

Media systems of the European Union:
A qualitative analysis of four member states
and their situation of the press

Bachelor Thesis by Maurice Alexander Stegen
Student no: s1345133

University of Twente
Faculty of Behavioural, Management and Social Sciences

2016

1st Supervisor: Dr. Ringo Ossewaarde
2nd Supervisor: Dr. Claudio Matera

"Infrastructure" © Ed Stein



Abstract

This bachelor thesis aims at getting a glimpse of the compromising of press freedom of media systems in place within the European Union. Furthermore, its focus lies on identifying and conceptualizing the key dynamics of those media systems of four European member states. As a basis for this a number of theoretical and scientific research in this field has been useful, such as previous classifications on media systems by Hallin & Mancini et caetera. This has been done with a qualitative coding scheme. Finally, one will elaborate on possible causes and consequences of those differences in media systems within the selected European member states.

Acknowledgements

I 'd like to thank my family and friends for always supporting me. Furthermore, I would like to thank Ringo Ossewaarde and Claudio Matera for the great conversations and advices on this thesis and far beyond. For that I will be forever grateful.

- M. A. Stegen

Table of Contents

I. Introduction	
1. Background.....	6
2. Research question.....	7
3. Approach.....	7
II. Theoretical Framework	
1. Introduction.....	9
2. The issue of a democracy in crisis.....	12
3. The issue of media serving democracy	13
4. The issue of the media and the rise of neo-populism.....	14
5. Conclusion.....	14
III. Research Methodology	
1. Introduction.....	16
2. Case selection.....	16
3. Method of data collection.....	17
4. Method of data analysis.....	18
5. Conclusion.....	20
IV. Data & Analysis	
1. Descriptive report.....	22
2. Discussion of the results.....	28

V.	Conclusion.....	32
1.	Answering of the research question.....	32
2.	Reflection.....	32
3.	Implications for the EU.....	33
4.	Final remarks.....	35
VI.	List of References.....	36
VII.	Appendix.....	39

I. Introduction

In the following chapter, the reader will be made familiar with the issue and subject matter of this bachelor thesis as well as its main research question. Thus, the research question which is central to this thesis is: *To what extent is there a compromising of press freedom of European Union media systems in the 21st century?* This question will be dealt with an in-depth analysis of newspaper articles published on the situation of the press in four different EU member states within the last five years. In addition, media systems and thereby also the freedom and the plurality of the press are being shaped by multiple factors which will be elaborated on further within the theoretical framework later onwards. Moreover, this chapter strives to grant the reader insight on the concepts of press freedom and media systems in the European Union in the background section. This will be followed by a closer examination of the research question in regard to the briefly introduced concepts and an outline of the approach as a conclusive point of this section.

1. Background

Press freedom is generally defined as an absence from the state in media activities and is a basic right most European citizens take for granted. Although freedom of speech and freedom of expression are, at least within the legal framework, ensured within all European member states and one of the fundamental values laid down in the Treaty of the European Union, Article 2. (European Parliament, 2015), it is however currently under the threat of being undermined. A media system can be described, in general, as a classification of the environment of the media. According to the chapter “Comparing Media Systems: The European Dimension” written by Thomass & Kleinsteuber (Trappel et al., 2011, 25) media systems are embedded in their social environment which is also culturally and nationally shaped, therefore they may be best considered in the scope of their territorial borders. In addition, media systems are being shaped by technological innovation, the industry and the economy in general. Lastly, the European media laws as well as the politics of the Union itself and the member states do have an impact on the media system in place. Although, as mentioned beforehand, there is common European law in place which aims to preserve the freedom of the press there are indeed (according to multiple

sources in academic research) breaches and differences in regard to the level of press freedom and its plurality and thereby to the types of media systems currently in place. Recent events in countries such as Hungary and Poland undermining press pluralism and targeting independent journalistic reporting as well as situations of assaults in Spain, Italy and Bulgaria as well as Romania and Greece (to name a few) emphasise this argument. One would expect that under the common European law, in regard to the freedom of the press and the freedom of expression, that this would be practiced equally in every European member state. Sadly, this is not the case; there are multiple media systems in place within the European Union which range from a liberal to a medium to regulated type of media system (Blum, 2005). Reasons why media systems are different from one another are part of the current academic debate.

Often attention is drawn to the compromising of press freedom and plurality abroad. However, little attention has been drawn to focus on the states within the European Union, this is what the research of this thesis will focus on in a smaller scale. Previous research has delivered that press freedom in Europe is currently under terrorist attack as recent events have shown such as the cartoon crisis of 2005 as well as the recent attacks on the Charlie Hebdo satirical magazine in Paris in 2015. Moreover, there is also a compromising of press freedom and of the freedom of expression taking place within the European Union. The idea is to partly link it to the recent rise of neo-populism as well as neo-fascism (both unsurprisingly linked to Euroscepticism) and its rise in popularity is also partly linked to the terrorist attacks. Ironically, these parties which have now established themselves to a certain extent throughout Europe in almost every member state whether known as the French Front National, the Italian Forza Nuova, the German AfD, the Hungarian Fidesz, or the Polish PiS are a threat to press freedom as well, undermining the plurality of the press. Indeed, it might as well be as Sylvia Walby argues that democracy is currently in a crisis. Therefore one will need to have a look at the current evolvement of press freedom of the four selected states and its different definitions as well as recent cases and events, the media itself and of course the media systems which should then establish themselves in this respect. The different interpretations of press freedom need to be addressed as well as the issue of the media itself. For example, whether it is merely a product to be marketed (e.g. the tabloid press) or is it serving the people in order to monitor political events and serve as a fourth pillar of democracy. It is indeed a clash of the liberal democratic values versus the ideas of neo-totalitarianism and their respective influences on press freedom and thereby media systems. This certain phenomena can be observed in almost all member states of the Union, namely that there is a new tendency towards totalitarianism which means to get control of the

media. As almost naturally, all totalitarian regimes themselves aim for the media as a useful weapon of propaganda and then again, a pluralistic press is a feared instrument against autocratic regimes or parties.

2. Research question

The main idea of this research paper is to find out which types of media systems can be defined and in which ways they affect press freedom and plurality of the media in the scope of the European Union. Whether the type of media system of a member state can be categorized as either a Liberal, Medium and Regulated. A number of dimensions play into this aspect, which will be presented further on. Therefore, the main qualitative research question of this bachelor thesis which is descriptive in nature is the following;

“To what extent is there a compromising of press freedom of European Union media systems in the 21st century?”

The aim of this research question is to give an understanding of the multiple media systems and their effect which are in place in Europe and furthermore link them to four member states. Namely the EU member states Bulgaria, Hungary, Italy, Poland. Its main purpose is to gain a new understanding on the compromising of press freedom within European media systems. Since it is a descriptive research question the focus will be on the how and why (therefore “to what extent” was posed). It is therefore of essence, in order to answer the research question, to identify and describe the characteristics of press freedom as well as media systems as detailed as possible. It is evident, judging from the academic literature, that there are indeed differences present which exert themselves in a different manner on the type of compromising of press freedom and plurality of the national media. Furthermore, it seeks to conceptualize and identify the dynamics that shape media systems. It is urgent to know the extent of a compromising of press freedom in the last years as it is a subject which has been largely neglected in the scope of the European Union. In answering this question one should be able to understand the differences and gain new insights between media systems currently in place in the European Union as well as their influences and possible consequences. Furthermore, the examining of this research question aims to affiliate to the previous academic debate, by bringing up and discussing concepts such as press freedom, media systems, the (decline of) democracy and the rise of neo-populism. Although, and this shall be the innovative aspect of this thesis, with a new

perspective and diverse discussion of previous perspectives, by linking those concepts to one another together with the latest qualitative data available (in the course of the last five years). This thesis therefore seeks to find out to what extent there still is an undermining of press plurality and the freedom of the media within EU member states, where little attention has been paid from a European perspective to why and especially how this has occurred during the last years.

3. Approach

In order to find an answer to this research question, various aspects need to be examined. Furthermore, an appropriate methodological approach is of essence, to find out which dimensions there are that explain differences in media systems in the European Union and that ultimately shape press freedom. A qualitative approach using the case study as a research design in order to answer the research question because we want a closer insight to the actual extent of it being compromised. The quantitative data provided about media systems does not differentiate about its type. As thereby a quantitative approach would not lead to valid conclusions regarding the implementation of media systems, a qualitative approach was chosen focussing on four cases, namely Bulgaria, Hungary, Italy, Poland. Therefore, a comparative case study with a thorough content analysis was chosen as an approach in order to apply the research design. This research question begs for a qualitative content analysis because it is unobtrusive, it is therefore not collected directly from people. This is important in order to deal with this analysis accordingly. It can be regarded as a study of recorded human communication in form of a conceptual analysis. The focus lies on the media systems in the European Union. The kind of data which will be used are newspaper articles. Ten articles per member state were examined, therefore a total of 40 articles were qualitatively coded according to the dimensions first set out by Blum (2005). In order to strengthen the internal validity as well as the reliability is 10 per selected member state. The time frame for this research is limited to 5 years (thus from 2011-2016) as media systems are prone to constant change. As three of the four countries are young Eastern European democracies, Italy was chosen as well. The benefits of developing a coding scheme in a qualitative content analysis in this case are first and foremost that it holds the potential of being more objective. There is access to a large amount of data available which is also diverse. Lastly, there has to be no worry about a response rate or such thing. As mentioned previously, the focus will lie on four member states of the European Union namely; Bulgaria,

Hungary, Italy and Poland. These four cases are particularly interesting and worth examining due to the fact that they proved to have several breaches in regard to press freedom and the plurality of the media. Of course, one would have included more member states, in order to increase the argument's validity. However an analysis of more than four countries would result in the thesis becoming too broad and one has to accept that it has its limits in those ways. Thus it can be seen as a starting point for further academic research in this area. For each member state 10 newspaper articles will be selected and ultimately coded according to the characteristics (of the dimensions) laid out in the coding scheme. Afterwards, during the analysis, of these results one would clearly be able to attribute them to one of the three models of the media systems; namely the Liberal Model, the Medium Model as well as the Regulated Model. Only then, reasons for differentiations of member states' media systems may seem evident. The dynamics of the media systems are then to be linked with the previously mentioned theoretical part in order to come to certain conclusions if patterns seem to reveal themselves and thereby give possible answers in regard to the research question.

