

Cambridge University Press

0521535409 - Comparing Political Communication: Theories, Cases, and Challenges

Edited by Frank Esser and Barbara Pfetsch

Excerpt

[More information](#)

Introduction

Cambridge University Press

0521535409 - Comparing Political Communication: Theories, Cases, and Challenges

Edited by Frank Esser and Barbara Pfetsch

Excerpt

[More information](#)

ONE

Comparing Political Communication

Reorientations in a Changing World

Barbara Pfetsch and Frank Esser

This volume intends to assess the state of the art of comparative research in political communication and to make reference to potential ways in which political communication could and should develop. When Jay Blumler and Michael Gurevitch urged political communication to adapt to the perspective of international comparison more than 25 years ago they were able to refer to only a few studies (Blumler and Gurevitch 1975). At the time, the neglect of comparative work in communication research was even more blatant as this approach had been well established in neighboring social sciences such as political science. However, scholars in comparative politics were never really interested in the mass media and political communication. In communication science on the other hand, political communication has always been a central subject; though it was believed for a long time that it would suffice to describe singular phenomena in the realm of national politics or to subscribe to historical studies. Thus, until the early 1990s communication research lacked an international orientation comparable to that of political science (Kaase 1998; Schoenbach 1998).

From today's point of view it is surprising how long it took for the comparative approach to be acknowledged as a necessary and useful strategy and tool of communication research. Doris Graber (1993, 305) rightly points out that political communication cannot be suitably studied without comparative research "as its form varies between cultures, which makes it necessary and instructive to analyze it from different cultural perspectives." Comparative research in political communication deserves more attention because it enables us to inspect our own findings critically by using the examination of others, and only by doing so enables us to reach conclusions with an extensive claim to validity.

Cambridge University Press

0521535409 - Comparing Political Communication: Theories, Cases, and Challenges

Edited by Frank Esser and Barbara Pfetsch

Excerpt

[More information](#)

BARBARA PFETSCH AND FRANK ESSER

Against this background, it is all the more remarkable that we lack a comprehensive publication in the English-speaking world that brings to the fore and discusses the questions and concepts as well as the applications and problems of comparative political communication research. Such a publication¹ has become all the more important as we can meanwhile document a rapid development of relevant research. During the 1990s, various productive networks of researchers working across national borders were formed that were responsible for a series of prominent and fruitful projects. Moreover, the process of European integration gives the activities on this side of the Atlantic further impetus. Any doubts pertaining to the benefits and the prospect of the comparative approach have been abandoned. Hence, Michael Gurevitch and Jay Blumler (Chapter 14, this volume) note: "Far from being neglected, comparative political research has almost become fashionable." With this in mind, the challenge now is to revisit and systematize the manifold studies into a comprehensive "state-of-the-art" report, which is a suitable document of the advances of comparative research in this subfield of communication science.

Going beyond the sociology of communication science as an academic discipline, this volume also allows for the deeper insight that political communication processes in themselves are by no means to be understood as delimited phenomena. In the twenty-first century we are confronted with developments in the realm of politics and mass communications that rule out the conception of political communication as a phenomenon that could be defined within singular national, cultural, or linguistic boundaries. In fact, the challenge today is to face the developments and consequences arising from the modernization and globalization of political processes. This is not least necessary because we now know that the structures and processes of media development and communications do systematically impact the development of democracy, the legitimization of political power, and the participation in politics (Chapter 6, this volume).

However, studies on the relationship between political communication and the quality of democracy across different countries (Gunther and Mughan 2000; Thomass and Tzankoff 2001) reveal that the role of political communication is by no means consistent. It is far more dependent on whether established "old" democracies or so-called new

¹ A German edition of this volume was published by Westdeutscher Verlag, Wiesbaden, 2003, under the title *Politische Kommunikation im internationalen Vergleich – Grundlagen, Anwendungen, Perspektiven*.

Cambridge University Press

0521535409 - Comparing Political Communication: Theories, Cases, and Challenges

Edited by Frank Esser and Barbara Pfetsch

Excerpt

[More information](#)

COMPARING POLITICAL COMMUNICATION

democracies are being considered. While there is evidence that the media in transition countries support the adoption of democratic norms and play a marked constructive role in political consolidation (Schmitt-Beck and Voltmer 2001), their contribution to the democratic process in contemporary Western systems is no more than ambivalent. Thus, the interrelations and consequences of political communication clearly vary according to the duration and the traditions of the development of democracy, whereby the problems and deficits of modernized political communication mainly occur in the Western mass democracies. As a consequence, the contributions to this volume – with the exception of the study by Norris (Chapter 6, this volume), which takes a global perspective – concentrate on the “old,” established democracies in Western Europe and the United States.

