

Володимир Кулик, *Дискурс українських медій: ідентичності, ідеології, владні стосунки* [Volodymyr Kulyk, *The Ukrainian Media Discourse: Identities, Ideologies, Power Relations*], Київ: Критика, 2010, pp. 656.
ISBN 978-966-8978-39-5

Keywords: Ukraine; media; discourse; national identity; post-Soviet transformation.

Дискурс українських медій: ідентичності, ідеології, владні стосунки [The Ukrainian Media Discourse: Identities, Ideologies, Power Relations] by Volodymyr Kulyk,¹ recently published by the Ukrainian Krytyka Publishing House is an important study of post-Communist media and society in Ukraine. It is a pioneering work that addresses a number of issues which so far have got very little attention in academic research. One of it is the condition of mass media in post-communist Ukraine as well as the changes the media have (or have not) undergone since the Soviet times—the times when their prescribed role was the propaganda mouthpiece of the Communist Party. Another is the issue of cultural change in post-communist Ukraine, i.e. the change of shared values, ideas, beliefs, attitudes and in particular collective identities. The author also analyses the discourse of contemporary Ukrainian media and shows how, at times, it becomes a battleground for different ideologies but equally often is used for the maintenance of habitual worldviews, inherited from Soviet past.

This volume of more than 650 pages has been published with the assistance of Harvard Ukrainian Research Institute. It consists of nine chapters of which the first two (Chapter 1–2) are devoted to the discussion of theoretical and methodological issues. The next two (Chapters 3–4) discuss the condition of contemporary Ukrainian media as well as general characteristics of Ukrainian media discourse along with the leading ideologies mediated by it. The following four (Chapters 5–8) present the results of four case studies of selected media practices important from the point of view of identity formation in Ukraine. The case studies—an undoubted merit of this book—are devoted to news coverage of elections based on the Parliamentary election campaign of 2002 (Chapter 5); the coverage of Ukrainian census of population in 2001

¹ Volodymyr Kulyk is Senior Research Fellow at the Institute of Political and Ethnic Studies, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine. He is the author of several books and a number of articles (in Ukrainian, English, Russian and Polish) on contemporary Ukrainian nationalism, language policy, national identity and media discourse.

(Chapter 6); the representation of the “language issue”² by the media (Chapter 7); and the critical media campaign against the introduction of new Ukrainian language spelling in 2000–2001 (Chapter 8). As one can notice, all the case studies are related to the events of early 2000s, the time of Leonid Kuchma’s presidency, preceding the Orange Revolution of 2004. However, this doesn’t make the book dated. In the last chapter (Chapter 9) the author considers similarities and differences between the media discourses before and after the Orange Revolution and substantiates the thesis that the basic characteristics of the media discourse have not fundamentally changed after 2004. Hence its ideological effects, including its impact on national identity formation have remained invariable.³

The first chapters introduce the reader to discourse analysis theory and methodology.⁴ Therefore, a significant part of his book is devoted to the introduction of the Ukrainian reader to the theoretical-methodological perspective of discourse analysis and its application for the study of mass communications. It is notable that the introduction is written in a remarkably clear and comprehensive manner and therefore may serve as a guide for the newcomers to the field of discourse analysis in Ukraine.⁵

Kulyk is guided mainly by the perspective of Critical Discourse Analysis and focuses on the relationships between discourse and power, discourse and common sense knowledge, discourse and social identities. At the same time, he passes over a number of other approaches to discourse analysis such as, for example, Conversation analysis, Discourse Pragmatics, or Analysis of Institutional Discourse. However, even though the author notes in Chapter 1, entitled “The Discourse,” that he concentrates mainly on the aspects of discourse analysis important from the point of view of his own research purposes (p. 58)—readers unfamiliar with the discipline can mistakenly take this chapter as an introduction to the whole discourse analysis discipline.

