity: Anger and Politics in Postcommunist Europe*. Cornell: Univrsity Press
13. Reisigl M. (2010). *Dyskryminacja w dyskursach. Tekst i dyskurs — Text und Diskurs*, (3), 27–61.
14. Reisigl M. (2011). *Analiza retoryki politycznej*. [in:] R. Wodak & M. Krzyżanowski (ed.), D. Przepiórkowska (Tłum.), *Jakościowa analiza dyskursu w naukach społecznych* (pp. 151–186). Warszawa: Oficyna Wydawnicza Łośgraf.
15. Swales J. (1990). *The Concept of Discourse Community. Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. Boston: Cambridge University Press. 21–32.
16. Wasilewski J. (2012). *Opowieści o Polsce: retoryka narracji*. Warszawa: studio headmade.