II. Theoretical Framework

The following chapter aims at making the reader familiar with the concepts of media systems and their effect on press freedom and plurality, as well as the dynamics that influence them. Multiple academic works and theories were taken into account, in order to perceive the complexity of this subject in a multi-faceted manner and to provide conceptual answers to the research question in intellectual forms.

1. Introduction

There have been a number of scientific articles and books regarding this topic especially on how to define media systems such as “Comparing Media Systems: Three Models of Media and Politics” written by Daniel C. Hallin and Paolo Mancini and the more recent comparative case studies focussing on the EU member states, namely “Press Freedom and Pluralism in Europe: Concepts and Conditions” written by Andrea Czeppek, Melanie Hellwig and Eva Novak. In addition, Blum (2005) has presented a good way in order to categorize nations into media systems and their effects and dynamics. However, this has been more than ten years ago and much has changed since then and there is only a scarce number of scientific research on the current situation of this matter available which is one of the main motives behind this bachelor thesis. The book “Comparing Media Systems: Three Models of Media and Politics” written by Daniel C. Hallin and Paolo Mancini published for the Cambridge University Press in 2004 classifies media systems in Western democracies into three different normative models, namely the “Liberal”, the “Polarized Pluralist” and the “Corporatist democratic”. Hallin and Mancini are using a combination of empirical observations of several case studies and theories of political and media studies. The models are however, quite outdated and biased to a certain extent due to the fact that they pay little if not at all, attention to the young democracies (such as, for example, the former USSR countries in Europe). Later research showed, that these new democracies can be assigned to the Polarized Pluralist model. Yet they happen to identify the dimensions which are crucial in order to find out which type of media system actually promotes press freedom which is of importance in order to answer the main research question. The four dimensions presented by Hallin & Mancini (2004, p.189) which alter the three respective models are;

Newspaper Industry, Political Parallelism, Professionalization and the Role of the State in the Media System.

In addition, Hallin & Mancini put forward the so called theory of convergence, mainly citing European integration for this reason, in a political sense as well as in a judicial sense is taking place over the last years. This can also be linked to the decline of traditional mass parties throughout Europe, according to Hallin & Mancini, as well as the commercialisation of the media in general. "Press Freedom and Pluralism in Europe: Concepts and Conditions" written by Andrea Czepek, Melanie Hellwig and Eva Novak for the European Communication Research and Education Association in 2009, includes several comparative case studies from European Union member states in Central and Eastern Europe (Bulgaria, Hungary, Lithuania, Poland and Romania), from Western Europe (Austria, France, Germany and Great Britain), Northern Europe (Finland) as well as Southern Europe (Italy and Spain). According to Czepek, Hellwig & Novak: "Press freedom is usually considered a basic element of democratic societies, which should enable citizens to take part in the democratic process and to form an opinion on the basis of being informed about political, social and cultural events and developments. This is only possible if the media offer a pluralistic choice of topics, views and voices, and access is universally granted." (2009, p. 11) The research conducted can be defined as a cross-sectional study as the analysis of the case studies was recorded at one single point in time, in addition it is a analysis of direct observations. By comparing the different European cases, Czepek, Hellwig & Novak (2009, p. 13) come to the conclusion that the freedom of the press in Europe is currently in breach in several member states. There are multiple reasons presented; such as a low circulation of newspapers, an elite orientated press, a weak professionalization of the press and strong state intervention (e.g. periods of censorship). This accounts especially for the countries classified as Central and Eastern Europe as well as Southern Europe.

According to Czepek, Hellwig & Novak (2009, p. 13), there is an unbalanced relationship in regard to the media ownership in the respective countries, namely Bulgaria, Hungary, Italy and Poland. This means that the public television for example, is being controlled or strongly influenced by the government in accordance with commercial broadcasting. In addition, according to Czepek, Hellwig & Novak (2009, p. 13), in these particular countries there are declining resources for journalistic work, in the form of transnational media investments as well as fragmented media markets. These aforementioned reasons or say deficits, make a closer look at the four countries, particularly interesting, as they seem as prime European examples to study the compromising of press freedom and its plurality has shown, judging from the rankings

published by Reporters Without Borders (2015) and Freedom House (2016). Furthermore, the article “Measuring Media Freedom: Approaches of International Comparison” written by Markus Behmer and published in 2009 deals with the aspects of measuring media freedom and provides different scientific approaches on how to do so. It also addresses the difficulties when it comes to measuring press freedom and the different paradigms in regard to defining media systems per se. Behmer (2009), recommends using the data of Freedom House as a comprising method in order to measure the level of press freedom. Moreover, Behmer gives hints for a comprehensive framework in order to conceptualize the dimensions. “*A good and comprehensive guideline could be provided [...] by ‘Media Development Indicators’ which were submitted by the International Programme for the Development of Communication (IPDC). Therein they develop ‘a framework for assessing media development’ which comprises [...] an elaborate list of key indicators.*” (Behmer, 2009, p. 30) Another book, which was particularly interesting on that matter was “Media Accountability and Freedom of Publication” written by Denis McQuail and published by the Oxford University Press in 2003 in which he cites the media as key actor which has largely remained intact over the past decades. It can be an influential tool to influence the public opinion and draw attention, promote or dismiss certain ideas. This can obviously be portrayed in a positive as well as negative way. The key theory developed by McQuail, are the concepts of Responsibility and Accountability that concern the media. The media has a responsibility in the sense that it should inform the public objectively and take the consequences and the quality of the publication. Furthermore, the media must also be sincere in order to assert its accountability, thereby being pluralistic and independent. Another article which was quite informative, especially in regard to the former USSR Eastern European Union member states, was written for the 2004 European Journal of Communication by Karol Jakubowicz and is called “Ideas in Our Heads: Introduction of PSB as Part of Media System change in Central and Eastern Europe.” In this article Jakubowicz (2004) analyzes the situation of public service broadcasting (PSB) in the Eastern European young democracies since the fall of the iron curtain. According to Jakubowicz (2004) , there were three different types of media policies introduced in postcommunist Europe, namely the idealistic orientation, the mimetic orientation and the atavistic orientation. Jakubowicz (2004) argues that the idealistic orientation of media policies was abandoned altogether after the fall of the iron curtain. The so called mimetic media policy pursued in Eastern member states tend to be an imitation of Western policies, lacking ideas and force of its own and also being mixed and outweighed by the so called atavistic media policies present. This atavistic type of media policy orientation of PSB

is, in the eyes of Jakubowicz (2004), retrogressive and picks up practices from the former Communist era. So far, Jakubowicz (2004) argues that the introduction of public service broadcasting in Eastern European member states has failed or at least hasn't shown outstanding positive and progressive effects, for this he cites political, economic and socio-cultural factors.

2. The issue of a democracy in crisis

In order to find out to what extent there is a compromising of press freedom within media systems of the European Union a connection has to be made to the concept of a healthy democracy which is crucial for a free press to sustain itself. In her book "Crisis" published in 2015 by the Polity Press, Professor Sylvia Walby offers a multi-faceted framework of theorizing crises, a chapter on a prospective democratic crisis is particularly interesting in regard to this thesis. Walby (2015) defines a democratic crisis mainly "as a political crisis in which governments around Europe have fallen, established political parties have crashed and new political projects and parties have emerged." In addition this would mean that "existing political institutions are no longer sufficient to channel conflict, which would have consequences for the rate of violence and result in a possible systemic crisis." (p.110) Thus, a crisis of democracy is linked to the decline of mass parties and the establishment of new political parties (first and foremost populist parties). Thereby, assaults on independent journalistic reporting as well as the transformation of the media system in place are the result. However, if this accounts to be true and linking it to the book "Crisis" by Walby (2015) a discussion in regard to other literature and theory put forward on this matter is of essence. By stating that democracy and a free press are of essence for a liberal media system, both are evidently inseparable, meaning one can not survive without the other. With a democracy in crisis, as Walby (2015) puts it, it is partly the role of the media to sustain it. So what if the democracy is undermining and compromising the media and vice versa? Would this result in a total crisis, in which democracy and a free media system are being threatened? Not necessarily, as long as the pillars of the European Union act as their guardian. However, as Walby (2015), with a political crisis, either taking place in a nation state or in a supranational body like the EU, can quickly exert itself into democratic crisis if countermeasures are not taken. Of course, there are multiple reasons that ultimately affect press freedom and thereby the media system in place, which is constantly changing. Therefore, when looking at this matter more closely, there can be a compromising of press freedom to a large

extent if democracy is in peril. It may be undermined if there changes to the democratic outlook of a country which can be reflected in a rise of undemocratic values, such as e.g. neo-populism and neo-fascism.

3. The issue of media serving democracy and vice versa

Another theoretical issue which needs to be addressed is the issue of the media which falls into line with democracy. This may give further explanations when examining the the research question from a conceptual point of view. In the aforementioned section, we came to the conclusion that a drastic political crisis, thus a democratic crisis, may give rise to undemocratic values which can reflect themselves in somewhat totalitarian parties. These are prone not only to endanger the democratic environment but furthermore can also pose a threat to press freedom, namely its compromising. In the feature article called ‘Media Serving Democracy’ from the book “Media in Europe Today” (2011) written by Hannu Nieminen and Josef Trappel, the importance of the media for a healthy democracy is being underlined. Nieminen and Trappel (2011) argue that a *“liberal democracy cannot be thought of without the media. Historically there is an inseparable connection between democracy and the media, as what we understand today as democratic political system can only emerge on the condition of freedom of speech through the media.”* (p.138) This asserts the theory put forward that one cannot exist without the other. A healthy democracy is thus in need of a liberal, pluralistic and independent press as well as the media can only sustain itself in a democratic environment in which freedom of speech and expression is protected and not being under threat of being compromised. Its variety as well as its independence is essential for the public to be informed and of the choice to select what to read. If there is a strong concentrated ownership of the media in one country this cannot be guaranteed. Furthermore, this accounts for the same when reflected in strong parallelism between the media and political parties, this can be caused by direct or indirect state control of the media and thereby diminishing its plurality. Direct state control, exerts itself in laws and bills undermining the versatility of the media and are of course a lot more obvious (e.g. censorship). However, this compromising of press freedom may also result in indirect state control with corruption and influential ties to the business elite as well as the criminal underworld with violent assaults on journalists leading to self-censorship. This is of course a lot more problematic, as it’s total impact remains difficult to measure. As Nieminen and Trappel (2011) conclude, *“the overarching democratic request concerns the media’s accountability to*

the public at large. This requires a high degree of political and economic independence, respect and sufficient resources for journalistic practice, clear and predictable media regulation, a well-balanced composition of commercial and not-for-profit media, including media with a public service remit and sufficient financial resources available to media companies. Not each and every television channel, radio operator or daily newspaper needs to live up to all these requirements, but the media landscape as a whole should adhere to these principles.” (p.149) Thus we can conclude that a non-compliance of a member state to these principles may result in a compromising of press freedom of media systems.