Similar deficiencies can be spotted in the next theoretical chapter devoted to the media theory and the methods of analysis of media discourse. For example, in the part on media effects Kulyk considers the concept of *framing* exclusively in terms of cognitive effects and ignores the studies in frame analysis addressing other than cognitive effects of framing, such as affective/attitudinal (see, for ex., Cobb & Kuklinski 1997; McLeod, Detenber 1999) and behavioural (Shah et al. 1996; Valentino et al. 2001). This is reasonable from the point of view of the author’s main interest in the media influence on people’s shared knowledge and pictures of the world. However,

² In Ukraine—which has a large Russian ethnic population (17,3%) and where large number of ethnic Ukrainians (mostly in the East and South of the country) also routinely speak Russian—the language issue is a perennial topic of the politics.

³ This is even more true for the current situation in Ukraine where after Victor Yanukovich succeeded Victor Yushchenko as President in February 2010 we are witnessing the return of Kuchma-like practices of state control over the media conditioning the extension of corresponding discourse practices.

⁴ Both theory and practice of discourse analysis are so far little known in Ukrainian humanities and social science. Kulyk is the first to initiate a consequent and systematic discussion of the concept of discourse and its use for the study of the media and society in Ukraine.

⁵ In comp Poland the situation is more advanced as the perspective of discourse analysis attracted the attention of scholars already in the second half of the 1990s (see, for ex., Duszak (1998); Czyżewski, Kowalski & Piotrowski (1997), Trutkowski (2000), Horolets (2007)).

even though for readers familiar with the theory of media effects this narrowing of the perspective is understandable, it can be misleading for a newcomer.

Chapter 2 entitled “Media and Media Discourse” fulfils two significant tasks. First, it introduces the reader with the theory of media and mass communication studies with the focus on the institution of the media, its relationships with the state and society as well as the effects of the media on society, especially on shared ideologies⁶ and identities.

Second, it presents and substantiates the media discourse analysis methodology applied in the study. It is necessary to remind the reader here that there is no single and unified method of discourse analysis. One can rather speak about a collection of analytical instruments and research techniques which can be used by each researcher to design their own research “toolkit” corresponding best to their research purposes.

Kulyk takes Fairclough’s guidelines for the analysis of media discourse (Fairclough 1995) as his starting point but supplements it with other methods and techniques, in particular, those applied in frame analysis. The author pays special attention to the so-called presuppositions, i.e. the knowledge that is assumed by speakers to be commonsense and accepted by their audiences without challenge. These shared pictures of the world are not as a rule overtly mentioned and clearly articulated but rather implied by media texts. According to Kulyk, these non-articulated assumptions play an important role in imposing ideologies and identities on their audiences. Therefore much of his study of media discourse is devoted to the disclosure of these assumptions and the description of the way they are thrust on readers/viewers.

The author does not jump to conclusions with regard to the influence of the Ukrainian media discourse on shaping of national identities exclusively on the basis of the analysis of the media discourse. He reasonably notes that his “disclosure of assumptions” is “itself an assumption” (p. 79). Therefore, he augments the analysis of selected media texts and recurring discursive practices with the study of important elements of the context of media production and consumption in Ukraine. Kulyk, in particular, provides an overview of the economic situation of Ukrainian media (chapter 3). He also analyses the political and legal dimensions of media practices—the level of freedom of speech, political pressure and legal constraints on the media, political engagement of media owners and its influence on editorial offices’ performance, the language policy of the Ukrainian state (*ibid.*).

Besides, the author pays special attention to the process of news production in Ukraine and the way professional ideologies and routine practices of media making impact media texts. For this purpose he uses different research data including his interviews with chief editors and top-managers of news outlets and the reports and publications of Ukrainian media-supporting organisations.

Close attention paid to the methodology of research is a certain advantage of this study. Following Johnston (2002), Kulyk suggests that success of a study in the framework of discourse analysis, to a large extent, depends on the clear spelling

⁶ Kulik uses the term „ideology” in a broader and neutral sense of representations or systems of representations shared by the members of social groups and rooted in social life (p. 39).

out of the methodology, since methodology saves the researcher from premature theorising (p. 62). He applies this principle for his own research by consequently and transparently expounding the tools. The author also reflects on his methodological choices in the important points of his analysis of media discourse such as the selection of discourse samples, enhancement of the corpus of samples with supplementary data or choice of contexts for the selected texts.

