

Mediatisation of Politics as An Emanating Research Paradigm: Assessment and Reflection on the Weaknesses and Potential Contributions of Strömbäck” (2008) Theory of Mediatisation of Politics

Nyarwi Ahmad

Abstrak/Abstract

Within the last couple of decades, “mediatisation” has been taking shape as a prominent research approach, which has been robustly adopted to capture and explore transformations of the roles, positions and powers of the media and their consequences on society, culture and politics. However, whilst diverse theories and concepts of mediatisation and mediatisation of politics have been advanced within the specific context of the Western-established democracy, controversial debates regarding formulations of such theories and concepts and their applications within and across democratic countries have been unresolved properly yet. Since this issue remained prevail, we lacked sufficient knowledge regarding the development of mediatisation of politics as a research paradigm and its potential theoretical contributions for understanding political communication phenomena that took shape within and across democratic countries. This work purposely selected the Strömbäck” (2008) theory of mediatisation of politics as a starting point to evaluate such issues. The strengths and weaknesses of this theory are discussed. Further recommendations to improve the robustness of this theory are displayed as well.

Dalam beberapa dekade terakhir, “mediatisasi” sedang menjadi sebuah pendekatan penelitian yang menonjol dan diadopsi secara masif untuk menjelaskan dan mengeksplorasi transformasi peran, posisi dan kekuatan media dan konsekuensinya terhadap masyarakat, budaya dan politik. Namun, ketika beragam teori dan konsep mediatisasi dan mediatisasi politik telah berkembang dalam konteks spesifik demokrasi yang mapan di Barat, perdebatan kontroversial mengenai rumusan teori dan konsep semacam itu dan aplikasinya di dalam dan di seluruh negara demokratis belum terselesaikan dengan baik. Karena persoalan tersebut masih belum teratasi dengan baik, maka kita tidak memiliki pengetahuan yang memadai mengenai pengembangan mediatisasi politik sebagai paradigma penelitian dan kontribusi teoritis potensialnya untuk memahami fenomena komunikasi politik yang terjadi berbagai negara-negara demokrasi. Tulisan ini sengaja memilih teori Strömbäck’ (2008) tentang mediatisasi politik sebagai titik awal untuk mengevaluasi isu-isu tersebut. Kekuatan dan kelemahan teori ini akan dibahas. Rekomendasi lebih lanjut untuk meningkatkan ketahanan teori ini juga akan disajikan.

Kata kunci/Keywords:

Mediasi, mediatisasi, mediatisasi politik, paradigma penelitian yang sedang berkembang, komunikasi politik.

Mediation, mediatisation, mediatisation of politics, emerging research paradigm, political communication

*Department of Communication Science,
Faculty of Social and Political Sciences,
Universitas Gadjah Mada, Jalan Sosio Yustitia,
Bulaksumur, Yogyakarta 55281*

gloryasia2008@gmail.com

Introduction

Within the last couple of decades, “mediation” and “mediatisation” have been widely adopted as the key concepts to capture and evaluate the following developments. The first one is directed to evaluate modes of social, cultural and political interactions, which have been increasingly mediated. A slight differently, the second one is specified to capture and examine the increasing such interactions that have been continuously mediatized. Such interactions are seen and possibly manifest as communication and/or actions (Hjarvard, 2008: 120). Within these interactions, the media are considered as independent institutions and autonomously own their rules and powers in allocating their resources (Hjarvard,

2008: 126). Such interactions allow the media to offer benefits to and create sharing-experiences with the wider non-media actors and institutions (Hjarvard, 2008: 126-127).

Since globally adopted by both the social sciences and humanities scholars, “mediation” and “mediatisation” have been widely considered as fruitful research themes (Hepp, 2011, 2012) and vigorously advanced as philosophical standpoints in the field interdisciplinary studies of politics, cultures, media and communication (Scultz, 2004; Hjarvard, 2008; Krotz, 2007, 2009, 2014). As compared to the first one, the last one has been strenuously deployed to evaluate and explore the existence of the moulding forces of the media, which have been seen as being related with, affected on and determined by both modes of communication of individual political actors and political organizations in society and various mediated communication forms that have changed and taken place within the different fields (see Krotz, 2007: 257; Krotz, 2009: 25; Krotz, 2014; Hepp, 2011:11-12). More importantly, the last one has been robustly taking shape not only as a robust area, but also as a new research approach. This approach has been globally adopted to capture and understand transformations of the roles, positions and powers of the media and their consequences on society, culture and politics (Krotz, 2007, 2009, 2014; Hepp, 2011; Couldry & Hepp, 2013; Hepp & Krotz, 2014; Hjarvard, 2013, 2014).

So far, much of effort has been taken to investigate such developments. The following issues however, remained prevail. *At first*, “mediatisation of society” and “mediatisation of politics” have been also vigorously deployed as catch all terms and concepts (Couldry, 2008; Hjarvard, 2008; Strömbäck, 2008; Livingstone, 2009a, 2009b; Schrott, 2009). A plenty of investigations using such terms has been also carried out to holistically examine various stages and dimensions of mediatisation of societies, cultures and politics. However, since formulations and applications of such concepts have not been validated comprehensively, the existing disputable debates regarding such formulations have been unsolved properly yet (Deacon & Stanyer, 2014; Hepp, et.al, 2015; Deacon & Stanyer, 2015).

Secondly, “mediatisation of politics” took place as an influential research paradigm since the last one and a half of decades. A theory of “mediatisation of politics” has been advanced within the specific context of the Western-established democracy. This theory is derived based on the assumption that the traditional mainstream media has prominent rules and powers in directly and indirectly shaping political exchanges and interactions. As followed this assumption, those who introduced, adopted and applied this theory robustly investigated the stages, processes and dimensions of mediatisation that took shape in the political spheres (Strömbäck, 2008, 2011a;

Strömbäck & Esser, 2009; Strömbäck and Dimitrova, 2011; Strömbäck & Aelts, 2013; Esser & Strömbäck, 2014). However, validity and applicability of this theory within and across democratic countries and the workability of this theory in the new media environment that took shape in such countries have been not fully established yet.

As regards to such conditions, this work favours proposing the following propositions. *At first*, there have been the differentiations and relationships between the concepts and practices of “mediation” and “mediatisation”. But, such differentiations and relationships have not been fully clarified yet. *Secondly*, as compared to “mediation”, “mediatisation” has been taking place as an influential research approach. But, disputable debates regarding conceptualisations of types, stages, processes and dimensions of the mediation and mediatisation have been unresolved properly. *Finally*, the increasing uses of this paradigm to capture and understand various structural-systemic factors and conditions that drive transformations of the media and communication and their consequences on politics and democracy paved the way for the emergence of a theory of mediatisation of politics. This theory has some weaknesses. This theory however, offers robust conceptual frameworks, as we want to holistically capture and explores on how and the degree to which these developments took shape within and across democratic countries.

To evaluate such propositions, this work takes the following efforts. *At first*, the existing research traditions introduced in the literatures of the *mediatisation studies* would be discussed and “mediatisation” as research approach would be examined briefly. *Secondly*, theoretical formulations regarding the differences and relationships between “mediation” and “mediatisation” would be assed systematically. *Thirdly*, the emergence and development of “mediatisation of politics” as a research paradigm would be chronicled. *Fourthly*, the emergence and development of Strömbäck’s (2008) theory of mediatisation of politics and its weaknesses and potential contributions for understanding political communication phenomena would be chronicled and critically examined. *Finally*, the potential application of this theory in capturing and exploring such phenomena within and across democratic countries, particularly in the Indonesian politics Post-Soeharto, would be evaluated. Such points would be detailed as follows.

Mediatisation and Its Research Traditions

Some argued that “mediatisation” has been taking place alongside the processes of the globalization, individualization, de-territorialisation, inter-mediacy and commercialization (Lundby, 2009; Krotz, 2007, 2009, 2014, Hepp, 2009). Since “mediatisation” has been globally acknowledged as a robust research approach,

subsequent authors postulated the following research traditions, which are the institutionalist and social-constructivist research traditions (Hepp, 2013; Couldry & Hepp, 2013; Hepp & Krotz, 2014). As followed the first one, those who favoured investigating the mediatization phenomena should fully consider on how and the extent to which the “*media logic*”, as proposed by Altheide & Snow (1979) and Asp (1986, 1990), took place and determined the “*media organizations*” and has been accommodated by the “*non-media actors*”. In contrast, those who preferred taking the second one should comprehensively take into account the following two inter-connected dimensions, which are: a) the processes of the construction of reality that have been manifested in particular media; and b) how and the degree of which certain media have constructed the socio-cultural reality.

So far, these research traditions have been seen as being helpful due to the following conditions. The existing literatures of the media studies not only partially addressed transformations of the media and communications and their consequences on society, cultures and politics, but also insufficiently theorized and explained wider structural conditions that shape up these developments. These research traditions instead, give us a plenty of chances to resolve the innate weaknesses of such literatures, as we want to capture and explore such developments holistically (Krotz, 2007; Couldry & Hepp, 2013; Hepp & Krotz, 2014). To do so, we need to adopt and develop the literatures of the *mediatization studies* and deploy the “*mediatization*” as a research approach.