4. The issue of the media and the rise of neo-populism

Lastly, the issue of the media and the rise of neo-populism needs to be addressed. After that it should become clear that those concepts are closely interrelated and are strong dynamics that influence and alter the press freedom of media systems. The rise of neo-populism throughout Europe can lead to a compromising of press freedom, which in return can be the product as well as part of the issue of a democracy in crisis. In the book published in 2003 by Bruce Horsfield “The Media and Neo-Populism: A Contemporary Comparative Analysis” the author examines several Western democracies, their rise in neo-populism together with the media in place. He argues that neo-populism can easily be transported through communications of mass media, as neo-populist politicians often fuel it with controversial, provocative, bold and striking remarks. This can be especially accounted for the tabloid press, which can be seen as a product which has to be sold. In countries with a high commercialization of the press this can occur. As Horsfield (2003) puts it “[p]opulism, under different, perhaps new banners, is likely to continue to crop up anywhere that social balances and security levels are faced with internal as well as global challenges.” (2003, p. 11) According to Horsfield, the media plays a crucial role in supporting neo-populist parties, which is prone to be influenced by a number of institutional and structural dynamics. Possible dynamics, according to Horsfield, that have an effect on the disclosure of right-wing neo-populism can be “the crisis of the national state, high level corruption [as well as] domestic electoral volatility.” This argument concurs with Walby’s (2015) concept of a democracy in crisis. Neo-populism thus can fully unfold in a society which suffers from a political crisis which then transforms itself into a crisis of democracy as “[m]uch of this populism has proved to be radical and anti-democratic in nature[...].” (Horsfield, 2003, p. 6)

This anti-democraticness which exerts itself through neo-populism tends to undermine either the democracy itself and thereby the media or by compromising the media it tends to undermine the democracy.

5. Conclusion

The aforementioned theoretical framework provides solid concepts and conditions in order to examine the main research question of this thesis. It has ascertained the idea that there is a compromising of press freedom of some sort within in some European Union member states from a theoretical perspective. Furthermore this theoretical approach has argued that media systems are indeed the environment that influence press freedom and the plurality of the press. The dynamics that change and influence them and may lead to a compromising of press freedom were elaborated and introduced here, they will be further drawn upon in the analysis. To sum up, we have learned that media systems do play a distinct role on the press freedom, and they may best be analyzed on a national level. Furthermore, we have come to the conclusion out of these perspectives that in a healthy democracy, a functioning pluralistic press is of essence. In addition, this may be threatened when a democracy is experiencing a crisis which can often be in coincidental with right-wing populism but not necessarily.

III. Research Methodology

1. Introduction

The following chapter is dedicated to the methodological approach of this thesis. This incorporates the cases that were selected, on the of data collection and its selection and give pros and cons on the research method to be employed. Furthermore, the sources that have been collected and their reliability as well as the idea behind choosing specifically these sources will be explained. After that, the reader should be able to understand why essentially this methodological approach was chosen and how the data and its analysis will be conducted. In addition, plausible shortcomings will be addressed with possible ways of ruling those out.

2. Case selection

As for the first selected case, Bulgaria, one of the Union's latest members, according to Lilia Raycheva (2009, p. 21) its latest charges on corruption show that this country is far from being a state of independent journalistic reporting and thereby having a pluralistic press. With Bulgaria's accession to the European Union, it has officially adopted its standards regarding freedom of the press, however the influence of Bulgarian politicians with the media remains strong. In addition, the member state Bulgaria was still considered only "partly free" in a 2016 survey of Freedom House. Furthermore, in the 2016 Reporters Without Borders Report annual report Bulgaria was listed as 113th (among 180 countries in the world). The report noted that "[a]ll of the European Union member countries made it into the top except Bulgaria" (51st) as well as Italy. In Sofia, Journalists can be physically assaulted because of their work. The second selected case is Poland, the country of the European Union that fell farthest in the ranking of Reporters Without Borders 2016 annual report is indeed Poland which is ranked 47th (fell 29 places behind) from a total of 180 states examined. Although still rated as "free" in Freedom House 2016 report, the survey also states that "[l]egislation passed at the end of 2015 gave the government greater control over public media, presaging a year of heightened tension between the ruling Law and Justice party and the press." The third selected case is Hungary which is ranked as 67th in the 2016 annual report of Journalists without Borders. According to the 2016 survey conducted by the organisation of Freedom House, Hungary was ranked as only "partly free." The fourth selected case is Italy which is currently ranking as 77th in the annual report of

Journalists Without Borders. According to the Freedom House report of 2016, Italy is being ranked as only “partly free.”

According to the 2015 report by Freedom House “[e]ven in the much more open media environments of Europe, journalists faced unusual pressures from terrorists, and to extent, from their own governments. In a year that began with the shocking murder of eight cartoonists and editors at the Paris offices of the satirical magazine *Charlie Hebdo*, media freedom in the region was threatened by violence, new surveillance and anti-terrorism laws and verbal attacks or interference from politicians and government officials.”

3. Method of data selection

The dimensions concerning each specific state are being assigned to by coding newspaper articles and online reports through the application of Google Analytics. It can be a useful tool in order to find out about the traffic of websites and monitor their popularity. Within the search engine a custom date range was set from 2011 to 2016 with the most popular selections assigned with the codewords “press freedom -name of case-” and “media -name of case-”. There were five sources selected per codeword, so 5 sources that were tracked under press freedom and 5 under media for each case. The idea was to get articles and reports as detailed and diverse as possible. A list of all 40 articles that were developed into a coding scheme may be found in the appendix section. As this study aims to take into account a variety of sources, ten online articles and reports per selected member state were assessed and coded. It was of essence to include domestic as well as foreignly published articles in order to find out to what extent they converge. However there were a maximum one to two domestic articles or reports selected per case. This was mainly done in order to increase the validity of the content. As naturally, the press in each country is ultimately influenced by the media system of the respective country in place. Arguably, the press and media online may not be affected by cases of censorship as heavily, as for example, the printed word may be. Simply because it is a lot more difficult to restrict and censor online content. In addition, renowned and credible as well as neutral publishers of the selected sources were prioritised. This accounts especially for organisations that have been known for their objective and scientifically based reports, such as Freedom House, Index on Censorship, Mapping Media Freedom and the International Press Institute or the Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung. Moreover, this also accounts for popular news agencies, renowned

for their independent journalistic reporting such as EurActiv, The Guardian, The Economist, The New York Times, Politico, Reuters, Deutsche Welle as well as the BBC and Al Jazeera.

4. Method of data analysis

In order to find out to what extent there are differences of the compromising of press freedom in media systems in the European Union, an appropriate methodological approach is of essence. A qualitative approach using the case study as a research design. As mentioned beforehand, the quantitative data provided about the compromising of press freedom does not differentiate about its type. Thus, a quantitative approach would not lead to valid conclusions regarding the implementation of media systems, a qualitative approach was chosen focussing on the four aforementioned cases. Therefore, a comparative case study with a thorough content analysis was chosen as an approach in order to apply the research design. Furthermore, this will be done in form of a coding scheme. Afterwards, a descriptive comparison will be conducted in order to examine and trying describe the invariances between the selected cases and then comparing the overall three types of media systems as distinguished by Blum (2005, p. 7-8). In addition, by focussing on nation states per se one may be missing out on further causations of importance such as for example the transnational development of media systems throughout Europe. Due to the differences and interferences between member states (as they influence and affect one another), it is maybe not valid enough to treat them as single cases. However, this is an aspect which one has to keep in mind but can't really affect without the project becoming broader than it already is. Nevertheless, the results of analysis may bear a regional pattern by which this problem could be diminished. Another fallacy could be in regard to the media system as a static attribute, as they are prone to constant change. (Czepek, Hellwig & Novak, p. 147). On the other hand, one has to accept that media systems are constantly changing and that the focus of the case studies is taking into account the development over the last five years.

Nevertheless, what can also be extracted from the literature is, that it would be helpful limit oneself to a certain number of member states, or say regions without omitting the greater scope of the analysis. This could be done, by taking examples from the north, west, centre, south and east of Europe. (Czepek, Hellwig & Novak, 2009). Mainly due to the fact, that previous academic sources such as Trappel et al. (2011, p. 32) have argued that media systems tend to be influenced by and within territories. However, the regions should be attributed later onwards if a geographical pattern seems evident. Therefore, one will classify the member states into the three

different media systems as defined by Blum (2005, p. 7). In addition, as many states as possible should be taken into account in order to increase the argument's validity and therefore four distinguished cases will be analyzed and conceptualized into one of the three media systems. Afterwards, one would be able to make a comparison between the media systems themselves and their differences. As well, as the dynamics which are prone to influence them and the causes they may bear with the previously presented theoretical background. As mentioned beforehand, this bachelor thesis is employing a qualitative content analysis, by using three main categories to which each member state may be assigned to. In total there are nine sources, which are the dimensions, namely the government system, the political culture, media freedom, media ownership, funding of media, parallelism of media and political parties, the state control of the media, media culture and media orientation. The coding scheme will be developed according to these dimensions.