The diversity of methods used in the study also deserves attention. Kulyk looks for appropriate research tools in different approaches to media and discourse analysis and integrates them in a workable research instrument. He also combines qualitative methods typical for discourse analysis with quantitative procedures of content analysis. This makes possible the generalisability of the conclusions made on the basis of analysis of text samples from selected media outlets for a wider range of objects.

Methodological part of the study rises, however, some critical remarks. The first one concerns the formulation of the general purpose of the study. On one hand, Kulyk emphasises many times that he intends to find out a possible impact of media discourses on formation of national identities, or, in other words, to trace back how identity formation is realised by means of media discourse (see parts 2.4–2.5). On the other, on p. 149 he claims that he aims “primarily to show the influence of the authors’ ideas on their texts and not to evaluate the impact of the texts on the recipients’ perception.” For somebody already familiar with the discourse analysis approach these two purposes would seem not contradictory but complementary, as a researcher moving within this perspective as a rule seeks to investigate not unilateral, but bilateral and multidirectional relationships between texts, their producers, consumers and personages. And this is literally what Kulyk says in the introduction to the book: “I aim to depict how the use of the language reflects and simultaneously shapes the identities of speakers, listeners and individuals or groups being discussed, their relationships with each other and with individual and collective pictures of the world.” However, for the readers who are only getting acquainted with discourse analysis the statements quoted above would be clearly inconsistent and therefore would bring vagueness into the methodological framework of the study.

Another issue that deserves some criticism is the research tools used for the analysis of news framing. According to Kulyk, one of the most common frames in Ukrainian news is the so-called “appropriate measures of the authorities” frame. Kulyk claims that this frame is commonly used to cover the actions of power-holders. Its characteristic feature can be defined as “the lack of any elements of problematisation of the presented actions or statements” (p. 258). This definition, which de-facto presents one of the study research tools, is not clear enough to test its applicability for other investigations. It teaches that in order to find the “appropriate measures of the authorities” frame in a text one should check whether the conduct of the authorities is presented in an unproblematized way. However, Ukrainian media produce quite a few texts which do have the elements of critique of politicians and their doings but nevertheless present them without real problematisation and debate. It occurs when the media transmit the critique of one politician holding the office by another. For example, during the presidency of Victor Yushchenko, he and Prime Minister

Tymoshenko often publicly criticised each other and this critique was transmitted by the media as a rule without any explanation, experts' opinions or background information. In our opinion, more "workable" means for detection of uncritical and unproblematized coverage of political issues could be an already existing instrument proposed by Shanto Iyengar (1991) and elaborated by Semetko, Valkenburg (2000). Iyengar offered to check whether the media present actions of power holders via the perspective of attribution of responsibility, which helps audiences see the link between governmental actions (or inactions) and social problems. Attribution of responsibility frame, when applied in news coverage, helps the readers answer the questions: "Who is advocating what?" "Who is responsible for a decision taken or the implementation of a policy?" (de Vreese 2003). Mere accusations by one politician of another do not bring answers to these questions without proper editorial or expert commentary, investigation and background information. As the experience of several researchers applying the tools designed by Iyengar (see, for ex., Semetko and Valkenburg 2000; de Vreese 2003) shows, the lack of news framing in terms of attribution of responsibility is a reliable indicator of superficial and uncritical character of the news.

However elaborate and significant the theoretical-methodological part of the book is, its main value lies in the chapters focusing on the discourse of contemporary Ukrainian media (Chapters 3–9). This part provides broad and diverse information on today's Ukrainian media, which goes far beyond the immediate purposes of the study. This is understandable since Ukrainian media are extensively under-researched, which is especially true for the period after the Communist breakdown in 1989. Scarce academic publications (Костенко, Иванов 2005; Квіт, 2008; Dyczok, 2003, 2005a, 2005b, 2006; Riabchuk 2001; Krasnoboka, Semetko 2006; Nikolayenko 2004; Belyakov 2009; Khabyuk 2009) are insufficient to cover all the variety of aspects of post-communist media transformation in Ukraine. Therefore it is not surprising that Kulyk devotes much attention to the general data on Ukrainian media and the contexts of their performance not only in the prologue to the empirical part (Chapter 3 "Media in Contemporary Ukraine") but also throughout the four chapters presenting the findings of his study (Chapters 4–8). These data encompass the issues related to media production and consumption, relations between media and politics from early 1990s till the end of the "Orange team" leader, Victor Yushchenko's presidency, journalism professionalism and professional standards, legal constraints for media independence and many others.