Mediatization as An Emerging Research Approach

As the roles and powers of the media and development of Information Communication Technologies (ICTs) increasingly determined modes of social, cultural and political interactions of societies, “*mediatization*” gradually took shape as an emerging research approach. A plenty of authors vigorously adopted and developed this approach to capture and explore the whole stages and processes and diverse dimensions of mediatization that took shape in societies (Couldry, 2008; Mazzoleni, 2008a, 2008b; Hjarvard, 2008, 2013, 2014; Lundby, 2009; Livingstone, 2009a, 2009b; Krotz, 2008, Hepp, 2009, 2011, 2012a, 2012b; Esser & Strömbäck, 2014b, 2014c). However, as briefly exhibited by the following points, controversial debates regarding the epistemological, ontological and methodological aspects of mediatization remained prevail.

Scultz (2004: 88) argues that “*mediatization*” should be understood as “*the processes of social change in which the media play a key role may be defined as extension, substitution, amalgamation and accommodation*”. In this respect, mediatization should be seen as an extension of what he called as “*the natural limits of human com-*

munication capacities” in managing the space, time and expressions (Scultz, 2004: 88). He also argued that “*mediatization*” takes shape as processes wherein the media increasing become the prominent medium, which either partially or comprehensively substitutes social activities of humans and social institutions (Scultz, 2004: 88). Such processes leads to the activities carried out by and the realities experienced and defined the ways the media actors amalgamated with the non-media actors within and across their own private and social life (Scultz, 2004: 89). Such processes also likely forces these actors to adopt the “*media logic*” and “*accommodate to the way the media operate*” and respond “*the rules of the media systems*” practically (Scultz, 2004: 89).

As seen, Scultz (2004) indicated a set of conditions that paves the way for “*mediatization*” taking shape in society. He however, explored less the whole processes of “*mediatization*” and contexts wherein such processes took place. As considered such issues, Hjarvard (2008) proposed the following arguments. He introduced concept of “*mediatization of society*”. This concept underpins “*the process whereby society to an increasing degree is submitted to, or becomes dependent on, the media and their logic*”. As followed the “*structuration perspective*” formulated by Giddens (1994), he posited that this process exists as a structural-“*duality*” wherein “*the media have become integrated into the operations of other social institutions, while they also have acquired the status of social institutions in their own right*” (Hjarvard, 2008: 113). He also argued that this process lead to various social interactions and structuration, which are constructively mediated by the media and taking shape within the respective institutions, between institutions, and within and across groups that exist in society (Hjarvard, 2008: 113).

Theoretically speaking, Scultz (2004) and Hjarvard (2008) offered invaluable ideas that allow us to understand conditions that trigger both the emergence and development of “*mediatization of society*”. They however, considered less the historical dimensions and elements that underlie “*mediatization*”, which are taking shape in society. As considered such issues, the subsequent authors postulated the following ideas. Krotz (2008: 23) voiced that “*mediatization*” should be adopted as a research approach to holistically understand “*the historical developments that took and take place as a result of change in (communication) media and the consequences of those changes*”. As considered that such developments likely exist as complex phenomena, Hepp (2009, 2012, 2013, 2014) and his colleagues (Couldry & Hepp, 2013; Hepp & Krotz, 2014) suggested adopting this approach to explore both the qualitative and quantitative aspects of “*mediatization*”. In this respect, the first one relates with the increasing numbers and types of communication technologies offered by the media and used by

humans and social institutions and development of capabilities of these human and institutions in accessing and using technologies within and across different levels and contexts (Hepp, 2009: 138; Hepp, 2012: 13; Couldry & Hepp, 2013: 197). A slight differently, the second one refers to *"the interrelation of how technological media structure the way we communicate and how the way we communicate via media is reflected in their technological change"* (Hepp, 2009: 139) and is associated with the ways social reality is constructed and defined by the development of technologies adopted by both the media-related actors and the non-media actors (Hepp, 2012: 13-14; Couldry & Hepp, 2013: 197).

Nonetheless, Hepp (2012b: 21-22) also highlighted the need for us to holistically explore transformations that take place within and across the following modes of communications, which are: (a) the direct communication; (b) reciprocal media communication; (c) produced media communication; and (d) virtualized media communication. Since such transformations lead to the social, cultural, commercial and political interactions not only being increasingly *mediated*, but also being vigorously *mediatized*, it is important for us to systematically scrutinize the differentiations and relationships between the concepts and practices of *"mediation"* and *"mediatisation"*. These issues would be discussed as follows.

Mediation and Mediatisation

Mazzoleni and Schulz (1999: 249) argued that *"mediatisation"* is taking place as *"problematic concomitants or consequences of the development of modern mass media"*. However, whilst they considered less the nature of *"mediation"* and offered an illusive understanding of *"mediatisation"*, they clarified less the differentiations and relationships between the concepts and practices of *"mediation"* and *"mediatisation"*. As regarded to such issues, Couldry (2008) proposed the following arguments. *"Mediation"* refers to *"the act of transmitting something through the media"*, *"the overall effect of media institutions existing in contemporary societies"* and *"the overall difference that media make by being there in our social world"* (Couldry, 2008: 379), while *"mediatisation"* relates to the *"the transformation of many disparate social and cultural processes into forms or formats suitable for media re-presentation"* and *"common patterns across disparate areas"* (Couldry (2008: 377). Meanwhile, Livingstone (2009a, 2009b) voiced the following propositions. *"Mediation"* is closely connected with what she called as the *"horizontal and historical connections within and across the expanding array of mass and new media in people's communication environments"* (Livingstone, 2009a: 8), while *"mediatisation"* is closely associated with *"meta process by which everyday practices and social relations are increasingly shaped by mediating technology and media organizations"* (Livingstone, 2009a: 3, 2009b: x).

In the meantime, Hjarvard (2008) posited the following thoughts. *"Mediation"* refers to *"communication via a medium, the intervention of which can affect both the message and the relationship between sender and receiver"*. In this respect, *"mediation"* is closely associated with what he called as the *"concrete act of communication by means of a medium in a specific social context"* (Hjarvard, 2008: 114). A slight differently, *"mediatisation"* is closely associated with what he coined as *"a more long-lasting process, whereby social and cultural institutions and modes of interaction are changed as a consequence of the growth of the media's influence"* (Hjarvard, 2008: 114).

As seen, Coundry (2008) and Livingstone (2009a, 2009b) proposed much more workable definitions for capturing and understanding practices of *"mediation"* and *"mediatisation"*, as compared to Mazzoleni & Schulz (1999). Likewise Hjarvard (2008), Coundry (2008) and Livingstone (2009a, 2009b) attempted to visualize the differentiation and relationships between such practices. But these authors lacked clarifications regarding the diverse types of *"mediatisation"* that took shape in society. As considered such issues, Hjarvard (2008) posited the following arguments. *"Mediatisation"* may take place as *"either a direct (strong) or an indirect (weak) form"*. In this respect, the first one relates to *"situations where formerly non-mediated activity converts to a mediated form, i.e., the activity is performed through interaction with a medium"* (Hjarvard, 2008: 114), while the second one refers to situations wherein *"a given activity is increasingly influenced with respect to form, content, or organization by mediagenic symbols or mechanisms"* (Hjarvard, 2008: 115).

A slight differently with Mazzoleni & Schulz (1999), Coundry (2008), Livingstone (2009a, 2009b) and Hjarvard (2008), Hjarvard (2009, 2013, 2014) strongly highlighted that whether being seen as either a concept or a practice, *"mediation"* is inseparable with, but distinct from *"mediatisation"*. He argued that the first one has been discussed within the *mediation studies*, while the second one has been examined within the *mediatisation studies*. In this respect, the first one focusing on the structural transformations and the roles, positions and powers of the media in the whole social, political and cultural interactions of societies and account the long-term and large-scale of structural transformations of relationships between media, culture and societies. In contrast, the second one is specified to capture and explore not only developments of the *"mediatisation habitus"* and transformations of modes and forms of mediated communication, but also their consequences on the broader aspects of the structural changes of the media in the contemporary culture and societies (Hjarvard, 2009, 2013, 2014).

Theoretically speaking, Hjarvard (2008, 2009, 2013, 2014) clearly hinted that as compared to

the “mediation”, “mediatization” likely takes shape as an emerging research approach and offers a much more robust conceptual framework. Adopting this approach allows us to holistically understand the increasing roles, positions and powers of the media in societies and their impacts on society (Hjarvard, 2004: 48; Hjarvard, 2008: 115) and comprehensively capture the changes in the media, ICT and communication environment and their consequences on modes of communications that took shape in societies and carried out by diverse political actors and organisations and social entities (Schulz, 2004: 88; Lundby, 2009: 1). Moreover, using this approach likely gives us a critical conceptual framework to holistically analyse of what Hepp & Krotz (2014: 3) identified as “*the interrelation between the change of media and communication, on the one hand, and the change of culture and society on the other*”. More importantly, applying this approach likely help us to understand not only transformation of the media and communication in societies as a whole, but also its structural and systemic effects on the whole dimensions of social and cultural life of societies (Krotz, 2007, 2009, 2014).

Though since the early 2000s, “mediatization” has been increasingly seen as a robust research approach and offers fertile conceptual lenses, some innate weaknesses of the concepts introduced and used in the *mediatization literatures* however, have been unresolved properly. For example, Deacon and Stanyer (2014), as run the content analyses of the *mediatization studies* published by experts in 14 leading mainstream media and communication journals, highlighted the tendency of the simplistic way they used on understanding and defining “mediatization”. They found that most of these experts considered transformations of the media and/or ICTs as the causal factors and essential conditions that entailed further changes in wider contexts and fields and accounted for the roles of the media as the primary actors. But, most of them took into account less the roles and powers of the ‘*non-media factors*’ on determining transformation of communication practices. However, whilst they conceptualized “mediatization” as a continuous process and/or a historical change, they lacked a consensus, in terms of *when, how and to what extent it started, transformed and ended* (Deacon and Stanyer, 2014: 1041).