Dimensions	A: Liberal	B: Middle	C: Regulated
1. Government system	1.1 Democratic	1.2 Authoritarian	1.3 Totalitarian
2. Political culture	2.1 Polarized	2.2 Ambivalent	2.3 Concurring
3. Media freedom	3.1 No censorship	3.2 Cases of censorship	3.3. Censorship
4. Media ownership	4.1 Private	4.2 Public & Private	4.3 Public
5. Funding of media	5.1 Market	5.2 Market & State	5.3 State
6. Parallelism of media & political parties	6.1 Low	6.2 Moderate	6.3 High
7. State control of media	7.1 Low	7.2 Moderate	7.3 High
8. Media culture	8.1 Investigative	8.2 Ambivalent	8.3 Concurring
9. Media orientation	9.1 Commercial	9.2 Divergent	9.3 Public Service

Categories for Media Systems by Blum (2005) developed into a coding scheme.

As mentioned before, the research design is in a qualitative content analysis. As Earl Babbie (2013, p. 300) points out a “[c]ontent analysis is essentially a coding operation.” This involves transforming raw data, in this case online news articles and reports, into a standardized form.

The written communications (in this case, the 40 articles coded) are coded and classified according to the categories media systems introduced by Blum (2005). A detailed version of the codebook, with a description of the indicators of the references, may be retrieved in the appendix. As opposed to manifest coding of materials, which is an objective way of counting specific elements, latent coding was chosen. Indeed, it may be regarded as a lot more subjective, but a latent coding is important if we want to find out the underlying meaning. Of course, the subjectivity of the latent coding may decrease the argument's reliability and specificity. Therefore, when coding the articles one has to be as objective and code as many different sources as detailed as possible. The fact that a single researcher was committed to the coding, decreases this threat. However, it is thereby not ruled out completely, as Babbie (2013, p. 301) states: "Even if you do all the coding by yourself, there is no guarantee that you definitions and standards will remain constant throughout the enterprise." The coding scheme will be made according to the dimensions as presented by Blum (2005, p. 11). As for the conceptualization and the operationalization, the codes are also of essence, is because they are mutually exclusive. Afterwards, the countries may be sorted into the coding scheme with the computer programme Atlas.ti in order to establish significant conclusions about these countries and media systems and the differences between the four member states.

5. Conclusion

With the case selection, method of data collection, method of data analysis described, the query remains on how to answer the main research question of this thesis which can only be answered with a number of research activities that build up on another. As we are interested in the different dimensions of media systems compromising press freedom in the four states, the first activity of the research activity is thus the selection and examination of the sources. After that we begin the study with identifying and coding every articles for possible references to the dimensions. In order to decrease the number of possible errors the articles were read and coded twice each for the selected references. After that comes the analysis, in which the numerical output should thoroughly be described. At least three examples of traces should verify every assertion, due to the fact that less than that can not really be seen as scientifically significant. The analytic interpretations should furthermore be also reporting on inconsistencies which do not fit in accord with our hypotheses, namely that there is a compromising of press freedom in

the European Union taking place. After own analysis and interpretation the output of Atlas.ti will be examined with concepts previously briefly introduced in the theoretical framework in order to find an answer to the research question.

IV. Data & Analysis

In the following chapter, the collected data and the research conducted will be analysed, thus a total of 40 online newspaper articles and reports published within the last five years (10 per specific case) in form of a coded output of Atlas.ti. In order to answer the research question and link it to the previously presented theoretical framework, the results of the coding scheme developed will be presented and described. They will be analysed for each specific case after references that indicate a compromising of press freedom. Afterwards, these findings will be compared related to the concepts and theories previously which lastly results in the answering of the research question and providing possible explanations and consequences thereof.

1. Descriptive report

The full report of the findings may be retrieved in the Appendix on which this description is based on. The dataset has indeed revealed interesting results in regard to our research question. In the total of the 40 articles analyzed, a total of 379 references to the dimensions could be coded. However some dimensions, or references to them did not appear at all. This accounts for all four sources. Nevertheless for every article it was possible to find corresponding codes. Therefore one can argue that indeed evidence for was found. In this non-numerical examination and interpretation of news articles and reports whereby the raw data was standardized according to the codes presented by Blum (2005).

In the case of Bulgaria, it is interesting to note that there were 13 traces of cases of censorship in the total of 10 articles coded for that subject. In addition to that, there were 16 traces that the media is in public as well as in private ownership. What seems quite alarming, is that there were 23 traces of high parallelism of the media and political parties. This also goes in accordance with 20 references to a high state control of the media. In regard to the media culture, there were three references to the media culture as investigative, one reference to the media culture as ambivalent and 16 references to the media culture as concurring. There were no references at all to be found to the type of government system in place. This asserts that there is a significant compromising of press freedom from a moderate to a high extent in the case of Bulgaria.

"HU: [C:\Users\Maurice\Documents\European Studies\Bachelor Thesis\Media systems.hpr7]"

Code-Filter: All [27]

PD-Filter: All [10/40]

Quotation-Filter: All [188]

CODES	PRIMARY DOCUMENTS	
	Bulgaria	Totals
1.1 Democratic (Gove	0	0
1.2 Authoritarian (G	0	0
1.3 Totalitarian (Go	0	0
2.1 Polarized (Polit	0	0
2.2 Ambivalent (Poli	1	1
2.3 Concurring (Poli	2	2
3.1 No censorship (M	0	0
3.2 Cases of censors	13	13
3.3 Censorship (Medi	0	0
4.1 Private (Media o	0	0
4.2 Public & Private	16	16
4.3 Public (Media ow	1	1
5.1 Market (Funding	0	0
5.2 Market & State (1	1
5.3 State (Funding o	4	4
6.1 Low (Parallelism	0	0
6.2 Moderate (Parall	0	0
6.3 High (Parallelis	23	23
7.1 Low (State contr	0	0
7.2 Moderate (State	4	4
7.3 High (State cont	20	20
8.1 Investigative (M	3	3
8.2 Ambivalent (Medi	1	1
8.3 Concurring (Medi	16	16
9.1 Commercial (Medi	0	0
9.2 Divergent (Media	0	0
9.3 Public Service (3	3
Totals	108	108

In the case of Hungary, there were a seven references to the type of government system of Hungary being defined authoritarian. One reference to the political culture as ambivalent, another reference to the political culture as concurring. A total of 22 traces of cases of censorship were to be found in the case of Hungary. This was the reference, which was defined as the broadest one can say. Mainly due to the fact that, assaults on journalists, as well as heavy fines or taxes, mentioning of pre-dictated interviews and self-censorship was also taken into

account under this category. There was one reference to complete censorship but in relation to the 22 cases of censorship this does not seem all too valid. There were four cases of public and private media ownership but this was more or less to be expected. These are the only references made in that code group of media ownership for the case of Hungary. In addition, there are two traces of market and state funding and one trace of solely state funding in the ten articles to be found. Furthermore, there are 16 references towards high political parallelism of the media and the ruling political parties. This also concurs with the output that there are 10 references of moderate state control of the media and 23 references of high state control of the media. In the eight traces that the media culture of the state of Hungary can be seen as concurring. Lastly there were three traces that the orientation of the media referred to as divergent and five traces that the media is orientated towards the public service. This asserts that there is a compromising of press freedom from a moderate to high extent in the case of Hungary.

CODES-PRIMARY-DOCUMENTS-TABLE (CELL=Q-FREQ)y

Report created by M. A. Stegen - 13.06.2016 22:10:24

"HU: [C:\Users\Maurice\Documents\European Studies\Bachelor Thesis\Media systems.hpr7]"

Code-Filter: All [27]

PD-Filter: All [10/40]

Quotation-Filter: All [188]

CODES	PRIMARY DOCUMENTS	
	Hungary	Totals
1.1 Democratic (Gove	0	0
1.2 Authoritarian (G	7	7
1.3 Totalitarian (Go	0	0
2.1 Polarized (Polit	0	0
2.2 Ambivalent (Poli	1	1
2.3 Concurring (Poli	1	1
3.1 No censorship (M	0	0
3.2 Cases of censors	22	22
3.3 Censorship (Medi	1	1
4.1 Private (Media o	0	0
4.2 Public & Private	4	4
4.3 Public (Media ow	0	0
5.1 Market (Funding	0	0
5.2 Market & State (2	2
5.3 State (Funding o	1	1
6.1 Low (Parallelism	0	0
6.2 Moderate (Parall	0	0
6.3 High (Parallelis	16	16
7.1 Low (State contr	0	0
7.2 Moderate (State	10	10

7.3 High (State cont	23	23
8.1 Investigative (M	0	0
8.2 Ambivalent (Medi	0	0
8.3 Concurring (Medi	8	8
9.1 Commercial (Medi	0	0
9.2 Divergent (Media	3	3
9.3 Public Service (5	5

Totals	104	104

As for the third case, Italy, no references were made that refer to the tendency of the government system. In two cases the political culture of Italy is referred as ambivalent and in four cases as concurring. Of all four selected cases, Italy ranks the highest when it comes to cases of censorship (namely 30 times referred to in the ten reports on Italy) and this is highly significant as later discussion of the output will show. There are six traces that the media is in public as well as private ownership and two traces in regard to the funding of the media (privately as well as publicly financed). Seven references account for a high political parallelism between the state and the media. Surprisingly, the references on state control are on par, moderate as well as high state control of the media appeared both 16 times. However the media culture remains blurred, with one trace of an investigative one, five of an ambivalent and three of a concurring one. One argue that the media culture in Italy is indeed ambivalent and that it maybe depends on the topics covered by journalists and reporters. Lastly, the orientation of the media is in three traces referred to as divergent and in five traces orientated towards the public media. This confirms that there is significant compromising of press freedom ranging from moderate to high in the case of Italy.