Chapter 4 introduces the results of content analysis and frame analysis of relatively large corpus of media texts from several broadcasting and printed media. The author presents the thematic and genre structure of Ukrainian media discourse, describes the distribution of media attention between various topics (politics, economy, culture, etc.), different countries, and social groups (politicians, non-political elites, average people). He demonstrates that the overwhelming majority of contemporary Ukrainian media are of entertaining and tabloid character. The prime time of Ukrainian national TV channels is dominated by series and soap operas focusing on people's private lives and professional activities (mostly of militia and military men) and are either

produced in Russia or grounded in Russian realities.⁷ At the same time, the content of news deals very little with public and political activity of average citizens but rather concentrates on political events driven by the elites (predominantly political ones, but not scientific or cultural). International news programmes are usually devoted to Western countries, whereas Russia and especially other neighbouring countries, such as Poland, Belarus, Slovakia, Moldova, get lesser attention.⁸

The author explains these regularities by some market and political factors as well as by editorial choices. Some of these conclusions deserve more discussion. For example, Kulyk claims that Russia receives little attention in the news in comparison with its extensive representation in entertainment blocks and celebrity chronicles because media editors do not regard Russia as a news priority (p. 249). However, due to still intensive economic relationships, broad labour migration of Ukrainians to Russia and finally personal and family links between many Ukrainians and Russians, a lot of decisions taken in Moscow, including Russia's policy of energy blackmail or migration regulations, have perceptible outcomes for Ukrainian citizens or their relatives. Consequently, these decisions could have been interesting for Ukrainian audience if professionally analysed and presented through the framework of the interests of Ukrainian people. Do Ukrainian media have international reporters and commentators professional enough to make good news about Russia? What role in silencing controversial Russian policy regarding Ukraine is played by the interests of major Ukrainian media owners, whose financial-industrial fortunes are connected with Russia? These and similar questions are the subject for further research.

Chapters 5–8 of the book concentrate on the issue of national identity formation in Ukraine and the interplay between the ideas on identity carried by different social, political and professional groups (including media makers) and discourses of broadcast and printed media. The choice of national identity as a central subject matter of this research is not accidental, if we take into account the relatively recent collapse of the Soviet Union and the necessity of newly formed states to integrate their citizens around some consolidating ideas. One of the important conclusions made by the author in this book is that “although a string of press and broadcast media practices, especially in the news production, consolidates the dominant role of the national identity attached to Ukraine as the corresponding political entity and community, in many other [media practices] this country/community is presented as inseparably bounded with Russia or even belonging to it” (p. 315).

Chapter 5 entitled “Creating Identities, Labeling the Events: Elections” presents the first of the case studies. Here Volodymyr Kulyk analyzed thoroughly the media discourse of parliamentary election campaign of 2002. For this analysis, the author has chosen two popular Ukrainian dailies: The Facts and Commentaries (*Fakty i Komentari*) and The Young Ukraine (*Ukrayina moloda*). The Facts and Commentaries represented the block of political parties For United Ukraine (*Za yedynu Ukrayinu*)

⁷ Many of Russian soap operas are produced in Ukraine because of lower costs of production

⁸ As for Russia, this is true only for the news about politics. In cultural news and in the materials of entertaining character Russia prevails over other foreign countries, and sometimes also over Ukraine (see Kulik 2010: 294).

united around the then President Leonid Kuchma, and The Young Ukraine canvassed for the opposition party Our Ukraine (Nasha Ukrayina) led by Victor Yushchenko.