In addressing such problems, Jensen (2013: 216-218) and Hepp, et. al. (2015) proposed the following arguments. We could be much more capable in understanding the mediatization phenomena, as we go beyond the media effects and explore both transformations of the media and communication practices and their consequences on culture and society comprehensively. But, it is not a necessary for us to consider the media as “*the driving forces*” of such transformations. We instead, need to take into account the “me-

diatization” as “*a context-sensitive approach*” and “*embedded communication*” in both the natural environment and the human body and has been inseparable with development of contemporary ICTs. Such efforts are needed to help us to be much more capable in getting and advancing the more powerful analytical framework to capture and explore such developments (Jensen, 2013: 216-218; Hepp, et.al, 2015: 320-321).

Despite of that, Deacon and Stanyer (2015) also highlighted that the existing literatures of the “mediatization” conceptualized less the “*contexts*” wherein “mediatization” took place. Jensen (2013: 216-218) and Hepp, et. al (2015: 320-322) actually did not give us the workable ways to fully manage such issues. But, we could consider their suggestion regarding the importance of adopting and advancing “mediatization” as “*a context-sensitive approach*”, as we want to holistically capture and evaluate diverse stages, types and dimensions of not only the *mediatization of society*, but also the *mediatization of politics*. The last point would further discussed as follows.

Mediatization of Politics as an Emanating Research Paradigm

Since 1960s, the mainstream media, especially within the specific context of the Western-established democracy, gradually gained their influential places and roles in the political sphere. This tendency leads to dynamic conditions wherein the politics has been increasingly “mediated” and “mediatized” and political system has been constantly influenced by the behaviours of not only the political actors and organizations, but also the media-related actors. Such conditions triggered the following authors to gradually adopt and develop “*mediatization of politics*” as a new research paradigm in the fields of the media, politics and (political) communication.

It was Asp (1986) who firstly proposed a term of “*mediatization of political life*” to capture a condition wherein “*a political system to a high degree is influenced by and adjusted to the demands of the mass media in their coverage of politics*” (as quoted by Strömbäck, 2011a: 425). As focused on the Swedish politics, he and his colleague also identified the increasing roles and powers of the media in political spheres and adaptation of the media logic by political actors and institutions. But, instead of using term “*mediatization of politics*”, they coined this development using term “*medialization of politics*” (Asp & Esaiasson, 1996: 80). They argued that this development is likely taking shape within what they called as “*a three-stage process*”. The first stage is indicated by a society and political system wherein the media took shape as “*dominant communication channel between those who govern and those who are governed*” (Asp & Esaiasson, 1996: 81). The second stage is characterized by a condition wherein “*the mass media become independent ac-*

tors who exercise great influence on the governing body and the people” and “the media not only have power over their public, but also have independent power over the picture that influences the audiences” (Asp & Esaiasson, 1996: 81). The last stage is marked by the existence of what they called as the “invisible face of the media power”, which refers to the increasing tendencies of the society and political system to adopt the “working routines of mass media” and the “conditions that the media set up” based on the “logic of the media” (Asp & Esaiasson, 1996: 81).

As seen, Asp (1986) and Asp & Esaiasson (1996) adopted “mediatisation of politics” as a research paradigm to capture the increasing rules and powers of the media-related actors and their consequences on society, politics and political system. But, they explored less the causal factors that pave the way for development of *mediatisation of politics* (a), the elements and dimensions that underlie this development (b) and the ways and the degrees to which this development took shape within and across democratic countries (c). As considered such conditions, the following authors took subsequent efforts.

Mazzoleni & Scultz (1999) identified the structural conditions and factors likely drive this development. These conditions consist of the changing styles of the news reporting and defining news worthiness in the political sphere, the increasing functional powers of the agenda-building and agenda-setting of the media, the prominent roles of the media logic in political interactions and the need of political actors and institutions to adopt this logic (Mazzoleni & Scultz, 1999: 250-252), while such factors include the crisis of the party system and the changing conditions of and the relationships between the media and political institutions (Mazzoleni & Scultz, 1999: 252-257).

Theoretically speaking, Asp (1986) and Asp & Esaiasson (1996) merely considered the raising roles and powers of the media on political system and society as “causal factors” that lead to “mediatisation of politics” taking place. Mazzoleni and Scultz (1999) instead, strongly considered both the structural conditions and factors that likely drive “mediatisation of politics”. More importantly, they clarified the nature of “mediatisation of politics”, which they defined as the “politics that has lost its autonomy, has become dependent in its central functions on mass media, and is continuously shaped by interactions with mass media” (Mazzoleni & Scultz, 1999: 250).

A slight differently with Asp (1986) and Asp & Esaiasson (1996), Mazzoleni (2008b: 3047) posited “mediatisation of politics” as “a complex process that is closely linked to the presence of a media logic in society and in the political sphere”. This process is indicated by the following trends, which are: a) the increasing roles and powers of the media on determining the politics affairs and the ways they are performed and communicated; b) the prominent roles of the media as indispens-

able actors within the political spheres; and c) the media increasingly took their central places within the most political events, such as election campaigns, government communication, public diplomacy and image building, and national and international celebrations (Mazzoleni, 2008: 3047–3048)

As seen, Mazzoleni and his colleague attempted to visualize the nature of “mediatisation of politics”. However, since there have been no consensus regarding the elements and dimensions that construct “mediatisation of politics” and the ‘contexts’ wherein “mediatisation of politics” likely exist, the following authors introduced the following diverse terms and concepts when they captured and explored such elements and dimensions. They include “mediating politics” (Washbourne 2010), “mediatized politics” (Scigo, 2012; Thimm, et.al, 2014), “mediated politics”, “mediatisation of politics” (see Mazzoleni and Scultz, 1999; Bennett & Entman 2001; Kepplinger, 2002; Meyer, 2003; Strömbäck, 2007, 2008; Coul-dry, 2012) and “mediatization of political news” (Cushion and Thomas, 2013; Cushion, et.al, 2013; Cushion, et.al, 2014), “mediatization of e-campaign” (Schweitzer, 2012). Additionally, subsequent authors also advanced the following terms, which are: the “media-driven” (see Croteau & Hoynes, 2001; Aalberg & Strömbäck, 2011), “media logic” and “political logic” (for overviews, see Altheide & Snow, 1979; Strömbäck, 2007, 2008, 2010, 2011a; Schrott, 2009; Strömbäck & Esser, 2009; Takens, et.al, 2013; Esser, 2013).

As realized that such terms being defined insufficiently, subsequent authors favoured using the concept “mediatisation of politics” and provided understandings of its applications within the specific context of the Western-established Democracy (see Strömbäck, 2008, 2011a; Elmelund-Præstekær, et.al, 2011; Strömbäck & Dimitrova, 2011; Kunelius & Reunanen, 2012; Hepp, 2013; Zeh & Hoppmann, 2013; Strömbäck & Aelts, 2013; Chushion & Thomas, 2013). This concept has been commonly deployed along with the concepts “mediatized politics” and “mediated politics” (Mazolini & Scultz, 1999: 249; Strömbäck, 2008, 2011a; Strömbäck & Esser, 2009) and interchangeably deployed with the concept “mediatisation of political communication” (Hjarvard, 2008: 49).

Since the early 2000s, such concepts have been robustly adopted to explore the dimensions that constitute ‘mediatisation of politics’. But, prominent scholars who worked on the mediatisation studies lacked a consensus regarding the differentiations and relationships between such concepts. More importantly, they clarified less such dimensions ontologically. As attempted to clarify this issue, the following authors formulated subsequent propositions. Lilleker (2006: 119) posited that *mediatisation of politics* is associated with the increasing roles and powers of the media in defining, structuring and constructing the whole

dynamic processes and discourse of political communication—in particular— and of societies—in general—through which the media have innate capability in spiralling up their influences. A slightly differently, Landerer (2013: 253) argued that *mediatisation of politics* relates to what he called as the predominance of the “*audience-oriented market logic*” in the political sphere over the “*normative logic*” of political actors and organisations. A slight similarly, Skogerbo and Karlsen (2014:76) voiced that *mediatisation of politics* refers to the ways and the degrees to which the media logic affected on the whole political processes and determined political outcomes.

Theoretically speaking, Lilleker (2006: 119) conceptualized the macro dimensions that constitute “*mediatisation of politics*”, while Landerer (2013: 253) and Skogerbo & Karlsen (2014:76), respectively, theorized the meso and micro dimensions that lead to the emergence and development of “*mediatisation of politics*”. Though they took different point of views, these authors offered invaluable ideas that allow us to explore such dimensions holistically. However, whilst the *media logic* has commonly recognized as the real “*engine of mediatisation*” (Mazzoleni, 2017: 139), they did not yet give us a sufficient understanding regarding the ways and the degree to this logic existed and has been adopted by the media-related actors and the non-media actors within and across these macro, meso and micro dimensions. As attempted to resolve such issues, Strömbäck and his colleagues proposed the following theory of “*mediatisation of politics*”.