CODES-PRIMARY-DOCUMENTS-TABLE (CELL=Q-FREQ)

Report created by M. A. Stegen - 13.06.2016 22:09:05

"HU: [C:\Users\Maurice\Documents\European Studies\Bachelor Thesis\Media systems.hpr7]"

Code-Filter: All [27]

PD-Filter: All [10/40]

Quotation-Filter: All [188]

		PRIMARY DOCUMENTS	
CODES	Italy	Totals	

1.1 Democratic (Gove	0	0	
1.2 Authoritarian (G	0	0	

1.3 Totalitarian (Go	0	0
2.1 Polarized (Polit	0	0
2.2 Ambivalent (Poli	2	2
2.3 Concurring (Poli	4	4
3.1 No censorship (M	0	0
3.2 Cases of censors	30	30
3.3 Censorship (Medi	0	0
4.1 Private (Media o	0	0
4.2 Public & Private	6	6
4.3 Public (Media ow	0	0
5.1 Market (Funding	0	0
5.2 Market & State (2	2
5.3 State (Funding o	0	0
6.1 Low (Parallelism	0	0
6.2 Moderate (Parall	0	0
6.3 High (Parallelism	7	7
7.1 Low (State contr	0	0
7.2 Moderate (State	16	16
7.3 High (State cont	16	16
8.1 Investigative (M	1	1
8.2 Ambivalent (Medi	5	5
8.3 Concurring (Medi	3	3
9.1 Commercial (Medi	0	0
9.2 Divergent (Media	3	3
9.3 Public Service (5	5

Totals	100	100

In regard to the last case studied, Poland, there were two references made to the type of government system as authoritarian, which might explain the two references found which describe the political as polarized and the two references made the political culture being concurring. Poland is not only the country with the least references found, it also has the least references made towards cases of censorship, which rank as seven. Furthermore, there were two traces of public and private media ownership and three traces towards a public ownership of the media. In addition to that there was one reference made to market and state funding of the media, as well as two references solely to state funding. Moreover, there were eight traces of high political parallelism between the state and the media. A total of two traces indicated moderate state control of the media and 23 refer to a high state control. The culture of the media remains on par with three traces referring to it as ambivalent and three to concurring. This might also be reflected in the orientation of the media, which is being referred to in two cases as divergent and in five cases as public service orientated. This confirms that there is a certain compromising of press freedom to a moderate extent in the case of Poland.

CODES-PRIMARY-DOCUMENTS-TABLE (CELL=Q-FREQ)

Report created by M. A. Stegen - 13.06.2016 22:08:00

"HU: [C:\Users\Maurice\Documents\European Studies\Bachelor Thesis\Media systems.hpr7]"

Code-Filter: All [27]

PD-Filter: All [10/40]

Quotation-Filter: All [188]

CODES	PRIMARY DOCUMENTS	
	Poland	Totals
1.1 Democratic (Gove	0	0
1.2 Authoritarian (G	2	2
1.3 Totalitarian (Go	0	0
2.1 Polarized (Polit	2	2
2.2 Ambivalent (Poli	0	0
2.3 Concurring (Poli	2	2
3.1 No censorship (M	0	0
3.2 Cases of censors	7	7
3.3 Censorship (Medi	0	0
4.1 Private (Media o	0	0
4.2 Public & Private	2	2
4.3 Public (Media ow	3	3
5.1 Market (Funding	0	0
5.2 Market & State (1	1
5.3 State (Funding o	2	2
6.1 Low (Parallelism	0	0
6.2 Moderate (Parall	0	0
6.3 High (Parallelism)	8	8
7.1 Low (State contr	0	0
7.2 Moderate (State	2	2
7.3 High (State cont	23	23
8.1 Investigative (M	0	0
8.2 Ambivalent (Medi	3	3
8.3 Concurring (Medi	3	3
9.1 Commercial (Medi	0	0
9.2 Divergent (Media	2	2
9.3 Public Service (5	5
Totals	67	67

2. Discussion of the results

“Journalism is printing what someone else does not want printed: everything else is public relations.” Is a quote often attributed to the English writer George Orwell. Whether it was truly phrased by Orwell himself is not of importance here, it is its meaning. “According to the

democratic ideal, media's function is, first of all, to inform the citizens on the whereabouts of public life. The function is that of servicing citizens with relevant and objective information on common matters, which is a prerequisite for critical and reasoned public debate, leading to public opinion and the common will formation." (Nieminen & Trappel, 2011, p. 141) This asserts the standpoint and role the media must maintain in order to bear guardian and watchdog in a democratic environment. The generated output which has briefly remains indeed interesting and concurs with the initial idea pointed out in the introduction as well as the theoretical framework, namely that there is a compromising of press freedom which taking place in, at least some member states of the European Union and that is indeed quite Orwellian. This is reflected in the fact that every of the four member states shows an unusual amount of traces especially in the code categories of cases of censorship, high political parallelism of political parties and the media as well as moderate or high state control of the media. This data output is very important to the research question is indeed also scientifically relevant because it shows that in all member states there is a high state control of the press and this can be extracted from all the manifold articles examined. It is the evidence that the press freedom and thereby of course the plurality of the media is being undermined and compromised first and foremost by the state in the countries analysed. "The relational patterns between the media and their political counterparts reveal yet another dynamic - the ways and means adopted by political actors to use, exploit or manipulate the media. Governments and Politicians have been eager to use and possibly control, the media; the strategic use of communication is - not only nowadays - an essential requirement to gain and maintain political power," as Horsfield (2003, p.14) asserts. The extent to which press freedom may be compromised can thus be reflected to what degree the media is associated with the presiding political elites in that country. In the case of Bulgaria, Hungary, Italy and Poland it is reflected in the high political parallelism that the established domestic media is in line with the views and standpoint of the political elite to which they belong (2003, p.16).

It is furthermore quite shocking that the leading parties, whether in Bulgaria, Hungary, Italy or Poland are all (at least) centre-right orientated governments, which seem not to take chances on liberating the press and enhancing media pluralism through independent journalistic reporting, to put it mildly. In other words, this crisis can be attributed to the rise of neo-populism throughout Europe. This rise of neo-populism gives rise to undemocratic ideas as it tends to narrow down, over exaggerate and exploit situations. However, mass media products like the tabloid press tend to stoke up sensationalism as means of reporting which may grant neo-populist parties a kick-start. As Horsfield (2003, p. 15-16) argues that "[t]abloid media

which are under no particular pressure from society to assume civic responsibilities, are more likely to echo publicly anti-traditional party [...], anti-immigration sentiments and to foster cynicism and disengagement. This is of extraordinary worth of mentioning, due to the fact that it portrays that not only freedom of the press and democracy are inseparable from one another but also that neo-populism and the media are mutually dependent on one another. Of course, a pluralistic press and independent journalistic reporting tends to give multiple views on subjects and occurrences. If this is being under the threat of being undermined or compromised then the crisis of a regulated press exerts itself into a political crisis. As Walby (2015) points out, “[i]f political institutions have become unable to channel conflict then the political crisis is likely to cascade into violence and become crisis in democracy” (p. 119) This may be reflected in the numerous assaults on journalists which were also taken into account under the code of cases of censorship. Furthermore, this violence which is taking place towards journalists whether it is initiated by hate speech of neo-populist leaders or through criminal organisations and mobs such as the Italian mafia, this disembogues towards something which is far worse, namely self-censorship. This occurs when journalists, reporters and whole news agencies are threatened to such extent that they carefully select what is being published and what is not. It is also devastating for a free press as it remains to be a dark figure, a mere estimated number of unknown and thereby unreported cases. Czepek, Hellwig and Novak (2011) agree that “self censorship is often a concern in journalism, induced by various dependencies on the political and economic system. But it is difficult to measure self-censorship. Thus pluralism of media reporting can be an indicator because high diversity of media content indicates a low level of self-censorship.” (2011, p. 40)

As Sylvia Walby (2015) argues, this crisis of democracy can only be solved by “[r]egulation by democratic states [that] reduces such distortion of markets by the corrupt and powerful. The achievement of democratic depth requires the regulation of finance in the interests of the majority, not the minority” (p. 117) This accounts especially for the media markets in all of the four countries examined which are in the hands of a small powerful political elite, as the high ratio of references on high parallelism between political parties and the media show. This also goes hand in hand with the idea laid out by Jakubowicz (2004) concerning the critique of public service broadcasting as according to him the “introduction of PSB has either so far failed, or has produced very uncertain results, as PSB organizations lack social embeddedness and the right democratic context in which to operate.” Naturally one has to take into account that the media as well as democracy in central and in eastern Europe has taken a different evolvement after

the fall of the iron curtain and “[w]ith regard to broadcasting, most countries established public service broadcasters but political parallelism is still widespread.” (Nieminen & Trappel, 2011, p. 140) In the case of the outputs conducted with Atlas.ti, this reflected in the high references of political parallelism and high to moderate state control of the media. In all cases, the orientation of the media was referring more towards the public service. As Jakubowicz states, “public service broadcasting is so far generally seen as failing to deliver to its promise of independence and political impartiality, as well as of serving as a mainstay of the public sphere and of delivering diverse and pluralistic content of high quality” (2007, p. 309) Thus what can be extracted from the articles which naturally were to be read before they were coded is that the compromising of press freedom takes different forms, which can also be seen from the number of references per code for each specific member state. In addition, these outputs are in many ways reflecting the latest reports of Freedom House and Reporters Without Borders (2016), in which Bulgaria, Hungary and Italy are being rated as “partly free” whereas in the case of Poland it is still rated as “free”. In the analysis, Poland was the state with the least breaches of press freedom and hints for censorship and control of the media. Mainly due to the fact that most of the breaches by Poland were reported on in the beginning of this year (2016), which can be attributed to the new bill introduced which grants leading political parties like the PiS more control of the state media.