The two newspapers represent, according to Kulyk, two opposite discourses of the Ukrainian media, both deeply influencing identity formation in the country, especially during electoral campaigns. The former newspaper, The Facts and Commentaries, represents the *centrist*⁹ discourse. It presents itself as an embodiment of the common sense of Ukrainian people attached to allegedly universal values of stability and welfare and keeping away from “radical” and “divisive” ideas characteristic of, primarily, “nationalists” and “communists.” This discourse—dominating the Ukrainian public debate in early 2000s because of the extensive state control over the media—presented elections as an ordinary and unremarkable event aimed at “keeping civic unity and stability in Ukraine.” Correspondingly, each attempt of critical assessment of the present regime was classified as an intention to “split the society and stir up enmity.” A characteristic feature of the centrist discourse is that it treats the Ukrainian present (the independent Ukrainian state), and its past, when Ukraine was part of the Soviet Union, as periods equally “normal;” in addition, this discourse never draws a border between the contemporary Ukrainian identity and the Russian (and post-Soviet) one.

Opposite to it, the *national democratic* discourse is built on the confrontation between the Soviet and the non-Soviet and decidedly separates the Ukrainian identity from the post-soviet identity. The 2002 Parliamentary elections were depicted by the national-democratic newspaper The Young Ukraine as a turning point in the future development of the country as well as an opportunity for the Ukrainian people to free themselves from the anti-Ukrainian power. Incumbent president and his political fellows were criticized for their inability to make Ukraine wealthy and respected in the world, and for allowing Russia to openly meddle with Ukrainian politics.

Kulyk’s vision of the two opposite media discourses in Ukraine (which corresponds to the thesis about “Two Ukraines”—the Ukrainophone West vs. the Russophone East)¹⁰ has—in our opinion—some limitations. Possibly it would be more interesting to look at the media discourse in the light of the idea of “several Ukraines” which would take into consideration regional diversity in Ukraine and the fact that the divisions between the “pro-Russian” and “pro-Western,” or “Ukrainian national” and “post-Soviet” are often not clear-cut in the media.

In Chapter 6 entitled “Power/Knowledge/Language: the Population Census” the author traces the formation of *knowledge*¹¹ about the society, the power and the assumptions about “normality” in Ukraine on the basis of news coverage of the population census in 2001.¹²

⁹ Kulyk explains that the term *centrist* does not mean that the politicians creating this discourse indeed represent the political forces situated in between the right and the left and guided by some set of principles, but that they define themselves as a generally accepted alternative to the extreme views.

¹⁰ This thesis was introduced in the publicist discourse by Mykola Riabchuk, whose main opponent is Yaroslav Hrytsak, the author of the thesis about “several Ukraines”.

¹¹ Kulyk uses the term *knowledge* here in the Foucaultian sense, making accent on the inseparable link that connects “the deployment of force and the establishment of truth” (Foucault 1977).

¹² V. Kulyk chose texts from 15 newspapers (national and regional), news reports from two popular channels: “1+1” and “Inter” and two internet-based news outlets.

Summing up empirical data, he concludes that the Ukrainian media covered the census in a non-problematizing manner, presenting it as a normal procedure designed and realized by the authorities in an “appropriate way” and producing objective knowledge on the society. As a consequence, the media discourse “confirmed and strengthened the dominant representations about the significance of the census, its categories as well as the social reality reflected in its results” and proposed to consider this reality, “in accordance with the authorities’ position, as the adequate or normal” (p. 407).

The press and television did not doubt the expediency of the census questionnaire questions even though they essentially coincided with the questions of Soviet census of 1989 and consequently corresponded to the Soviet state way of thinking about national identity, nation-building and language policy. Also there were no special discussions about the results of the census. As a rule, media spoke about the census results as on objective reality. The statistics about a substantial decrease of the number of Russians in Ukraine and an increase of Ukrainians were perceived as a reflection of the existing state of affairs and not as a possible consequence of the change of attitude to the Ukrainian ethnic group that became a dominant ethnic group after Ukraine’s independence in 1991.

Such a non-critical view could be explained, according to Kulyk, by the lack of professionalism among the journalists. In the tabloid press, a decrease of population in the country from 52 to 48 million was described as catastrophic event (p. 396), without any special reflections on why this happened.