In view of the significance of communication processes for the development of democracy many mainstream researchers dwelled on the United States as the country in which the modernization of political communication seemed furthest advanced and most apparent. The American “media democracy” appeared for a long time to be *the* role model for the development of political communication in all Western democracies (Blumler and Gurevitch 1995, 77). With the creation of the term *Americanization* the essential paradigm had been set that generated a great deal of dynamics in international research. A boom in comparative political communication studies was the outcome following the criticism of the parochial perspective of many U.S.-centered projects, which tended to neglect institutional arrangements as well as cultural and structural contexts of political communication. Since the 1990s, European and American scholars have been asking themselves whether the American model of media democracy is indeed appropriate for describing generalizable patterns of developments of modern political communication in today’s Western democracies (Gurevitch and Blumler 1990; Swanson 1992; Negrine and Papathanassopoulos 1996; Swanson and Mancini 1996). The fundamental transformation of the media systems of the Western world, which was caused by the changes in information technology and communication infrastructure and by the global media economy and diffusion of news, also belongs to the driving forces behind comparative research. A clear sign of the globalization of media is the growth and concentration of internationally active media conglomerates. This development has had significant repercussions for national media systems. In almost all European countries there has been a reorientation of media policy with respect to deregulation

Cambridge University Press

0521535409 - Comparing Political Communication: Theories, Cases, and Challenges

Edited by Frank Esser and Barbara Pfetsch

Excerpt

[More information](#)

BARBARA PFETSCH AND FRANK ESSER

and the opening up of media markets. In the case of the United States there has been a further wave of commercialization over the past decade (Underwood 1998; Bogart 2000). While the long-term consequences are still not foreseeable, it was already clear at the beginning of the transformation process that political communication would not go unaffected by the technical development and the increase in competition and commercialization. In view of the development of global communication systems and processes, which no longer stop at national borders, it is obvious that research also cannot be limited to examining particularities that concern one country only. The onus now was on discovering transnational trends, similarities, and deviations from general patterns that only become apparent when a broad – comparative – perspective is taken.

The growth of comparative research has led to a cornucopia of studies. In this situation it is appropriate and necessary to establish paradigmatic paths in the knowledge jungle and to bundle results in order to be able to develop new perspectives. This is the starting point of this volume. In the appraisal of the current research, we follow an outline of three main sections, discussing the fundamentals, applications, and perspectives of comparative political communication research. The first part will access comparative political communication by expounding the basic themes, the problems, and overall developments and by providing an overview of the spectrum of comparative studies. Furthermore, an introduction would be incomplete if it did not address the problems of comparative research designs and its methodological foundations. The essays in the second part of the volume highlight concrete examples of comparative studies in specific subareas of political communication. The focus here is on comparative investigations into the structures, processes, actors, contents, and effects of political communication. These contributions are not just concerned with presenting tangible projects and their results but also with discussing the specific added value of the comparative approach. This added value takes the form on the one hand of a substantial increase in insight regarding the respective research questions and on the other of experience gained regarding the implementation of comparative designs. The contributions in the third part of the volume look to the future and discuss the theoretical and methodological prospects of the comparative approach. The final chapter provides a synthesis of the common theoretical and methodological issues of the studies presented and attempts to integrate the manifold approaches, questions, and concepts.

Cambridge University Press

0521535409 - Comparing Political Communication: Theories, Cases, and Challenges

Edited by Frank Esser and Barbara Pfetsch

Excerpt

[More information](#)

COMPARING POLITICAL COMMUNICATION

INTERNATIONAL COMPARISON AS A RESEARCH STRATEGY
AND METHODOLOGY

The acknowledgment of the relevance of communication in political processes is of course not synonymous with the successful implementation of comparative studies. A widening of the perspective thus implies research designs in which a variety of exogenous influencing factors that are difficult to control must be considered. As a matter of principle, various methodological conditions are to be set when a comparative perspective is taken.

Comparative research lives up to the rule that “every observation is without significance if it is not compared with other observations.” It can be said, arguing theoretically from the point of view of epistemology, that we form our ideas through comparisons. We know that apples are not pears because we have compared them with each other. An object only develops an identity of its own if it is compared with others” (Aarebrot and Bakka 1997, 49). This means that we observe at least two populations when making comparisons. In the field of political communication we usually compare political systems that can be comprehended as nation states, regional entities, political subsystems, or parts of subsystems (e.g., local areas of communication or elite or media cultures). Comparative political communication research is also always a cultural comparison. Even though many studies that compare across countries are based on the assumption that culture and nation overlap, this must not disguise the fact that both parameters are not necessarily congruent. It is often the case that contradictory and discrepant processes and phenomena of political communication appear within one single political system taking the form of a nation state, as is shown by comparing journalistic cultures, for instance, in Francophone and Anglo-American Canada (Pritchard and Sauvageau 1997) or by comparing media effects in Western and Eastern Germany (Chapter 13, this volume). Cultures constitute communities of values in the broadest sense. In comparative political communication research, therefore, it is possible to study specific subcultures and their value structures such as the political communication cultures emerging between journalists and political spokespeople in different political systems (Chapter 15, this volume) or the local communication cultures within their specific media environments across countries (Chapter 7, this volume).