Concluding one can say that there are multiple indicators found in the total spectrum of the articles analysed for every case. However, what is quite interesting, that this compromising of press freedom exerts itself in many different ways. It may therefore be not valid enough to simply measure the overall press freedom. Bulgaria is and remains a very interesting case, due to the fact that the articles and reports published on Bulgaria’s media situation could still not tell who owns most of it. In Borisov’s Bulgaria, the most popular media agencies are in the hands of oligarchs close to the government. It was reported that the main media companies are in the hands of relatives of an MEP of the leading Bulgarian party. However, these are rumours not facts. But let alone the fact that the media ownership cannot really be distinguished from political actors remains suspicious. Hungary under Viktor Orban’s Fidesz party is certainly as one of the examined articles puts it ‘a canary in a coalmine’ with strict control of the media to date. A few years ago, the Hungarian government, was asked by the European Commission to revise it, however most of it is still intact. In addition, it is not only the law in place but also a matter of finances. Heavy taxes are imposed quite arbitrarily on news agencies that do not seem to be in line with the government’s views. In Italy corruption still has a large impact, as well as

violent assaults on journalists by the Italian mafia on independent journalistic reporting. The almost ancient law of defamation also plays a part in the compromising of press freedom in Italy which can result in heavy fines (almost unbearable for independent journalists) and even prison sentences. Especially, heads of state (as it was the case in the Berlusconi era) as well as the Vatican remain untouchable by the press (as it was with the latest scandal of Vatileaks). It is interesting to see that Poland is the case with the least traces developed in the coding scheme (67 in total) and is also the only country of the four cases which was ranked as 'free' in the 2016 country report of Freedom House. Quite possibly, this might change in the next year's report when the new bill signed by the Polish president that replaced the employees of the public media with sympathisers of the PiS party and its effects will thereof be visible. The European Commission has announced consequences to this newly passed bill in the beginning of this year but whether this is just an idle threat or brings actual measures to be taken with it remains debatable. In the feature article "Deficits and Potentials of the Public Spheres" published in the book "Media in Europe Today" Barbara Thomass advocates Europe acting within public spheres in order to decrease this compromising of press freedom. Thomass (2011) concludes that "[d]igital online media will provide more platforms for dialogue and debate. The fragmentation of audiences will persist, so that public spheres at the European level will be focused on different media and different issues. These are the trends which the media - especially the commercial one which are lagging behind in European coverage cannot ignore." Up to now (July 2016), no concrete actions leading to systemic change were taken from the side of the EU. The future of the free press and especially media pluralism in the European Union thus remains an uncertain one, which will be elaborated on in the following section.

V. Conclusion

1. Answering the research question

Now coming back to our initial research question presented in the beginning of this thesis, which was namely; *“To what extent is there a compromising of press freedom of European Union media systems in the 21st century?”* After now having examined the collected data and analyzing as well as discussing it with the given theoretical background one can conclude the following. There is certainly a compromising of press freedom from a moderate to great extent in European media systems in the 21st century. Of course, this only accounts for the four member states examined but it is enough to know that there is indeed a compromising taking place, in at least, some member states of the European Union. Furthermore, with the coding scheme revealing different dynamics which proves that the compromising of press freedom is manifold in the way the media system is designed to. In all of the four states examined too strict laws limiting the liberty of the press contributed to its endangered practice. In addition, it is, at least within the spectre of the eastern European member states, visible that these laws, or practices can be attributed to the neo-populist government. Certainly, this underlying meaning has been clarified, namely that neo-populism, which in many ways portrays ideas which are essentially undemocratic, pervades through media systems where plurality of the press is being undermined.

2. Reflection

Certainly it is clear now that there is a compromising of press freedom within the four European Union member states examined. It accounts that this lack of it is to some sort a matter of compromising of democracy itself. The multiple dynamics that influence and shape the media system and thereby the level of press freedom as well as its plurality have been clarified. It seems clear nonetheless that this compromising is taking hold first and foremost from within and that is through the state intervening. Through the ruling parties which are in power, in the case of Bulgaria, Hungary and Poland this can be attributed to the neo-populist parties. The case of Italy shows us that this may not necessarily be always the matter. We know for certain that when

the media is under scrutiny the accountability of democracy is in peril and vice versa. In addition we came to know that neo-populism rises and falls with the media, owing a lot to its influence. Two books were particularly useful in this respect which are also in line with the main argument of the thesis, namely “The Media and Neo-Populism: a Contemporary Comparative Analysis” by Bruce Horsfield as well as “Press Freedom and Pluralism in Europe: Concepts and Conditions” by Czepek, Hellwig and Novak. In addition, “Crisis” by Sylvia Walby also proved to have some relevant ideas contributing to this thesis, although often quite abstract. It proved to be of great importance when linking its concept idea of “Democracy in Crisis” to Nieminen & Trappel’s article “Media Serving Democracies.” The theories examined proved that a lot of the conditions and main concepts are although diverse, entangled to one another. Certainly, this concurred with the initial argument of this thesis, namely that press freedom in the EU is a right many European citizens often take for granted, though not guaranteed. Furthermore, a book which was of great significance to this thesis was the book by Horsfield which was underlining the strong relationship between neo-populism and the media. Arguably, this just can be seen as a starting point towards further research in this field. A lot of research has already been committed to it but however not in the recent years and not with much focus on the European Union itself. Due to the limited space of this thesis, only a small selection four from a total of (now again) 27 member states were being analysed. This is one of the major shortcomings of this thesis because one might agree that there is a compromising of some extent in the European Union (namely in the case of the four countries examined), it would have been great to perceive a greater scope by taking into account every member state. In addition, it would have been good to include more than 10 articles per case examined, but the multifariousness of articles was limited in the time frame examined. Of course one has to admit that there is indeed the problem with media systems changing very quickly and adapting to new dynamics, which can be seen especially in the case of Poland. The research conducted may not lead to groundbreaking new insights but it stresses the fact that press freedom is still being in breach in several European countries and that a European Union membership does not necessarily guarantee a safeguarding.

3. Implications for the European Union

In order to to safeguard these basic values the EU needs to make use of the rule of law principle in member states where press freedom is being compromised. This can hold national governments accountable to actions instead of merely national officials acting unconstitutional. According, to Gianna Iaciano from the European Centre for Press and Media Freedom, “[t]he rule of law principle is a prerequisite for the protection of all fundamental values of the European Union, as they are listed in art. 2 of the Treaty of the European Union (TEU).” (ECPMF, 2016) Therefore, if a member state breaches fundamental rights which are enshrined in the treaty of the European Union, they may be according to art. 7 suspended of their voting rights on a EU level if the breach is “serious and persistent.” (ECPMF, 2016). This procedure is divided into three steps: firstly the *assessment* in which constitutional changes adopted by the member state are being observed and analyzed that are against the so-called rule of law principle. The second step, is the *recommendation* which is being issued by the European Commission if indeed observations have been made that do not concur with the rule of law principle. In this recommendation, the Commission gives its remarks on how to bring those ‘systemic threats’ back into line with EU values (ECPMF, 2016). The third and last stage of this process is the *monitoring* by which the EU is observing further changes which may result in a breach of the rule of law principle. The matter with this policy is that it needs to be implemented more drastically. Often the reforms which were being made after a recommendation was being issued by the European Commission with respect to the compromising of press freedom, proved only to have minor changes. This can be seen in the case of Hungary, which under Orban’s government was forced by the Commission to reform its media laws. However, organisations such as Reporters Without Borders and the Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung are convinced that these reforms were only minor undertakings. Poland, since the launch of its new media laws in the beginning of this year, still has no recommendations to face. The Commission has in fact only been gathering information and has been analyzing to what extent there are systemic threats to the rule of law principle in the case of press plurality being undermined in Poland. Quite, the opposite Jean-Claude Juncker has assured during a statement that no such drastic measures, such as a suspension of voting rights will take place. As long as this will be the practice from the side of the EU, and especially in respect to the Commission, the national governments of the EU will continue to compromise press freedom and undermine the plurality of the media if not being under strict supervision.

4. Final remarks

The European Union has in general not taken position in order to combat the compromising of press freedom extensively. It lies in the hands of institutions like the European Commission as well as the European Judicial Court which could take actions in order to try to achieve press plurality and thereby independent journalistic reporting. Investigations need to be taken when there are indicators of press freedom being under threat. If those indicators prove to be true the national government breaching them must adhere to reforms as freedom of expression and freedom of the press are enshrined in the European treaties. What use are the treaties if they do not have the scope of being enforced on a national as well as a European basis? So far, measures taken against EU member states proved to lack the strength as well as the commitment. One could argue that they would not lead to a consensus or unity within the Union itself, which might be one of the reasons why the EU does not take drastic measures. One gets the impression that the European Union has multiple “other problems” to deal with at the moment. Nevertheless, this should in no way be neglected as almost no action against the compromising of press freedom at all might result in an increase. Drastic measures if necessary need to be taken such as for example a blocking of the voting rights when it comes to decision making. According to This is however of essence if we European citizens want to continue to live in a liberal, uncompromised media environment.

VI. List of References

Babbie, E. (2013) *The Practice of Social Research*. 13th International Edition. Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Behmer, M. (2009). *Measuring Media Freedom: Approaches of International Comparison*. European Communication Research and Education Association.

Blum, R. (2005). *Bausteine zu einer Theorie der Mediensysteme*. Medienwissenschaft Schweiz, 2, pp.5-11.

Czepek, A., Hellwig, M. & Novak, E. (2009). *Press Freedom and Pluralism in Europe: Concepts and Conditions*. European Communication Research and Education Association.

European Parliament. (2015). Retrieved on the 8th of December 2015 from:
<http://www.europarl.europa.eu/EPRS/EPRS-Briefing-554214-Press-freedom-in-the-EU-FINAL.pdf>.

Freedom House. (2015). Retrieved on the 5th of December 2015 from:
<https://freedomhouse.org/report-types/freedom-press>.

Freedom House (2015). *Bulgaria*. Retrieved on 15th of May 2016 from:
<https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2015/bulgaria>

Freedom House (2015). *Hungary*. Retrieved on 12th of May 2016 from:
<https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2015/hungary>

Freedom House (2015). *Italy*. Retrieved on 15th of May 2016 from:
<https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2015/italy>

Freedom House (2015). *Poland*. Retrieved on 15th of May 2016 from:
<https://freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world/2015/poland>

Hallin, D. & Mancini, P. (2004). *Comparing Media Systems: Three Models of Media and Politics*. Cambridge University Press.

Horsfield, B. (2003). *The Media and Neo-Populism: A Contemporary Comparative Analysis*. Greenwood Publishing Group.