Strömbäck” Theory of Mediatization of Politics

The need to develop a theory of mediatisation of politics is actually triggered by the following conditions. *At first*, the existing theories introduced in the *mediation studies* have been seen as less workable to understand both changes in the media and communication practices and their consequences on political sphere holistically (Scultz, 2004; Strömbäck, 2008). *Secondly*, the existing concept of *mediated politics* has been seen as being quite helpful to describe and capture the political affairs and interactions that have been increasing mediated (Strömbäck, 2008: 231), but, being inadequate to holistically detect and explore what Mazzoleni and Schultz (1999: 259) highlighted as “*the tendency of politics to turn into a sort of mediatized politics*”. *Finally*, Mazzoleni & Schultz (1999: 250-257) theorised the structural conditions and factors that drive developments of not only “*mediatized politics*”, but also “*mediatisation of politics*”. They however, did not posit a workable theory, which is needed to capture and explore these developments.

As adopted the ideas of Altheide & Snow (1979), Asp (1986), Asp & Esaiasson (1996) and Mazzoleni & Schultz (1999), Strömbäck (2008, 2011a, 2011b) and his colleagues (Strömbäck & Esser, 2009, 2014a, 2014b, 2014c; Strömbäck &

Dimitrova, 2011; Strömbäck & Van Aelst, 2013) proposed a new theory, which specifically directed to understand and evaluate such developments, based on the following propositions. *Firstly*, there has been an increasing trend of politics that not only being constantly *mediated*, but also being intensively and extensively *mediatized*. *Secondly*, the media has real visible effects not only on an individual who consumed the media contents, but also on society as a whole. But, the existing theories of the “*media effects*” introduced in the mediation studies merely focused on the existence of such effects on the individual person and failed to capture the manifestation of such effects on social and political actors, organisations and entities comprehensively. *Thirdly*, the “*media logic*” and the ways this logic existed have been taking shape as an influential element that underlay the emergence and development of the “*mediatized of politics*”. The “*media logic*” not only likely determines the behaviours of the media, but also likely constructs the experiences of political actors and organisations in the political affairs and spheres either individually or collectively.

Following such propositions, Strömbäck (2008, 2011a, 2011b) and his colleagues conceptualized the existence of the “*media logic*” and the adaptations of this logic in the political spheres as the primary condition and element that pave the way for developments of “*mediatized politics*”—in particular—and “*mediatisation of politics*”—in general. As adopted the ideas of Altheide & Snow (1979: 10), they proposed the following arguments. This logic likely exists as “*a form of communication*” and drives the ways the media produce and deliver messages (information). The organisational frameworks of the media in producing, packaging and delivering such messages determine the nature and existence of this logic. Such frameworks influence not only the communication style and formats advanced by the media when they covered and broadcasting political events and constructed political discourses, but also modes of interpretations carried by the audiences in understanding such events and discourses.

Much earlier before Stromback (2008) begun to develop this theory, Mazzoleni (1987) actually refined the ideas of Altheide & Snow (1979: 197) to develop the concept of “*media logic*”. As realized that Altheide & Snow (1979) took into account less the elements that underlie this logic and the ways the media-actors operate this logic within the specific campaigns, Mazzoleni (1987: 85) proposed the following arguments. *At first*, this logic refers to “*the set of values and formats through which campaign events and issues are focused on, treated, and given meaning by news workers and news organisations in order to promote a particular kind of presentation and understanding that is compatible with, for example, scheduling and time considerations, entertainment values and*

image of the audience". Secondly, the existence of this logic can be captured and evaluated through the following aspects, which are: a) "*the presentation of politics on the basis of mass communication formats*"; and b) the construction of "*the information system's assumption*". The last one is related to not only of the degree of autonomous role of the media in addressing and covering the behaviours of the parties, but also the degree of influential role of the media in defining political interactions and debates and interpreting such interactions and debates according to (Mazzoleni, 1987: 85).

Despite of that, Mazzoleni (2008a: 2932) also formulated the following propositions. *At first*, "*media logic*" takes place as the patterns of the media formats, which are advanced by the media and considered and adopted by social institutions and individual within "*a given societal context*". *Secondly*, adaptation of this logic by political actors and organizations in the political sphere encourages them be much more what he called as "*media-genic*" and "*media savvy*". This adaptation also forces them to develop the workable models of personalization of political communication and campaigning in order to secure their personal political images. *Finally*, the media likely drives the ways these actors/politicians and organization formulated political policies and discourse when this logic constantly shapes up their behaviours in political sphere.

As seen, Altheide & Snow (1979: 10) and Mazzoleni (1987, 2008a) indicated that both technological and organisational aspects of the media determine the ways the existence of the "*media logic*". They however, did not detail the ways the media organisation considered such aspects. As adopted the ideas of Altheide & Snow (1979: 10) and Mazzoleni (1987: 85), Hjarvard (2008: 113) attempted to clarify this issue. He argued that the "*media logic*" is likely determined by the institutional and technological modus operandi of the media. This logic constitutes the ways the media technologically and organizationally would manage and exploit their material and symbolic resources. But, operationalization of this logic is likely regulated and constrained by both formal and informal rules of the media. Similarly with these authors, he also highlighted that this logic likely constructs the form communication style of the media, on the one hand, and the characteristics and dimensions of social relations created by both the media and social and political actors and organizations that exist in society, on the other (Hjarvard, 2008: 113).

Though they clarified the nature of "*the media logic*", Altheide & Snow (1979: 10), Mazzoleni (1987, 2008a) and Hjarvard (2008: 113) lacked clarification regarding the operationalization and existence of the "*media logic*" in the political sphere. They also explored less on how such actors and organizations adopted the "*political logic*". More importantly, they considered less

the ways and the degrees to which the politics is *mediated* and political actors and organizations adopted this logic in the political sphere.

In addressing such issues, Strömbäck and his colleagues posited the following propositions. The "*media logic*" refers to "*a form of communication whereby the media processes, presents and transmits information that have determined the way of understanding, perceiving, interpreting and responding social and public affairs*" (Strömbäck, 2008: 233; Strömbäck & Dimitrova, 2011: 33). In contrast, "*political logic*" relates to both policy and process dimensions in which processes of the collective and authoritative decision making, the implementation of political decision, distribution of political power and political deliberation and bargaining have taken shape across political actors and political organizations (Strömbäck, 2008: 233; Strömbäck & Esser, 2009: 213-214). Based on such propositions, Strömbäck (2011a, 2011b) and his colleagues intensively the existences of these logics and evaluated the effects of the adaptations of these logics on the behaviours of the media-related actors, such as reporters/journalist, and the non-media actors, such as political parties' leaders and MPs (Strömbäck & Esser, 2009, 2014a, 2014b, 2014c; Strömbäck & Dimitrova, 2011; Strömbäck & Van Aelst, 2013).

Despite of that, Strömbäck (2008), as informed by ideas of Asp (1986), Bennett & Entman (2001) and Nimmo & Combs (1983) also clarified the differentiations and the relationships between concepts and practices of '*mediated politics*' and '*mediatized politics*'. As regards to the first one, he stated as follows.

"The *mediated politics* refers to a situation in which the media have become the *most important source of information and vehicle of communication between the governors and the governed... Politics* could thus be described as *mediated* whenever the mass media are *the main channels* through which politics is communicated and when, as a *consequence*, the depictions of "*reality*" that are *conveyed* through the mass media presumably have an impact on *how people perceive reality*." (Strömbäck, 2008: 230).

Following such propositions, Strömbäck (2008: 231) highlighted that "*mediated politics*" can be used as a practical concept, as we want to describe the degree to which the media has taken place as the most important channels in modern societies and the main place of the exchanges of political information and communication between the people and political actors. This concept however, seems less workable, as we want to capture and explore on what Mazzoleni & Schultz (1999: coined as "*the tendency of politics to turn into a sort of mediatized politics*". To resolve this problem, Strömbäck (2008: 231) advanced concept of "*mediatized of politics*". Unlike wise to the concept of "*mediatized politics*", this concept is specifically directed to capture not only the existence of and the interactions between the "*media*

logic” and “political logic”, but also on how and the degree to which political actors and organizations adopted such logics in the political sphere when the media already took shape as the primary source of political information (Strömbäck, 2008: 234).

As they clarified the relationships between the concepts and practices of the “media logic”, “political logic” and “mediatized of politics”, Strömbäck (2008) and his colleagues advanced a theory of “mediatization of politics”. This effort was carried out as follows. *At first*, Strömbäck (2008: 238-241) posited “mediatization of politics” as a multidimensional concept to capture and explore the following four stages and dimensions. The first one relates with the degree to which the media have prominent roles and powers, as the most important source of information and channel of communication. The second one is associated with the degree to which the media gain their own autonomy and self-rule when they dealt with the other social and political institutions. The third one is connected with the degree to which the contents of media are determined by either the “media logic” or “political logic”. The last one is refers to the degree to which political actors and political organizations are directed by either the “media logic” or “political logic”. *Secondly*, Strömbäck & Esser (2009: 213-216) refined this theory. In this respect, they not only detailed the elements that construct the “political logic” (Strömbäck and Esser, 2009: 213-214), but also clarified the mediatization of politics as “a four-dimensional concept” and introduced a new concept, which is the “media interventionism” (Strömbäck and Esser, 2009: 214-216). *Finally*, he and his colleagues also advanced and applied these aforementioned concepts to evaluate such stages and dimensions (see for example, Strömbäck, 2011a; Hopmann and Strömbäck, 2010; Strömbäck & Dimitrova, 2011; Alberg and Strömbäck; Strömbäck & Aelts, 2013).

