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.
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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 catastrophie. 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.
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