Taking seriously population census problem—in Kulyk’s interpretation—is an opportunity for redefinition of Ukrainians; it stimulates searching of new thinking about society, state structure as well as the ethnic minorities problems. Author argues that Ukrainian media to a large extent wasted this opportunity. (For example, in order to interpret the changes in ethnic structure of the Ukrainian population the media used the habitual opposition of “us-them” and the rhetoric of othering).

He believes that the census was a missed chance for the power to legitimize its ukrainization course. Kuchma—and his fellow politicians—in Kulyk’s mind refrained from doing this in order to conceal the inconsequence and ambiguity of their nation-building politics and to avoid the problematization and questioning of their politics.

It is difficult to agree with the author’s statement that the authorities ignored the census results showing a decrease of Ukrainian population. This topic has started to appear in Ukrainian political discourse in 2002. The results of the census were used by various political parties to advertise their actions supposed to improve the demographic situation in Ukraine, through e.g. the introduction of child birth allowances in 2005 and other measures to encourage Ukrainians to have more children.

In the Chapter 7 entitled “The Normalization of Ambivalence, Ignored Diversity: Language and Language Use” Kulyk explores a wide array of media texts devoted to the use of languages in Ukraine and, in particular, to the choice between the Ukrainian and Russian languages. He claims that the coverage of language issues in the Ukrainian media is dominated by the centrist discourse, which marginalizes and simultaneously absorbs Ukrainophone and Russophone discourses.

If for the latter two discourses the exclusive object of identification and defense is the Ukrainian or the Russian languages correspondingly, the centrist ideology tries to combine the support for the Ukrainian language (as a symbol of the state) with the claim that the Russian language should be preserved as a everyday life way of communication. The core characteristic of the centrist position on the language use in Ukraine is its essential ambivalence towards the choice between the Ukrainian and the Russian languages: the centrist media present the Ukrainian language as the matter of public concern and the main language in the society, but simultaneously assume that it is normal to also (or even primarily) use the Russian language.

The thesis about the *ambivalence* of Ukrainian media (and public) discourse is one of the leading themes of this book. Kulyk claims that the media discourse in Ukraine ambivalently combines the ideologies which contribute “to conservation of Soviet continuity and post-Soviet unity” with those which support the national independence (p. 10). The ambivalence in the discourse on language problems as well as the ideas about language use in Ukraine have, from his point of view, both positive and negative consequences.

The main positive consequences are, first, normalization of the use of Ukrainian language by making it appropriate and usual to speak Ukrainian, also in the areas where before 1989 the only acceptable and normal language was Russian. The second positive effect is the lack of complete ukrainization (or russification) of public sphere which could result in the language divide of the Ukrainian nation and even in the disintegration of the country (p. 491). The major negative effect of the ambivalence in the ideas about language use is the fact that the Ukrainian authorities wasted the opportunity—opened by the collapse of Soviet empire—to stimulate the spread of Ukrainian language (and the corresponding development of the national culture) and make it an important resource for post-communist emancipation. The acceptance of practically unlimited presence of the Russian language in the Ukrainian public discourse as a normal state of affairs has furthered the conservation of Soviet culture or/and adoption of new Russian culture in Ukrainian society. Both of these cultures reflect ideologies which question the existence of Ukraine outside the bounds of the empire and consequently contribute to disorientation and anomy among Ukrainians.

In Chapter 8 entitled “The Creation of Abnormality: the Planned Spelling Reform” the author analyses the case of critical media coverage of the Ukrainian language spelling reform project (hereafter the spelling reform) in 2000–2001. If the previous case studies dealt with so-called discourse practices of “the establishing of normality”—whose aim was to make audiences perceive some events, behaviors or choices as usual and normal—this chapter demonstrates how the media create abnormality. The author traces how the media deployed a campaign against the spelling reform project that moved the Ukrainian language away from the Russian language. Almost in all media, including both national-democratic and centrist ones, the introduction of new spelling was shown as a rather negative phenomenon in the social and political life of the country. What is more, the media discourse on the spelling reform was “purposeful discreditation and demonization, and panic-mongering” (p. 541).