As considered the ideas of Strömbäck (2008, 2011a, 2011b) and Strömbäck & Esser (2009, 2014a), Marcinkowski (2014), also scrutinized the existing theories that underpin ‘mediatization of politics’ and also developed an *alternative theory of mediatization of politics*. Likewise Strömbäck (2008, 2011a, 2011b), he also proposed the mediatization of politics as a multidimensional concept and practice. But, while he did not fully clarified the differentiations and the relationships between and among the concepts and practices of what he called as “mediatization of the reception of politics”, “mediatization of public communication about politics” and “mediatization of politics” (Marcinkowski, 2014: 12-13), he did not systematically detail the stages and dimensions that constitute such concepts and practices, as Strömbäck (2008, 2011a, 2011b) and his colleagues did. Despite of that, he also posited a *process-model of mediation of politics* (Marcinkowski, 2014: 14-15). However, whilst he merely took into account

the media and political systems as causal factors and processes and outcome of decision making as a result of process of *mediatization of politics*, he lacked clear clarifications regarding the influences of the economic system and communication infrastructure, the ways and the degrees to which the media advanced the media logic and political actors and organisations adopted the “media logic” and “political logic” and the consequences of such adaptations on political behaviours of these actors and organisations, as Strömbäck (2008) and his colleagues did.

Due to the following reasons, we argue that Strömbäck” theory of mediatization politics seems much more powerful, as compared to what was proposed by Marcinkowski (2014). *At first*, this theory not only placed the media logic as a central element that constitute not only practices of “mediatized politics”, but also the four stages and dimensions of “mediatization of politics”. Moreover, this theory not only included the concepts and practices of the “media logic” and “political logic”, but also conceptualized the dynamics of adaptations of such logics and their consequences on political behaviours of the media-related actors and the non-media actors within and across such stages and dimensions holistically (Strömbäck, 2008: 236-241; Strömbäck, 2011a: 425; Strömbäck & Esser, 2009: 213-216; Strömbäck and Dimitrova, 2011: 31; Strömbäck and Esser, 2014a: 6-7). More importantly, this theory also systematically visualized not only the relationships between these stages and dimensions, but also such adaptations and consequences within and across these stages and dimensions (Strömbäck & Esser, 2014a: 8).

Secondly, this theory could be deployed to capture and evaluate of what Strömbäck & Esser (2014b: 244) and Strömbäck and Esser (2014b: defined as “a long-term process through which the importance of the media and their spill-over effects on political processes, institutions, organizations and actors has increased”. This theory clearly considered “mediatization of politics” as a long-term and dynamic process and takes into account not only the increasing importance and influence of media and their consequences on all parts of politics and political processes that took shape within and across the political institutions, organizations and actors, but also the indirect effects triggered by the media and are result from the ways such institutions, organizations and actors adopted the media logic to fulfill their own needs (Strömbäck & Esser, 2014b: 244; Strömbäck & Esser, 2014c: 246).

As considered such conditions, we argue that adopting this theory would allow us to be much more capable in capturing and exploring the historical development, the quantitative and qualitative aspects and the macro, meso and micro dimensions of *mediatization of politics* that took shape within and across democratic countries.

The Strengths and Weaknesses of the Strömbäck" Theory of Mediatization of Politics

As seen, Strömbäck and his colleagues not merely advanced "*mediatization of politics*" as a research paradigm. They also invented a workable theory of *mediatization of politics*. We argue that this theory has the following strengths. *At first*, this theory takes into account both the institutionalist and social-constructivist research traditions suggested by Hepp (2013), Couldry & Hepp (2013) and Hepp & Krotz, (2014). *Secondly*, this theory also quite meets with Hepp" (2013: 624; 2013: 265) expectations regarding the importance of developing both the *diachronous and synchronous research approaches* in the mediatization studies. *Thirdly*, this theory implicitly included a set of conditions that paves the way for mediatization taking shape in diverse fields that exist in societies, as posited by Scultz (2004: 88-89), including the political field. *Fourthly*, this theory not only incorporates the Hjarvard" (2008: 113) ideas regarding the needs to evaluate the existences of the "media structure" and the "non-media structures" and the interactions and "structuration" processes carried by the media-actors and the non-media actors, but also contextualizes Hjarvard" (2008: 113) ideas within the specific fields of politics and political communications. *Fifthly*, this theory incorporated the idea of Krotz (2008: 23) regarding "*the historical developments*" of elements that constitute "mediatization" and also visualized the ways to apply his idea within the specific context of politics. *Finally*, this theory also considered both the quantitative and qualitative aspects of mediatization and models of communications, as proposed by Hepp (2009, 2012a, 2012b, 2013, 2014) and Hepp & Krotz (2014) and offered a set of conceptual frameworks that allows us to chronologically and holistically evaluate the existences of such aspects and models in the political sphere.

Though offered such benefits, the Strömbäck" (2008) theory of *mediatization of politics* entails the following weaknesses. *At first*, this theory to some degree took into account the existences of the "*moulding forces*" of the media and "*communicative configuration*", as posited by Hepp (2013: 624, 2014: 88-93) and Hepp, et, al. (2015: 10). But, this theory did not yet incorporate the three of the four elements that constitute this communication figuration, which are: the *constellation of actors*, a *thematic framing* that likely drive behaviours of both the media actors and the non-media actors and patterns of communicative practices within and between such actors. Whilst some authors indicated this theory seems being related with the agenda-setting theory (Van Aelst, et, al., 2014), Stromback (2008) explained less the similarities of (and also the relationships) between such theories. Similarly, Stromback (2011a, 2011b) and his colleagues (Strömbäck & Esser, 2009, 2014a, 2014b, 2014c; Strömbäck & Dimitrova, 2011; Strömbäck & Van Aelst, 2013)

did not yet addressed such issues holistically.

Secondly, this theory clarified less various characteristics, elements and forms of the "*media logic*" (a) and "*political logic*" (b). Stromback and his colleagues actually took a plenty of efforts to tackle such problems. But, as detailed by the following issues, such problems have been unresolved properly. Strömbäck (2011a) proposed the "*news media logic*" as part of the "*media logic*". This "*news media logic*" is associated with "*the institutional, technological, and sociological characteristics of the news media, including their format characteristics, production and dissemination routines, norms, and needs, standards of newsworthiness, and to the formal and informal rules that govern news media*" (Strömbäck, 2011b: 373). Strömbäck & Dimitrova (2011: 35) also added what they called as "*journalistic interventions*" as a crucial factor that likely shape up the (*news*) "*media logic*". As adopted the ideas of these authors, Takens, et, al. (2013) advanced the content indicators of the (*news*) "*media logic*". Such indicators include the personalized coverage, contest coverage (horse race coverage and game schema) and negative-positive coverage (Takens, et, al., 2013: 280-281). Similarly, Esser (2013: 166-174) also proposed three elements that constitute the (*news*) "*media logic*", which are: professional, commercial and technological elements. The first one is associated with the logical-orientation of the media regarding the journalistic norms and rules. Second one refers to the logical orientation of the media regarding the business and commercial interests. The last one is relates to the logical orientation of the media regarding technological communication development. Though these authors proposed such invaluable thoughts, they however, clarified less the diverse elements that *technologically, journalistically* and *commercially* construct the '*media logic*'—in general—and the '*news media logic*'—in particular.

Stromback and Esser (2009: 213-214) also proposed the following six dimensions that constitute the '*political logic*', which they called as "*power allocation, partisan, policy, deliberation, implementation and accountability*". This proposition actually goes beyond the Stromback" (2008: 233) argument that conceptualized the policy and process dimensions as two components that underlie this logic. But, this proposition seems being less applicable to capture the existence of this logic and the way and the degree to which this logic exist and is being adopted in the political sphere. As considered this problem, Esser (2013: 164-166) visualized the following three elements that constitute this logic. Such elements consist of policy (a), politics (b) and c) polity dimensions. The first one refers to the reasons that underlay and drive the "*production side of politics*", that include coordinating and balancing interests, organizing negotiations, debating alternative policy choices, devising programs through deliberation and collective decisions, gaining consensus

and getting the long-term solutions to public issues (Esser, 2013: 164). The second one relates to the reasons that stimulate and shape up the “*self-representational side of politics*”. This incorporates the office-seeking, the vote-seeking (win the election) and a set of logical orientations used to manage political legitimacy through advancing permanent campaign (Esser, 2013: 165). The last one is also associated with not only the “*system of rules regulating the political process*”, but also the “*underlying institutional structure of democracy*” and the “*polity frameworks*” that directly and indirectly constrain the behaviours of political actors and organizations in the political sphere (Esser, 2013: 165). The first and second dimensions are quite visible and likely detectable. The last dimension however, is likely invisible in the real political practices.

Thirdly, this theory is potentially suffering from the following criticisms. This theory did not fully take into account of what van Dallen (2012), Wahl-Jorgensen and Hanitzsch (2009), Hanitzsch (2006, 2007, 2009), Hanusch, et. al. (2011), Donsbach (2010) and Hanusch & Hanitzsch (2017) called as “*journalistic cultures*”, Bensen (2004) labeled as ‘*journalistic field*’, Chusion & Thomas (2013: 376) labelled as “*journalistic logic*” and their consequences on formation of the “*media logic*”—in general—and the “*news media logic*”—in particular. Moreover, this theory insufficient conceptualized diverse types of the “*mass media logics*” (Meyen, et. al, 2014: 6) and clarified the differentiations and relationships between the “*news media logic*” and what Altheide (2004: 294) called the “*logic of advertising, entertainment, and popular culture*”, which have been commonly taken for granted as a “*normal form*” of communication. More importantly, this theory also considered less on what Asp (2014) named as “*institutionalization of the news media logic*” and the existences the developments of and elements that constitute of what Klinger and Svensson (2015: 1246) termed as the “*network media logic*” and Van Dijck & Poell (2013: 3), Kalsnes (2016), Kalness, et.al (2017) coined as “*social media logic*” and insufficiently visualized their impacts on *mediatized politics and mediatization of politics*.