Iacino, G. (2016). *What can the EU do to defend media freedom in Poland?* European Centre for Press & Media Freedom. Retrieved on the 15th of July 2016 from: <https://ecpmf.eu/news/legal/archive/what-can-the-eu-do-to-defend-media-freedom-in-poland>

Jakubowicz, K. (2007). *The Eastern European/Post-Communist Media Model Countries*. Bristol and Chicago: Intellect. Pp. 303-13

Mapping Media Freedom. (2015). Retrieved on the 6th of December 2015 from: <https://mappingmediafreedom.org/#/>.

Mazzoleni, G. (2008). *Italy: Media System*. The International Encyclopedia of Communication.

McQuail, D. (2003). *Media accountability and the Freedom of Publication*. University of Oxford Press.

Reporters Without Borders. (2016) World Press Freedom Ranking. Retrieved on the 6th of March 2016 from: <https://rsf.org/en/ranking>

Thomass, B. (2011) *Deficits and Potentials of the Public Spheres*. The Euromedia Research Group. Pp.119-133

Thomass & Kleinstaubner. (2011). *Comparing Media Systems: The European Dimension*. The Euromedia Research Group. pp.25-39.

Trappel et al. (2011). *Media in Europe Today*. The Euromedia Research Group.

Walby, S. (2015). *Crisis*. Polity Press. pp. 110-143.

VII. Appendix

List of selected online published articles and reports

<u>Number (Country)</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Publisher</u>	<u>Publishing date</u>
1. (Bulgaria)	'Bulgaria'	Freedom House	2016
2. (Bulgaria)	'Borisov Grabs Limelight in Bulgaria's Media'	Balkan Insight	15.02.2016
3. (Bulgaria)	'Bulgaria's Media Oligarchs and Press Freedom'	European Journalism Observatory	25.09.2014
4. (Bulgaria)	'Why Bulgaria is the EU's lowest ranked country on press freedom index'	The Guardian	23.09.2014
5. (Bulgaria)	'Gravely damaged media pluralism'	The Economist	23.04.2013
6. (Bulgaria)	'Bulgaria worst among EU countries in 2016 Press Freedom Index'	The Sofia Globe	20.04.2016
7. (Bulgaria)	'The Collapse of Media Freedom in Bulgaria'	The Politics	2015
8. (Bulgaria)	'Media freedom in Bulgaria'	Balkanmedia (Konrad-Adenauer-Stiftung)	2015
9. (Bulgaria)	'Bulgaria: Investigative journalist hits back at smear campaign by media mogul'	Index on Censorship	11.01.2016
10. (Bulgaria)	'Press freedom in Bulgaria: No country for old values?'	East Side Stories (Café Babel)	22.01.2016
11. (Hungary)	'Hungary'	Freedom House	2016
12. (Hungary)	'How Hungary's government shaped public media to its mould'	Reuters	19.02.2014
13. (Hungary)	'Hungarian media tax threatens press freedom, says newspaper editor'	The Guardian	4.06.2014

14. (Hungary)	'Hungary's Crackdown on the Press'	The New York Times	8.09.2014
15. (Hungary)	'Media freedom remains under threat in Hungary'	European Commission	28.07.2014
16. (Hungary)	'UN review of Hungary shows country 'treats human rights as a public enemy''	Committee to Protect Journalists (CPJ)	13.05.2016
17. (Hungary)	'Hungarian media group fueled with central bank cash'	Reuters	23.05.2016
18. (Hungary)	'Hungary, 'canary in the coal mine' of EU press'	Politico	29.09.2015
19. (Hungary)	'Hungary: Media Freedom Under Threat'	Human Rights Watch	16.02.2012
20. (Hungary)	'Mapping Digital Media: Hungary'	Open Society Foundations (OSF)	February 2012
21. (Italy)	'EU fails to defend press freedom, new report finds'	Equal Times	7.10.2015
22. (Italy)	'Italian Senate considers bill to increase prison time for defamation'	International press Institute (IPI)	31.05.2016
23. (Italy)	'Italy's free expression hamstrung by lack of media plurality'	Index on Censorship	15.08.2013
24. (Italy)	'Italy loses 4 places in RSF press freedom index'	ANSA	20.04.2016
25. (Italy)	'How the Mafia Intimidates and Controls the Italian Media'	Vice Magazine	15.03.2016
26. (Italy)	'Press freedom trio call for reform of Italy's draft defamation law'	The Guardian	11.06.2014
27. (Italy)	'Mafia blamed for Italy's press freedom decline'	The Local	12.02.2015
28. (Italy)	'Italians little concerned at limits to press freedom'	Deutsche Welle	19.01.2011
29. (Italy)	'Italy: Reform could introduce fines for needless defamation suits against journalists'	Mapping Media Freedom	12.04.2016

30. (Italy)	'IPI Press Freedom Mission to Italy Underway; Lack of Editorial Independence, Media Concentration, and Proposed 'Wiretap' Bill Top Discussions'	International Press Institute (IPI)	2011
31. (Poland)	'Poland'	Freedom House	2016
32. (Poland)	'Poland: The EU's media freedom conundrum'	Al Jazeera	17.01.2016
33. (Poland)	'Is Poland governed by the rule of law? The EU isn't so sure anymore'	CS Monitor	13.01.2016
34. (Poland)	'Poland's President Approves Controls on State Media, Alarming E.U. Leaders'	The New York Times	7.01.2016
35. (Poland)	'Poland's new government seeks to bring media into line'	Deutsche Welle	22.12.2015
36. (Poland)	'Polish president signs bill putting state media under government control'	The Guardian	7.01.2016
37. (Poland)	'Poland's tricky political turn: Rule of law and media freedom endangered?'	The New Federalist	2.05.2016
38. (Poland)	'European commission to debate Poland's controversial new laws'	The Guardian	12.01.2016
39. (Poland)	'Polish media laws: Nationwide protests are staged'	British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC)	9.01.2016
40. (Poland)	'Polish President signs controversial media law'	EurActiv	8.01.2016

Codebook

<u>Code (27 in total)</u>	<u>Comment</u>	<u>Author</u>
1.1 Democratic	This code will be used whenever there is any reference to the type of government system as democratic.	M. A. Stegen
1.2 Authoritarian	This code will be used whenever there is any reference to the type of government system as authoritarian.	M. A. Stegen

1.3 Totalitarian	This code will be used whenever there is any reference to the type of government system as totalitarian.	M. A. Stegen
2.1 Polarized	This code will be used whenever there is any reference to the political culture as polarized.	M. A. Stegen
2.2 Ambivalent	This code will be used whenever there is any reference to the political culture as ambivalent.	M. A. Stegen
2.3 Concurring	This code will be used whenever there is any reference to the political culture as concurring.	M. A. Stegen
3.1 No censorship	This code will be used whenever there is any reference to media freedom in the form of no censorship.	M. A. Stegen
3.2 Cases of censorship	This code will be used whenever there is any reference to the media freedom in the form of some cases of censorship. Assaults on Journalists are also being taken into account.	M. A. Stegen
3.3 Censorship	This code will be used whenever there is any reference to the media freedom in the form of complete censorship.	M. A. Stegen
4.1 Private	This code will be used whenever there is any reference to the media ownership as private.	M. A. Stegen
4.2 Public & Private	This code will be used whenever there is any reference to the media ownership as public as well as private.	M. A. Stegen
4.3 Public	This code will be used whenever there is any reference to to the media ownership as solely being public.	M. A. Stegen
5.1 Market	This code will be used whenever there is any reference to the funding of the media through the market.	M. A. Stegen
5.2 Market & State	This code will be used whenever there is any reference to the funding of the media through the market and the state.	M. A. Stegen
5.3 State	This code will be used whenever there is any reference to the funding of the media solely through the state.	M. A. Stegen
6.1 Low	This code will be used whenever there is any reference to the parallelism of the media and political parties being low.	M. A. Stegen
6.2 Moderate	This code will be used whenever there is any reference to the parallelism of the media and political parties being moderate.	M. A. Stegen
6.3 High	This code will be used whenever there is any reference to the parallelism of the media and political parties being high.	M. A. Stegen

7.1 Low	This code will be used whenever there is any reference to the state control of the media being low.	M. A. Stegen
7.2 Moderate	This code will be used whenever there is any reference to the state control of the media being moderate.	M. A. Stegen
7.3 High	This code will be used whenever there is any reference to the state control of the media being high.	M. A. Stegen
8.1 Investigative	This code will be used whenever there is any reference to the media culture being investigative.	M. A. Stegen
8.2 Ambivalent	This code will be used whenever there is any reference to the media culture being ambivalent.	M. A. Stegen
8.3 Concurring	This code will be used whenever there is any reference to the media culture being concurring.	M. A. Stegen
9.1 Commercial	This code will be used whenever there is any reference to the orientation of the media being commercial.	M. A. Stegen
9.2 Divergent	This code will be used whenever there is any reference to the orientation of the media being divergent.	M. A. Stegen
9.3 Public Service	This code will be used whenever there is any reference to the orientation of the media to the public service.	M. A. Stegen

Codes: List of Codes and Associated Families

Codes
1.1 Democratic (Government system)
1.2 Authoritarian (Government system)
1.3 Totalitarian (Government system)
2.1 Polarized (Political culture)
2.2 Ambivalent (Political culture)
2.3 Concurring (Political culture)
3.1 No censorship (Media freedom)
3.2 Cases of censorship (Media freedom)
3.3 Censorship (Media freedom)
4.1 Private (Media ownership)
4.2 Public & Private (Media ownership)
4.3 Public (Media ownership)
5.1 Market (Funding of media)
5.2 Market & State (Funding of media)
5.3 State (Funding of media)
6.1 Low (Parallelism)
6.2 Moderate (Parallelism)
6.3 High (Parallism)
7.1 Low (State control of media)
7.2 Moderate (State control of media)
7.3 High (State control of media)
8.1 Investigative (Media culture)
8.2 Ambivalent (Media culture)
8.3 Concurring (Media culture)
9.1 Commercial (Media orientation)
9.2 Divergent (Media orientation)
9.3 Public Service (Media orientation)