Kulyk shows that critical media campaign was conducted at a disproportionately large scale and over an extensive period, which makes him assume that it could have been conditioned by the political influence on the media. He supposes that the campaign around the new spelling had to draw the society's attention away from what is known as the "tape scandal"¹³ as well as undermine the authority of Victor Yushchenko,¹⁴ who was one of the project's supporters.

Kulyk argues, however, that the media resistance towards the reform should be explained primarily by the attitudes and beliefs of journalists, politicians, and media audiences who supported the habitual variant of Ukrainian identity produced in the Soviet Union rather than its transformation in compliance with the principles of national-democratic movement of late 1980s–early 1990s. (The introduction of the "Diaspora spelling" frightened them and made them strongly object to its introduction).

The final remarks (Chapter 9) supplements the monograph with the comparison of the Ukrainian media discourses before and after the Orange Revolution (the periods of Leonid Kuchma's and Victor Yushchenko's presidencies, correspondingly).¹⁵ Kulyk concludes that the weakening of the state pressure on the media after the Orange Revolution resulted in the shrinking of the centrist discourse with its ambivalent combination of Ukrainian and Eastern Slavonic (Russian); Soviet and non-Soviet; or Ukrainophone and Russophone elements. The national politics of Yushchenko himself, aimed at strengthening the role of the Ukrainian language and culture, on one hand, and the intensive opposition towards this policy on the side of the "anti-Orange" forces, consolidated around the Party of Regions, on the other, stimulated some mainstream media to take a clearer position towards the language issue as well as the matters of the country's culture and history.

However, the rest of the media, especially the leading broadcast media, still prefer to blend the components of different ideologies to satisfy the demands of various social groups and attract the largest audience possible. As a result, the Ukrainian media discourse continues to accept ideological ambivalence in the issues principally important for social identity formation: national and political.

*

The Kulyk's book is—in our opinion—both inspiring and informative. It highlights how the media discourses not only reflect new and old social identities of the Ukrainians but also shape them.

¹³ The political scandal that started after Melnychenko, major of Security Service of Ukraine had made public the taped conversations of high-level officials of the country. These conversations were about the use of undemocratic norms in governing the state, and brought some evidence of the participation of high-level officials in the murder of Hryhoriy Gongadze.

¹⁴ At the time of the anti-reform media campaign he was the prime minister of Ukraine. His economic politics affected the interests of close to Kuchma oligarchs, and this has led finally to resignation of his cabinet in 2001.

¹⁵ Additional comments on the changes in Ukrainian media discourse after 2004 are made also in the end of Chapter 7, pp. 493–497.

It also offers reach and differentiated empirical data not only useful for audience interested in post-communist changes in Ukrainian mass-media but in post-communist Ukrainian social transformation in domestic and regional context.

Generally speaking, it is extremely worthy Ukrainian contribution to mass-media studies.