Fourthly, this theory also took into account less the changing economic environments at the macro level and the organizational reactions to the audience behaviours and the technological breakthroughs carried out by the media at the meso level that determined the (*news*) *media logic* (Chusion & Thomas, 2013: 362). This theory also considered less the existences of the elements that took shape within and across the micro, meso and macro levels, which likely shape up of what Shoemaker & Reese (1990, 1996, 2014, 2016) called as the “*hierarchical influential models*”. These elements are related within the media organisations, such as personal background and characteristics of the media actors, personal attitudes, values and belief of the media actors,

professional roles and ethics adopted by the media actors, the media routines and organisational goals and regulations) and the outside media organization, which are the news sources, the other media organisations, the advertisers and audiences, government regulations, the marketplace, technological infrastructures. These elements also include the diverse social and political ethics and norms and ideological orientations that took shape in societies and influence both the media organisations and individual journalist.

Finally, this theory also slightly ignored modes of the media performance and accountability, which are posited by McQuail (1992, 2003), refined by Bardoel & d’Haenens, 2004) and advanced by Gazali (2004) within the specific context of the Indonesian politics Post-New Order Soeharto. Moreover, this theory also took into account less the existences of variability of the media system that have been taking shape within and across democratic countries, as posited by Hallin & Mancini (2004) and refined Brüggemann et al. (2014) and Buchel, et. al. (2016). This system includes the corporatist system, liberal system, polarized-pluralist system and press-oriented system. Additionally, this theory also considered less on components that construct of what Aelts, et. al. (2017) called as “*a high-choice media environment*”, which has been robustly taking place in the Western democracy. These components consist of declining supply of political information (a), decreasing quality of news (b), escalation of media concentration and declining diversity of news (c), raising (political) fragmentation and polarization (d), proliferation of the (political) truth relativism (e) and mushrooming inequality in political knowledge.

Conclusion and Further Research Recommendations

As seen, this work has already chronicled and discussed the existing theories and concepts of “*mediation*”, “*mediatization*”, “*mediatization of society*” and “*mediatization of politics*”. Such theories and concepts have been advanced and widely adopted within the specific context of the Western-established democracy. The controversial debates regarding formulations of and the differentiations and relationships between such theories and concepts were displayed chronologically. The emergence and development of mediatization of politics as a research paradigm were displayed chronologically as well.

As selected the Strömbäck (2008) theory of mediatization of politics as starting point to discuss such issues, this work exhibited the evidences, which are summarized as follows. *At first*, there have been disputable debates related with the differences between the concepts and practices of “*mediation*” and “*mediatization*”. Regardless of this condition, “*mediatization*” has been gradually taking place as an influential research approach. This approach has been seen as being

helpful to resolve the innate weaknesses of the mediation approach and theoretical frameworks developed in the *mediation studies*.

Secondly, along with these developments, “*mediatisation of politics*” has been also globally adopted as an emanating research paradigm. This paradigm has been widely recognized as being useful to tackle the feebleness of the existing theories and concepts introduced in the *mediation studies*, particularly, the theories and concepts that underpin the media effects and the roles and positions of the media on political affairs and sphere. More specifically, this theory has been seen as being much more helpful to holistically capture and examine the increasing roles and powers of the media and their consequences on politics, political system and democracy.

Thirdly, as adopted this paradigm, Strömbäck (2008, 2011a, 2011b) and his colleagues (Strömbäck & Esser, 2009, 2014a, 2014b, 2014c; Strömbäck & Dimitrova, 2011; Strömbäck & Van Aelst, 2013) formulated and advanced a theory of *mediatisation of politics*. As informed by the existing literatures, this work scrutinized this theory. This work concluded that this theory is a much more mature, powerful and workable, as compared to an alternative theory of *mediatisation of politics* formulated by Marcinkowski (2014). This theory took into account the historical aspects and qualitative and quantitative components that underlay “*mediatisation of politics*”. Moreover, since this theory placed “*media logic*” as its central element, included concept of “*political logic*” and considered the adaptations of these logics by the media-related actors and the non-media actors in political sphere, this theory offers robust conceptual frameworks that could be used to capture and explore the historical developments of elements and dimensions that constitute “*mediatisation of politics*”. More importantly, since this theory incorporated the macro, meso and micro dimensions wherein “*mediatisation of politics*” likely take shape, this theory gives us reasonable conceptual lenses to evaluate the structural conditions and factors that drive such developments.

Fourthly, this work found that theory likely take place as descriptive and exploratory theory. This theory therefore likely exist “an idealized theory”. Even Strömbäck (2008: 241) himself affirmed that the four phases and dimensions of mediatisation of politics he conceptualised in this theory is actually too ideal and unlikely takes shape in the real politics. He also stated the distinctions between such phases and dimensions “*are less clear in reality than in theory*”. Though Strömbäck and his colleagues (such as, Strömbäck, 2011a; Strömbäck & Dimitrova, 2011; Strömbäck & Aelst, 2013) advanced and applied this theory and provided invaluable understanding of its application within the specific context of some Western-established democratic countries, they however, merely succeeded in partially capturing and examining the existences of such phases and transformations

of these dimensions in these countries. Overall, they did not yet fully success in holistically understanding and exploring the ways and the degrees to which such phases and dimensions took shape within and across democratic countries.

Based on such evidences, this work proposes the following propositions and recommendations. *At first*, development of mediatisation of politics that take place within and across democratic countries are inspirable with not only the political and the media systems (Marcinkowski, 2014: 14-15), but also the economic system that exist in such countries (Murdock, 2017: 119). Since the existing mediatisation theories took into account less the economic dimension (Murdock, 2017: 120), developments of marketization and commercialization (Murdock, 2017: 122-123) and the increasing roles and powers of corporate logic (Murdock, 2017: 124-126) and the infrastructure of communication technology (Murdock, 2017: 127-128), the Strömbäck” theory of mediatisation of politics is indeed not immune from such problems. To resolve such problem, this theory need to be further advanced by incorporating variability models of the media, political and economic systems within and across democratic countries.

Secondly, this theory was originally stemmed from the specific context of the Western-established democracy. But, we could adopt this theory to address the following conditions. Some of us might already recognize that in the aftermath the downfall of Authoritarian Regime Soeharto in May 1998s, the relationships between the media and politics have dramatically changes. Some authors already investigated the systemic and dynamic changes regarding the relationships between the state, market, media and civil societies (Hidayat, 2002a; Hidayat & Sendjaja, 2002) and the structures of the media ownerships (Lim, 2011, 2012; Nugroho & Syarief, 2012; Nugroho, et. al., 2012a, 2012b; Armando, 2014), examined transformations of the press freedom (Ispandriarno, 2008) and the media policy (Wahyuni, 2008) and performances (Gazali, 2004; Gazali, et.al, 2009) and explored the ways of the Indonesian political parties and politicians considering the media as the medium and tools of marketing and campaigning and hiring political pollsters and consultants in facing the elections (Danial, 2007; Qodari, 2010; Uffen, 2010a, 2010b; Ahmad, 2014, 2017; Yuliatiningtyas, 2014). However, since such issues have been commonly investigated using the mediation, media policy, media organisation and performance and critical political-economic paradigms, a specific research that holistically investigate on how and the degree to which mediatisation of politics has evolved and took shape in the new democracy of Indonesia since the downfall of the Authoritarian regime of Soeharto up to date have been under-developed. Thus, there is a plenty of opportunities for us to further evaluate the validity and applicability of this theory within the specific context of the new democracy of Indonesia.