Although the nation-state is by no means the only reference frame for comparative studies, we adhere to the term *comparative* in this volume

Cambridge University Press

0521535409 - Comparing Political Communication: Theories, Cases, and Challenges

Edited by Frank Esser and Barbara Pfetsch

Excerpt

[More information](#)

BARBARA PFETSCH AND FRANK ESSER

to signify the comparison across national political systems or societies. We are deliberately not using the terms *interculturally comparative* or *intersystemically comparative*. The pragmatic reason for this convention is that of all conceivable reference frames national political systems are the most clear-cut (Kohn 1989; Chapter 17, this volume). If the terms *interculturally* or *intersystemically* were used we would have to define in every case what is meant by *culture* or *system*. Because the overwhelming majority of studies in this volume is concerned with comparisons between countries it seems justified to speak of comparative research. As we understand it in this volume, comparative political communication research refers to comparison between a minimum of two political systems or cultures (or their subelements) with respect to at least one object of investigation relevant to communication studies. Furthermore, correlations with explanatory variables are considered on the microanalytical actors' level; the meso-analytical organizational and institutional level; and on the macroanalytical system or cultural level.

Moreover, we assume that the specific structures, norms, and values in political systems shape the political communication roles and behaviors. Therefore, comparative research is often designed in such a way that the countries studied are selected with regard to the contextual conditions of the object of research (Chapter 17, this volume). Thus, the crucial questions to be answered are 1) What always applies regardless of the contextual influences? 2) How does the object of investigation "behave" under the influence of different contextual conditions? Michael Gurevitch and Jay Blumler (Chapter 14, this volume) rightly stress that comparative research "should be designed to realize 'double value.' That is, it should aim to shed light not only on the particular phenomena being studied but also on the different systems in which they are being examined. In other words, more mature comparative research will be 'system sensitive.'" The way in which the context shapes the object of investigation and, conversely, any repercussions on the system resulting from the object of investigation, is of central importance in comparative political communication.

Since the early days of comparative studies, enormous progress has been made with respect to the refinement of research designs. In the meantime, the more demanding studies are built on the logic of "quasi-experimental methods." Researchers select their cases or countries in such a way that they correspond with the differing characteristics of the independent, explanatory variables (e.g., suffrage in countries with the

Cambridge University Press

0521535409 - Comparing Political Communication: Theories, Cases, and Challenges

Edited by Frank Esser and Barbara Pfetsch

Excerpt

[More information](#)

COMPARING POLITICAL COMMUNICATION

majority vote system versus countries with proportional representation) in different system contexts. The groups in field experiments comparing different countries are then compared to see to which degree the systems differ with respect to the dependent variables (e.g., personalization of election campaign reporting). Such quasi-experimental research designs certainly forbid a strongly causal attribution of explanatory factors for the determined variance of the dependent variable. However, “soft control” of the variance can be achieved by describing systematically the institutional and cultural contexts, and thereby fulfill the requirements “to think structurally, to conceptualize in macro terms, to stretch vertically across levels and horizontally across systems” (Blumler et al. 1992, 8). Against the background of these specifications the understanding of the comparative approach underlying this volume can be complemented in the following way: Comparative political communication research refers to a particular strategy to gain insight that allows for general conclusions, the scope of which cover more than one system and more than one cultural context, and that explains differences (or similarities) between objects of investigation within the contextual conditions of the surrounding systems or cultures.