References

- Belyakov, Alexander. 2009. "The Influence of 'Censorship by Money' on Freedom of Speech in Ukraine," *Critique*, 37: 601—617.
- Cobb, Michael D. & Kuklinski, James H. 1997. "Changing Minds: Political Arguments and Political Persuasion." *American Journal of Political Science*, 41: 88—121.
- Czyżewski, Marek, Kowalski, Sergiusz & Piotrowski, Andrzej. 1997. *Rytuałny Chaos. Studium dyskursu publicznego* [Ritual Chaos. Study of Public Discourse]. Kraków: Aureus.
- de Vreese, Claus. 2003. Communicating Europe. Policy Brief in the "Next Generation Democracy" Series, Retrieved from: <http://fpc.org.uk/fsblob/89.pdf>
- Duszał, Anna. 1998. *Tekst, dyskurs, komunikacja międzykulturowa* [Text, Discourse], Warszawa: PWN.
- Duszał, Anna, Fairclough, Norman (eds.). 2008. *Krytyczna analiza dyskursu: interdyscyplinarne podejście do komunikacji społecznej* [Critical Discourse Analysis]. Kraków: Towarzystwo Autorów i Wydawców Prac Naukowych "Universitas".
- Dyczok, Marta. 2003. "Ukraine's Media Landscape," in: Wsevolod W. Isajiw (ed.), *Society in Transition: Social Change in Ukraine in Western Perspectives*. Toronto: Canadian Scholar's Press.
- Dyczok, Marta. 2005a. "The Politics of Media in Ukraine: Election 2002," in: N. Hayoz, A. N. Lushnycky, (eds.), *Ukraine at a Crossroads*, Bern: Peter Lang.
- Dyczok, Marta. 2005b. "Breaking Through an Information Blockade: Election and Revolution in Ukraine 2004," *Canadian Slavonic Papers XLVII* (3—4): 241—264.
- Dyczok, Marta. 2006. "Was Kuchma's censorship effective? Mass media in Ukraine before 2004." *Europe-Asia Studies*, 58: 213—238.
- Fairclough, Norman. 1995. *Media Discourse*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Foucault, Michel. 1977. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. New York: Pantheon.
- Horollets, Anna. 2007. *Obrazy Europy w polskim dyskursie publicznym* [Images of Europe in Polish Public Discourse]. Kraków: Universitas.
- Iyengar, Shanto. 1991. *Is Anyone Responsible? How Television Frames Political Issues*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Khabyuk, Olexiy. 2009. "Public Service Broadcasting in Ukraine: To Be or Not to Be?" in: B. Dobek-Ostrowska, M. Glowacki, K. Jakubowicz, & M. Sukosd (eds.), *Comparative Media Systems: European and Global Perspectives*. Budapest: Central European University Press.
- Krasnoboka, Natalya & Semetko, Holli A. 2006. "Murder, Journalism and the Web: How the Gongadze Case Launched the Internet Era in Ukraine," in: S. Oates, D. Owen, & R. Gibson (Eds.), *The Internet and Politics: Citizens, Voters and Activists*. New York: Routledge.
- McLeod, Douglas, Detenber, Benjamin. 1999. "Framing effects of television news coverage of social protest." *Journal of Communication*, 49(3): 3—23.
- Nikolayenko, Olena. 2004. "Press Freedom during the 1994 and 1999 Presidential Elections in Ukraine: A Reverse Wave?" *Europe-Asia Studies*, 56: 661—686.
- Riabchuk, Mikola. 2001. "A Perilous Way to Freedom: The Independent Mass Media in the Blackmail State." *Journal of Ukrainian Studies*, 26: 93—133.
- Semetko, Holli A., & Valkenburg, Patti M. 2000. "Framing European politics. A content analysis of press and television news." *Journal of Communication*, 14: 459—479.
- Shah, Dhavan, Domke, David, Wackman, Daniel B. 1996. "'To Thin Own Self Be True.' Values, framing and voter decision-making strategies." *Communication Research*, 23: 509—560.
- Trutkowski, Cezary. 2000. *Spoleczne Reprezentacje Polityki* [Social Representation of Politics]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar.
- Valentino, Nickolas A., Beckmann, Matthew N., Buh, Tami A. 2001. "A Spiral of Cynicism for Some: The Contingent Effects of Campaign News Frames on Participation and Confidence in Government." *Political Communication*, 18: 347—367.

- Квіт, Сергій. 2008. *Медіареформа: подолання тоталітаризму* [Media Reform: Totalitarianism Overcoming], in: С. Квіт, *Масові комунікації*. Київ: Видавничий дім «Києво-Могилянська Академія».
- Костенко, Наталія, Іванов, Валерій. 2005. *Новини vs новини: Виборча кампанія в новинних телепрограмах* [News vs news: electoral campaign in TV news programs]. Київ: Центр Вільної Преси.

Natalya Ryabinska
Chair of Sociology, *Józef Majka* College of Social Science
Member of European Studies Unit, Institute of
Philosophy and Sociology, Polish Academy of Sciences
E-mail: nryabins@ifispan.waw.pl

Olga Popovych
Graduate School for Social Studies at the Institute of
Philosophy and Sociology, Polish Academy of Sciences
E-mail: ol80ga@yahoo.com