Bibliography

- Aalberg, T & Strömbäck, J. (2011) Media-driven Men and Media-critical Women? An Empirical Study of Gender and MPs' Relationships with the Media in Norway and Sweden. *International Political Science Review*, 32 (2), 167-187.
- Armando, A. (2014) The Greedy Giants: Centralized Television in Post-authoritarian Indonesia. *International Communication Gazette*, 76 (4-5), 390-406.
- Ahmad, N. (2017). Political Marketing Management of Parliament under the Presidential Government System: A Lesson Learn from the Indonesia House of Representative Post-New Order Soeharto. *Journal of Political Marketing*.
- _____ (2014) The Social Media Usage and the Transformation of Political Marketing and Campaigning of the Emerging Democracy in Indonesia: Case Study of the 2012 Gubernatorial Election of the Special Region of the Capital City Jakarta. In Patrut B & Patrut M (Eds), *Social Media in Politics: Case Studies on the Political Power of Social Media* (pp.97-125). London: Springer.
- Altheide, D. (2004) Media Logic and Political Communication. *Political Communication*, 21:3, 293-296, DOI: 10.1080/10584600490481307
- Altheide, D. & Snow, R (1979) *Media Logic*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Asp, K. (2014) NewsMediaLogic in a New Institutional Perspective. *Journalism Studies*, 15 (3), 256-270.
- _____ & Esaiasson, P. (1996). The Modernization of Swedish Campaigns: Individualization, Professionalization, and Medialization. In Swanson, D.L. & Mancini, P. (Eds), *Politics, Media, and Modern Democracy: An International Study of Innovations in Electoral Campaigning and Their Consequences*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Bardoel, Jo & Haenens, L. (2004). Media Responsibility and Accountability: New Conceptualizations and Practices. *Communications*, 29(5), 5-25.
- Bennett, L.W. & Entman, R.M. (2001) *Mediated Politics: Communication in the Future of Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Benson, R. (2004) Bringing the Sociology of Media Back In. *Political Communication*, 21:3, 275-292, DOI: 10.1080/10584600490481299
- Brüggemann, M., Engesser, S., Büchel, F., Humprecht, E. & Castro, L. (2014). Hallin and Mancini Revisited: Four Empirical Types of Western Media Systems. *Journal of Communication*, 64 (6), 1037-1065.
- Büchel, F., Humprecht, E., Castro-Herrero, L., Engesser, S., & Brüggemann, M. (2016). Building Empirical Typologies with QCA: Toward a Classification of Media Systems. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, 21(2), 209-232.
- Bunten, M & Uffen, A (Eds). (2009). *Democratization in Post-Suharto Indonesia*. London: Routledge.
- Couldry, N. (2008). Mediatization or Mediation? Alternative Understandings of the Emergent Space of Digital Storytelling. *New Media Society*, 10 (3), 373-391.
- _____ (2012) *Media, Society, World: Social Theory and Digital Media Practice*. Cambridge, UK: Polity Press.
- _____ & Hepp, A. (2013). Conceptualizing Mediatization: Context, Traditions, Arguments. *Communication Theory*, 23, 191-202.
- Croteau, D & William, H. (2001). *The Business of Media: Corporate Media and the Public Interest*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Cushion, S & Thomas, R. (2013). The Mediatization of Politics: Interpreting the Value of Live versus Edited Journalistic Interventions in U.K. Television News Bulletins. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, 18 (3), 360-380.
- _____, Aalberg, T., & Thomas, R. (2014) Towards a Rolling News Logic in Fixed Time Bulletins? A Comparative Analysis of Journalistic Interventions in the US, UK and Norway. *European Journal of Communication*, 29 (1), 100-109.
- _____, Rodger, H. & Lewis, R. (2014) Comparing Levels of Mediatization in Television Journalism: An Analysis of Political Reporting on US and UK Evening News Bulletins. *International Communication Gazette*, 76, 443-463.
- Deacon, D. & Stanyer, J. (2014) Mediatization: key concept of conceptual bandwagon. *Media, Culture & Society* 36(7): 1032-1044.
- _____ (2015) "Mediatization and" or "Mediatization of"? A Response to Hepp et al. *Media, Culture & Society*, 37(4), 655-657.
- Donsbach, W. (2010). Journalists and Their Professional Identities. In Allan, S. (ed). *The Routledge Companion to News and Journalism* (pp. 38-48). London and New York: Routledge.
- Elmelund-Præstekær, C., Hopmann, D.N., & Nørgaard, A.S. (2011). Does Mediatization Change MP-Media Interaction and MP Attitudes toward the Media? Evidence from a Longitudinal Study of Danish MPs. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, 16 (3), 382-403.
- Esser, F. (2013) Mediatization as a Challenge: Media Logic Vs. Political Logic. in Kriesi, H., Lavenex, S., Bochsler, D., Matthes, J., Esser, F. & Bühlmann, M. (Eds) *Democracy in the Age of Globalization and Mediatization* (pp.155-176). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gazali, E. (2004). Communication of Politics and Politics of Communication in Indonesia: Study on Media Performance, Responsibility and Accountability. Unpublished Doctoral Thesis, Radboud University Nijmegen.
- _____, Hidayat, D. N. & Manayang, V. (2009) Political Communication in Indonesia: Media Performance in Three Eras. in Willnat, L. & Annette, A. (Eds) *Political Communication in Asia*. New York: Routledge.
- Hallin, D. & Mancini, P. (2004) *Comparing Media Systems. Three Models of Media and Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hanitzsch, T. (2009). *Comparative Journalism Studies*. in Wahl-Jorgensen, K., & Hanitzsch, T (Eds). *The Handbook of Journalism Studies* (pp. 413-427). New York and London: Routledge.
- _____ (2007). Deconstructing Journalism Culture: Toward a universal Theory. *Journal of Communication*, 17, 367-385.
- _____ (2006) Mapping Journalism Culture: A Theoretical Taxonomy and Case Studies from Indonesia. *Asian Journal of Communication*, 16 (2), 169-186.
- _____, Hanusch, F., Mellado, C., Anikina, M., Berganza, R., Cangoz, I., Coman, M., Hamada, B., Hernández, M. E., Karadjov, C.D., Moreira, S.V., Mwesige, P.G., Plaisance, P. L., Reich, Z., Seethaler, J., Skewes, E.A., Vardiansyah Noor, D., & Yuen, E. K. W. (2011) Mapping Journalism Cultures Across Nations: a Comparative Study of 18 Countries. *Journalism Studies*, 12(3), 273-293.
- Hanusch, F., & Hanitzsch, T. (2017) Comparing Journalistic Cultures Across Nations. *Journalism Studies*, 18 (5), 525-535.
- Hepp, A. (2009) Differentiation: Mediatization and Cultural Change. In Lundby, K (Ed), *Mediatization: Concept, Changes, Consequences* (139-158). New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
- _____ (2011) *Mediatization, Media Technologies and the "Moulding Forces" of the Media*. Paper presented to the Philosophy of Communication Division for the annual International Communication Association conference in Boston, 26-30 May 2011.
- _____ (2012a). *Cultures of Mediatization*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- _____ (2012b). Mediatization and the "Molding Force" of the Media. *Communications*, 37 (1), 1-28.
- _____ (2013). The Communicative Figurations of Mediatized Worlds: Mediatization Research in Times of the 'mediation of everything'. *European Journal of Communication*, 28(6), 615-629.
- _____ (2014). Communicative Figurations. Research Cultures of Mediatization. in Kramp, L., Carpentier, N., Hepp, A., Tomani Trivundža, I., Nieminen, H., Kunelius, R., Olsson, T., Sundin, E. & Kilborn, R. (Eds.) *Media Practice and Everyday Agency in Europe* (pp. 83-99). Bremen: Edition lu- mière.
- _____ & Krotz, F. (2014) Mediatized Worlds: Understanding Everyday Mediatization. in Hepp, A & Krotz, F (Eds), *Mediatized Worlds, Culture and Society in a Media Age* (pp.1-18). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- _____, Hjarvard, S., & Lundby, K. (2015) Mediatization: Theorising the Interplay between Media, Culture and Society. *Media, Culture & Society* 37(2), 314-322.
- Hjarvard, S. (2003) A Mediated World: The Globalization of Society and the Role of Media. In Hjarvard, S. (Ed.), *Media in a Globalized Society*. København: Museum Tusulanum Press.
- _____ (2004). From Bricks to Bytes. The Mediatization of a Global Toy Industry. in Bondebjerg, I. & Golding, P. (Eds), *European Culture and the Media* (pp. 34-63). Bristol: Intellect.
- _____ (2008). The Mediatization of Society: A Theory of the Media as Agents of Social and Cultural Change. *Nordicom Review*, 29 (2), 105-134.