Codes: List of Codes by Primary Document

No. of Primary Documents: 40

Average Number of Quotes: 5

Primary Document	Codes Used
[1] UN review of Hungary shows country 'treats human rights as a public enemy'.docx Super	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 1.2 Authoritarian (Government system)• 2.2 Ambivalent (Political culture)• 2.3 Concurring (Political culture)• 3.2 Cases of censorship (Media freedom)• 4.2 Public & Private (Media ownership)• 5.2 Market & State (Funding of media)• 6.3 High (Parallism)• 7.2 Moderate (State control of media)• 7.3 High (State control of media)• 9.2 Divergent (Media orientation)• 9.3 Public Service (Media orientation)
[2] Hungary, 'canary in the coal mine' of EU press.pdf Super	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 1.2 Authoritarian (Government system)• 3.2 Cases of censorship (Media freedom)• 3.3 Censorship (Media freedom)• 4.2 Public & Private (Media ownership)• 5.2 Market & State (Funding of media)• 7.2 Moderate (State control of media)• 9.2 Divergent (Media orientation)

[7] Polands new government seeks to bring media into line.pdf
Super

- 2.1 Polarized (Political culture)
- 2.3 Concurring (Political culture)
- 3.2 Cases of censorship (Media freedom)
- 4.2 Public & Private (Media ownership)
- 4.3 Public (Media ownership)
- 5.3 State (Funding of media)
- 6.3 High (Parallism)
- 7.3 High (State control of media)
- 8.3 Concurring (Media culture)
- 9.3 Public Service (Media orientation)

[8] Is Poland governed by the rule of law The EU isnt so sure anymore..pdf
Super

- 7.2 Moderate (State control of media)
- 7.3 High (State control of media)
- 9.3 Public Service (Media orientation)

[9] Why Bulgaria istheEUslowestrankedcountryonpressfreedomindex.pdf
Super

- 2.2 Ambivalent (Political culture)
- 3.2 Cases of censorship (Media freedom)
- 4.2 Public & Private (Media ownership)
- 5.3 State (Funding of media)
- 6.3 High (Parallism)
- 7.2 Moderate (State control of media)
- 7.3 High (State control of media)

[10] **Bulgaria's Media Oligarchs and Press Freedom.pdf**
Super

- 2.3 Concurring (Political culture)
- 3.2 Cases of censorship (Media freedom)
- 4.2 Public & Private (Media ownership)
- 6.3 High (Parallism)
- 7.3 High (State control of media)
- 8.3 Concurring (Media culture)
- 9.3 Public Service (Media orientation)

[11] **BorisovGrabsLimelightinBulgariasMedia.pdf**
Super

- 6.3 High (Parallism)
- 7.3 High (State control of media)
- 8.3 Concurring (Media culture)

[12] **BulgariaaworstamongEUcountriesin2016PressFreedomIndex.pdf**
Super

- 3.2 Cases of censorship (Media freedom)
- 4.2 Public & Private (Media ownership)
- 6.3 High (Parallism)
- 7.3 High (State control of media)
- 8.3 Concurring (Media culture)

[13] **BulgariaInvestigativejournalisthitsbackatsmearcampaignbymediamogul.pdf**
Super

- 4.3 Public (Media ownership)
- 6.3 High (Parallism)
- 7.3 High (State control of media)
- 8.1 Investigative (Media culture)
- 9.3 Public Service (Media orientation)

[14] Italy's free expression hamstrung by lack of media plurality.pdf
Super

- 3.2 Cases of censorship (Media freedom)
- 4.2 Public & Private (Media ownership)
- 5.2 Market & State (Funding of media)
- 6.3 High (Parallism)
- 7.3 High (State control of media)
- 8.3 Concurring (Media culture)
- 9.3 Public Service (Media orientation)

[15] Italians little concerned at limits to press freedom.pdf
Super

- 2.3 Concurring (Political culture)
- 3.2 Cases of censorship (Media freedom)
- 4.2 Public & Private (Media ownership)
- 6.3 High (Parallism)
- 7.3 High (State control of media)
- 8.3 Concurring (Media culture)

[16] Press freedom trio call for reform of Italy's draft defamation law.pdf
Super

- 3.2 Cases of censorship (Media freedom)
- 7.2 Moderate (State control of media)
- 8.2 Ambivalent (Media culture)

[17] IPI Press Freedom Mission to Italy Underway; Lack of Editorial Independence, Media Concentration, and Proposed 'Wiretap' Bill Top Discussions.pdf
Super

- 3.2 Cases of censorship (Media freedom)
- 6.3 High (Parallism)
- 7.3 High (State control of media)
- 8.2 Ambivalent (Media culture)
- 9.2 Divergent (Media orientation)

[18] **Italyloses4placesinRSFpressfreedomindex.pdf**
Super

- 3.2 Cases of censorship (Media freedom)
- 7.2 Moderate (State control of media)

[19] **MafiablamedforItalypressfreedomdecline.pdf**
Super

- 3.2 Cases of censorship (Media freedom)
- 7.3 High (State control of media)
- 9.2 Divergent (Media orientation)

[20] **ItalyReformcouldintroducefinesforneedlesdefamationsuitsagainstjournalists.pdf**
Super

- 3.2 Cases of censorship (Media freedom)
- 7.2 Moderate (State control of media)

[21] **Italy-EUFAILSTODEFENDPRESSFREEDOMNEWREPORTFINDS.pdf**
Super

- 3.2 Cases of censorship (Media freedom)
- 7.2 Moderate (State control of media)
- 7.3 High (State control of media)

[22] **HowtheMafiaIntimidatesandControlstheItalianMedia.pdf**
Super

- 2.2 Ambivalent (Political culture)
- 3.2 Cases of censorship (Media freedom)
- 7.2 Moderate (State control of media)
- 8.1 Investigative (Media culture)
- 9.2 Divergent (Media orientation)

[23] **ItalianSenateconsidersbilltoincreaseprisontimefordefamation.pdf**
Super

- 3.2 Cases of censorship (Media freedom)
- 7.2 Moderate (State control of media)
- 7.3 High (State control of media)

[24] Bulgaria-Gravelydamagedmediapluralism.pdf
Super

- 3.2 Cases of censorship (Media freedom)
- 4.2 Public & Private (Media ownership)
- 5.3 State (Funding of media)
- 6.3 High (Parallism)
- 7.3 High (State control of media)
- 8.3 Concurring (Media culture)

[25] MediaFreedominBulgaria.pdf
Super

- 3.2 Cases of censorship (Media freedom)
- 5.2 Market & State (Funding of media)
- 6.3 High (Parallism)
- 7.2 Moderate (State control of media)
- 8.2 Ambivalent (Media culture)
- 8.3 Concurring (Media culture)

[26] TheCollapseofMediaFreedominBulgaria.pdf
Super

- 3.2 Cases of censorship (Media freedom)
- 4.2 Public & Private (Media ownership)
- 7.3 High (State control of media)
- 8.1 Investigative (Media culture)

[27] PressfreedominBulgariaNocountryforoldvalues.pdf
Super

- 3.2 Cases of censorship (Media freedom)
- 4.2 Public & Private (Media ownership)
- 6.3 High (Parallism)
- 7.3 High (State control of media)

[28] Bulgaria.pdf
Super

- 3.2 Cases of censorship (Media freedom)
- 6.3 High (Parallism)
- 7.3 High (State control of media)
- 8.3 Concurring (Media culture)

[29] EuropeancommissiontodebatePolandscontroversialnewlaws.pdf
Super

- 7.3 High (State control of media)

[30] Poland's tricky political turn- Rule of law and media freedom endangered.pdf
Super

- 1.2 Authoritarian (Government system)
- 6.3 High (Parallism)
- 7.3 High (State control of media)
- 8.3 Concurring (Media culture)
- 9.3 Public Service (Media orientation)

[31] PolishPresidentsignscontroversialmedialaw.pdf
Super

- 7.3 High (State control of media)

[32] PolishmedialawsNationwideprotestsarestaged.pdf
Super

- 6.3 High (Parallism)
- 7.3 High (State control of media)
- 8.2 Ambivalent (Media culture)
- 9.3 Public Service (Media orientation)

[33] Poland.pdf
Super

- 3.2 Cases of censorship (Media freedom)
- 5.2 Market & State (Funding of media)
- 7.2 Moderate (State control of media)
- 8.2 Ambivalent (Media culture)
- 9.2 Divergent (Media orientation)

[34] **MediafreedomremainsunderthreatinHungary.pdf**
Super

- 3.2 Cases of censorship (Media freedom)
- 6.3 High (Parallism)
- 7.3 High (State control of media)
- 8.3 Concurring (Media culture)

[35] **HowHungarysgovernmentshapedpublicmediatoitsmould.pdf**
Super

- 3.2 Cases of censorship (Media freedom)
- 6.3 High (Parallism)
- 7.3 High (State control of media)
- 9.3 Public Service (Media orientation)

[36] **HungarysCrackdownonthePress.pdf**
Super

- 1.2 Authoritarian (Government system)
- 3.2 Cases of censorship (Media freedom)
- 4.2 Public & Private (Media ownership)
- 6.3 High (Parallism)
- 7.3 High (State control of media)
- 8.3 Concurring (Media culture)
- 9.3 Public Service (Media orientation)

[37] **MappingDigitalMediaHungary.pdf**
Super

- 3.2 Cases of censorship (Media freedom)
- 7.2 Moderate (State control of media)

[38] **Hungarianmediataxthreatenspressfreedomssaysnewspapereditor.pdf**
Super

- 7.2 Moderate (State control of media)

[39] **HungaryMediaFreedomUnderThreat.pdf**
Super

- 1.2 Authoritarian (Government system)
- 3.2 Cases of censorship (Media freedom)
- 6.3 High (Parallism)
- 7.3 High (State control of media)
- 8.3 Concurring (Media culture)

[40] **Hungary.pdf**
Super

- 3.2 Cases of censorship (Media freedom)
- 4.2 Public & Private (Media ownership)
- 6.3 High (Parallism)
- 7.2 Moderate (State control of media)
- 7.3 High (State control of media)
- 8.3 Concurring (Media culture)
- 9.2 Divergent (Media orientation)