The comparative research strategy in political communication is not only associated with chances but also risks. The fundamental problem of comparative research in the social sciences lies, as Werner Wirth and Steffen Kolb (Chapter 5, this volume) point out, with the establishing of functional equivalence. The authors show in their chapter that the pitfalls of comparability appear on many levels so that researchers have to make a series of far-ranging strategic decisions when conceiving studies. Among these, the selection of countries and the determining of a quasi-experimental design seem to be among the easier ones. The authors rightly refer to the two strategies that are discussed as “most similar” and “most different systems design” in the literature (Przeworski and Teune 1970). Studies that are based on a “most similar design” make it possible to study the cultural differences in most similar systems. Studies that are based on a “most different design” unearth the similarities in the systems that differ the most. It is more difficult, on the other hand, to determine functionally equivalent constructs, indicators, and methods in such a way that it doesn’t amount to contortions and the interpretation of measurement artifacts as differences. The chapter by Wirth and Kolb makes us sensitive to the fact that comparative research rests on many prerequisite and implicit conditions. Moreover, the quality of comparative studies regarding their potential to empirically determine

Cambridge University Press

0521535409 - Comparing Political Communication: Theories, Cases, and Challenges

Edited by Frank Esser and Barbara Pfetsch

Excerpt

[More information](#)

BARBARA PFETSCH AND FRANK ESSER

and explain interrelationships all the more depends on whether the research is systematically guided by theory.

The range of themes and research questions associated with comparative political communication research is – as Hans Kleinsteuber (Chapter 4, this volume) points out – enormously broad and diverse. In this respect, comparative research goes well beyond determining similarities and differences between different objects studied. Kleinsteuber stresses that comparative designs fit to analyze complex interrelationships and thereby shed light on processes of diffusion, dependence, temporality, or performance. With respect to political communication, Kleinsteuber's overview reminds us that comparative studies are by no means limited to the prominent subject of election campaign communication, as one may believe from glancing through the literature. In fact, comparisons across countries have been applied in many fields of communication studies and media policy. Moreover, concerning the analysis of media systems we are on the way to understanding international processes of modernization and transformation as well as processes and effects of media regulatory policy. However, Kleinsteuber also emphasizes that some political developments, that is the problem of multilevel governance as observed, for instance, with the expanding competences following European Union integration policy, represent a serious challenge for comparative research.

THE QUESTIONS AND THEMES OF COMPARATIVE POLITICAL COMMUNICATION RESEARCH IN THIS STUDY

The demand for comparative research in political communication is consequential because it requires abstracting from the implicit premises and the national idiosyncrasies in both politics and media communications in the search for generalizable communication patterns and their consequences. Considering the substantial driving forces of comparative research two comprehensive themes stand out. On the one hand, fears concerning the homogenization of media, media contents, and political communication processes as a result of technological, social, and political change led to the debate of concepts of convergence such as Americanization, globalization, and modernization. On the other hand, the suspicion that the media would dominate the modern political publicity process with the implication of dysfunctional effects on modern democracies provoked an exhaustive preoccupation with the structures, actors, media contents, and effects of political communication.

Cambridge University Press

0521535409 - Comparing Political Communication: Theories, Cases, and Challenges

Edited by Frank Esser and Barbara Pfetsch

Excerpt

[More information](#)

COMPARING POLITICAL COMMUNICATION

METATHEMES OF COMPARATIVE POLITICAL COMMUNICATION

RESEARCH: AMERICANIZATION, GLOBALIZATION,
AND MODERNIZATION

The idea of a convergence of media systems and of a homogenization of media contents has established itself at a relatively early stage as a process of “Americanization” in the literature. As Daniel Hallin and Paolo Mancini (Chapter 2, this volume) write, “in terms of the kinds of media structures and practices that are emerging and the direction of change in the relation of media to other social institutions, it is reasonable to say that homogenization is to a significant degree a convergence of world media toward forms that first evolved in the United States.” Americanization accordingly comprises a targeted, uni-linear diffusion of political communication practices from the United States to other countries. Central parameters of behavioral logic converge with those of the corresponding actors in the United States, irrespective of institutional restrictions. The source of innovation is without doubt the United States, the adoption pattern is an imitation of communication practices that are prevalent there. This view, however, remains for the most part superficial, as it refers only to symptoms and practical patterns of political communication, whereas the institutions of the political system or the organizations and roles of media and political actors are neglected.

Daniel Hallin and Paolo Mancini therefore suggest that the changes in political communication are assigned to the broader and more complex concept of “globalization.” This perception implies a reciprocal, free, even conflicting exchange of values, norms, and practices between cultures. The far-reaching integration of modern means of communication facilitates that actors in one country orient themselves to the practices of other countries – including those of the United States – and adopt their strategies. In so doing, however, there is no hierarchical subordination/superiority, as implied by the term *Americanization*. The perspective of globalization points to mutual interaction or transaction processes of communication stemming from various sources. Many of the structures and behavior patterns that characterize an increasingly homogenous global communication system were in fact first of all observed in the United States. “Where European countries have borrowed American innovations, they have done so for reasons rooted in their own economic and political processes, often modifying them in significant ways” (Chapter 2, this volume).

A decisive shift in perspective regarding the changes in political communication was to attribute these to endogenous causes in the respective