- _____ (2009). Soft Individualism: Media and the Changing Social Character. in Lundby, K (Ed), *Mediatization: Concept, Changes, Consequences* (pp. 159-178). New York: Peter Lang Publishing Inc.
- _____ (2013). Introduction: From Mediation to Mediatization. In Hjarvard, S (Eds) *The Mediatization of Culture and Societies* (pp.1-7). New York: Routledge.
- _____ (2014). From Mediation to Mediatization: The Institutionalization of New Media. in Hepp, A & Krotz, F. (Eds) *Mediatized Worlds, Culture and Society in a Media Age* (pp. 123-142). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Hopmann, D.N. & Strömbäck, J. (2010) The Rise of the Media Punditocracy? Journalists and Media Pundits in Danish Election News 1994-2007. *Media Culture Society*, 32 (6), 943-960.
- Ispandriano, L.S. (2008). Political Communication in Indonesia: An Analysis of the Freedom of the Press in the Transition Process after the Downfall of the Soeharto-Regime (1998-2004). Unpublished PhD Dissertation of Institute of Media and Communication Science, Ilmenau Technical University. Germany.
- Jensen, K.B. (2013). Definitive and Sensitizing Conceptualizations of Mediatization. *Communication Theory*, 23, 203-222.
- Kalsnes, B. (2016). The Power of Likes: Social Media Logic and Political Communication. Doctoral Thesis submitted for the degree of PhD Department of Media and Communication, Faculty of Humanities, University of Oslo
- Kalsnes, B., Larsson, A.O., & Enli, G.S. (2017). The Social Media Logic of Political Interaction: Exploring Citizens' and Politicians' Relationship on Facebook and Twitter. *First Monday*, 22 (2).
- Kepplinger, H.M. (2002). Mediatization of Politics: Theory and Data. *Journal of Communication*, 52(4), 972-986.
- Klinger, U. & Svenssen, J. (2015). The Emergence of Network Media Logic in Political Communication: A Theoretical Approach. *New Media & Society*, 17 (8), 1241-1257.
- Krotz, F. (2007) The Meta-process of 'Mediatization' as a Conceptual Frame. *Global Media and Communication*, 3 (3), 943-960.
- _____ (2009) Mediatization: A Concept With Which to Grasp Media and Societal Changes. In Lundby, K (Ed), *Mediatization: Concept, Changes, Consequences* (pp. 21-40). New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
- _____ (2014). Media, Mediatization and Mediatized Worlds: A Discussion of Basic Concepts. in Hepp, A & Krotz, F (Eds), *Mediatized Worlds, Culture and Society in a Media Age* (pp.72-90). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kunelius, R. & Reunanen, E. (2012). Media in Political Power: A Parsonian View on the Differentiated Mediatization of Finnish Decision Makers. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, 17 (1), 56-75.
- Landerer, N. (2013) Rethinking the Logics: A Conceptual Framework for the Mediatization of Politics. *Communication Theory*, 23, 239-258.
- Lim, M. (2011). @Crossroads: Democratization & Corporatization of Media in Indonesia. Participatorymedia.lab.asu.edu. Retrieved from http://participatorymedia.lab.asu.edu/files/Lim_Media_Ford_2011.pdf. November 25, 2014.
- Lim, M (2012) *The League of Thirteen: Media Concentration in Indonesia*. Participatory Media Lab, Arizona State University: Arizona: USA and the Ford Foundation.
- Livingstone, S. (2009a). On the Mediation of Everything: ICA Presidential Address 2008. *Journal of communication*, 59 (1), 1-18.
- Livingstone, S. (2009b) Foreword: Coming to Terms With "Mediatization". In Lundby, K (Ed), *Mediatization: Concept, Changes, Consequences* (pp.ix-xi). New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Lundby, K (2009). Introduction: "Mediatization" As Key. in Lundby, K (Eds), *Mediatization: Concept, Changes, Consequences* (pp. 1-20). New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Marcinkowski, F. (2014). Mediatization Politics: Reflections on the State of the Concept. *Javnost -The Public*, 21 (2), 5-22.
- Mazzoleni, G. (2017). Changes in Contemporary Communication Ecosystems Ask for a "New Look" at the Concept of Mediatization. *Javnost -The Public*, 24 (2), 136-145.
- _____ (2008a). Media Logic. In Donsbach, D (Ed), *The International Encyclopedia of Communication* (pp. 2930-2932). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- _____ (2008b) Mediatization of Politics. In Donsbach, W (Ed.), *The International Encyclopedia of Communication* (pp. 3047-3051). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- _____ (1987). Media Logic and Party Logic in Campaign Coverage: the Italian General Election of 1983. *European Journal of Communication*, 2, 81-103.
- _____ & Schultz, W. (1999). Mediatization of Politics: A Challenge for Democracy? *Political Communication*, 16 (3), 247-61
- McQuail, D. (1992). *Media Performance: Mass Communication and the Public Interest*. London: Sage Publications.
- _____ (2003). *Media Accountability and Freedom of Publication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Meyen, M., Thieroff, M., & Strenger, S. (2014) Mass Media Logic and The Mediatization of Politics, *Journalism Studies*, 15 (3), 271-288.
- Meyer, T. (2002) *Media Democracy: How the Media Colonize Politics*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Murdock, G. (2017) Mediatization and the Transformation of Capitalism: The Elephant in the Room. *Javnost -The Public*, 24 (2), 119-135.
- Nugroho, Y & Syarif, S. (2012). *Beyond Click Activism: New Media and Political Processes in Contemporary Indonesia*. Berlin: Friedrich-Ebert Stiftung.
- Nugroho Y, Siregar M. & Laksmi, S. (2012a) *Mapping Media Policy in Indonesia*. Jakarta: CIPG and Hivos.
- _____ (2012b) *Mapping Media Policy in Indonesia. Report. Engaging Media, Empowering Society: Assessing Media Policy and Governance in Indonesia through the Lens of Citizens' Rights*. Jakarta: Centre for Innovation Policy and Governance, HIVOS Regional Office Southeast Asia, Ford Foundation Indonesia.
- Qodari, M. (2010). The Professionalisation of Politics: The Growing Role of Polling Organisations and Political Consultants. in Aspinall, E & Mietzner, M (Eds), *Problems of Democratization in Indonesia: Elections, Institutions and Society* (pp. 122-140). Singapore: ISEAS.
- Schulz, W. (2004) Reconstructing Mediatization as an Analytical Concept. *European Journal of Communication*, 19 (1), 87-101.
- Schrott, A (2009) Dimensions: Catch-All Label or Technical Term. In Lundby, K. (Ed), *Mediatization: Concept, Changes, Consequences* (pp. 41-62). New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
- Schweitzer, E. J. (2012). The Mediatization of E-Campaigning: Evidence From German Party Websites in State, National, and European Parliamentary Elections 2002-2009. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 17, 283-302.
- Shoemaker, P., & Reese, S. D. (1990). Exposure to What? Integrating Media Content and Effects Studies. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 67 (4), 649-652.
- _____ (1996). *Mediating the Message: Theories of Influences on Mass Media Content* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Longman.
- _____ (2014). *Mediating the Message in the 21st Century: A Media Sociology Perspective*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- _____ (2016). A Media Sociology for the Networked Public Sphere: The Hierarchy of Influences Model. *Mass Communication and Society*, 19, 389-410.
- Skogerbo, E. & Karlsen, R. (2014). Mediatization and Regional Campaigning in a Party Centred-System: How and Why Parliamentary Candidates Seek Visibility. *Javnost-The Public*, 21 (2), 75-92.
- Strömbäck, J. (2008). Four Phases of Mediatization: An Analysis of the Mediatization of Politics. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, 13 (3), 228-246.
- _____ (2011a) Mediatization and Perceptions of the Media's Political Influence. *Journalism Studies*, 12 (4), 423-439.
- _____ (2011b). Mediatization of Politics: Toward a Conceptual Framework for Comparative Research. In Bucy, E.P. & Holbert, L.R. (Eds), *The Sourcebook for Political Communication Research: Methods, Measures, and Analytical Techniques* (pp. 367-82). New York, London: Routledge.
- _____ & Esser, F. (2009). Shaping Politics: Mediatization and Media Interventionism. in Lundby, K (Ed), *Mediatization: Concept, Changes, Consequences* (pp. 205-224). New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
- _____ & Esser, F. (2014a). Mediatization of Politics: Towards a Theoretical Framework. In Esser, F & Strömbäck, J. (Eds), *Mediatization of Politics: Understanding the Transformation of Western Democracies* (pp. 3-28). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- _____ & Esser, F. (2014b). Introduction: Making Sense of the Mediatization of Politics. *Journalism Studies*, 15 (3), 243-255.
- _____ & Esser, F. (2014c). Introduction. *Journalism Practice*, 8

- (3), 245-257.
- _____ & Dimitrova, D.V. (2011). Mediatization and Media Interventionism: A Comparative Analysis of Sweden and the United States. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, 16 (1), 30-49.
- _____ & Van Aelst, P. (2013). Why Political Parties Adapt to the Media: Exploring the Fourth Dimension of Mediatization. *International Communication Gazette*, 75 (4), 341-358.
- Takens J., Van Atteveldt, W., Van Hoof, A., & Kleinnijenhuis, J. (2013). Media Logic in Election Campaign Coverage. *European Journal of Communication*, 28 (3), 277-293.
- Thimm C, Dang-Anh, M & Einspanner, J. (2014). Mediatized Politics: Structures and Strategies of Discursive Participation and Online Deliberation on Twitter. in Hepp, A & Krotz, F. (Eds), *Mediatized Worlds, Culture and Society in a Media Age* (pp.253-270). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Uffen, A. (2010a). Electoral Campaigning in Indonesia: The Professionalization and Commercialization after 1998. *Journal of Current Southeast Asian Affairs*, 29 (4), 11-37.
- _____ (2010b). The Legislative and Presidential Elections in Indonesia in 2009. *Electoral Studies*, 29 (2), 281-285.
- Van Aelst, P & Walgrave, S. (2011). Minimal or Massive? The Political Agenda-Setting Power of the Mass Media According to Different Methods. *The International Journal of Press/Politics*, 16 (3), 295-313.
- Van Aelst, P., Walgrave, S., Thesen, G. & Rens, V. (2014) "Mediatization and Political Agenda-Setting: Changing Issue Priorities?" in Esser, Frank & Strömbäck, Jesper (eds.), *Mediatization of Politics. Understanding the Transformation of Western Democracies*. Springer.
- Van Aelst, P., Strömbäck, J., Aalberg, T., Esser, F., de Vreese, Claes., Matthes, J., Hopmann, D., Salgado, S., Hubé, N., Stipka, A., Papathanassopoulos, S., Berganza, R., Legnante, G., Reinemann, C., Sheffer, T., & Staner, J. (2017) Political Communication in a High-choice Media Environment: a Challenge for Democracy? *Annals of the International Communication Association*, 41(1), 3-27.
- Van Dalen, A. (2012). Structural Bias in Cross-National Perspective: How Political Systems and Journalism Cultures Influence Government Dominance in the News. *The International Journal of Press/Politics* 17 (1), 32-55.
- Van Dijk, J., & Poell, T. (2013). Understanding Social Media Logic. *Media and Communication*, 1(1), 2-14.
- Wahyuni, H.I. (2008) *Broadcasting Media Regulation*. Yogyakarta: FISIPOL UGM
- Washbourne, N. (2010) *Mediating Politics: Newspapers, Radio, Television and the Internet*. Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press.
- Wahl-Jørgensen, K., & Hanitzsch, T. (2009). Introduction: On Why and How We Should Do Journalism Studies. in Wahl-Jørgensen, K., & Hanitzsch, T. (Eds). *The Handbook of Journalism Studies* (pp. 3-16). New York and London: Routledge.
- Yuliatiningtyas, S (2014) *Campaign Strategies of Political Parties in The 2014 Presidential Election in Indonesia*. A Paper for APSA Conferences The University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia 28th September-1st of October 2014
- Zeh, R & Hopmann, D.N (2013). Indicating Mediatization? Two Decades of Election Campaign Television Coverage. *European Journal of Communication*, 28 (3), 225-240.