Book reviews
This new book by Karol Jakubowicz is a multi-layered study dedicated to the state of modern democracy and the role of media in democratic processes taking place in the digital era. The author at the beginning of the analysis of these two big issues takes the leader one by one through a map of terms and definitions of democracy, forming democracy in modern times and the influence of media and new communication technologies on its formation. The author was inspired by many works about the modern crisis of democracy, from Alvin Toffler and John Naisbitt, Peter Dahlgren, Jurgen Habermas to Ulrich Beck. In particular, a special meaning is given to the opinions of James Carey, an American media expert, equating democracy and media in the context of the subject being analyzed. Jakubowicz agreed with his view that “journalism and democracy are two names for the same thing,” and “where there is no journalism, there is no democracy” (p. 11).

The author dedicates two chapters out of seven to ideological and political frames of democracy in the modern and globalized world, but at the same time divided world (chapter three), and the reasons for the crisis of democracy (chapter two). The remaining five chapters include an originally and deeply thought analysis of relations between democracy and media.

The author commences his considerations from the review of the existing conceptions of the relations between media and democracy, the role of media in democratic political systems (media as a watchdog of authority, an “alarm clock,” media of conflict and social consensus, citizen journalism), and ends them with a question about the possibility to introduce the currently direct communication democracy. The author expresses a view that changing social and technological conditions invalidate a lot of traditional conceptions of the role of media in a democracy, especially because the modern crisis of democracy “puts a question mark over all of them” (p. 27). Also the financial crisis of media, in particular observed in the printed press, transferring a part of the public debate to the internet, creates a situation where traditional media have a lesser possibility to influence the public agenda, to control the dialogue between politics and citizens or to have an educational role. After many scandals involving media (f.e. the British tabloid News of the World phone hacking scandal), it is much harder to play the role of “the watchdog of democracy” when one is seen as more of a “hunting dog,” tabloidized and full of contempt for authority. The construction of a “digital union” or a “net union” with which we deal with in the internet era, in his opinion, does not necessarily need to lead to direct democracy. Mass media which would be replaced by “media of the masses” that could materialize it is barely a scenario, more likely to exist in the technological sense than in the social one. In the post-democratic era when although all democratic institutions still function, the demos
is weakening under the pressure of huge economic strengths (p. 61). There are changes in many dimensions of modern democratic societies, not always in a positive sense for the democratic condition.

The third chapter is dedicated to the results of globalization and the various effects of international integration and the growing popularity of nationalism, populism and ethnic tensions as resistance against globalization. In the author’s opinion, nationalism can be a reaction to globalization and integration processes, and populism is an answer to “all the other” (p. 86). Globalization is a process internally contradictory due to the fact that the resistance that it causes introduces a “new worldwide disarray” (p. 86) or — as John Keane would like it — the “New Middle Ages” (p. 91). The author also cites the opinion of Zygmunt Bauman that globalization is accompanied by the appearance of fundamentalism, polarization and a neo-tribal reactions. In a globalized, neoliberal, post democratic world in which it is the market that controls a state and not the state controls the market, a politically-ideological decomposition takes place within the frames of democracy (p. 95). The role of transnational organizations such as the World Bank or the International Monetary Fund increases, and the role of the state weakens, ethnicity and nationalism are revitalized, and the eruption of populism particularly dangerous for democracy takes place. The latter tends to be deemed as the “dangerous mutation of democracy,” as I. Krastev said (p. 113), or as the “shadow thrown on democracy” because it accuses democratic procedures for failures. As a result, as is observed even within the old democracies, support for authoritarian solutions is growing.

Chapter four and five of the book are a detailed study devoted to the crisis of the role of media in a democracy and such important issues like tabloidization and commodification of media, and mediocracy. In particular tabloidization and commodification of media that erases the differences between journalists’ materials and goods or between information and entertainment, transform journalism into “the art of efficient product sales” (p. 125). Therefore, their ability to play an important media role in democracies is reduced. Tabloidized information (sensations, personalized, emotional, trivializing), displacing “hard,” serious news, weakens the quality of journalism. Also, the way politics in media looks when presented most often in categories of conflict, aggravates the display of the crisis of democracy. The author makes a review of the attempts to democratize media which means for him taking down the barriers between the medium/communicator and its recipients and the one direction communication of content for the benefit of dialogue and conversation. An element of this process must also be the democratization of media organizations themselves and (...) allowing recipients to have influence on their manner of functioning” (p. 150). Jakubowicz thinks, however, that the expectations of mass participation in forms of meditated communication are unrealistic which does not mean that the new media are without influence on the models of communication. Movements for the democratization of media, which started in western democracies in the middle of the past century, coming from the contestation of the mainstream media and social status quo
rejected the mentality of mass media as the means of manipulation and deformation of reality. The explosion of alternative media through “access channels” or “open channels,” created also by public media, was the possibility to create a more pluralistic media system. Such an alternative model of media, based on access and participation, the idea of locality, deinstitutionalization of communication, de-professionalization of journalism and development of horizontal communication, is developed in many western countries. At the same time, it did not entirely fulfill the hopes of supporters of democratization of the media system in the purpose of democratization of communication. In direct democracy every citizen is a unit who may actively communicate on all levels of social communication and influence mass media. Social experience and research show that most people are really not interested in communicating at a high public scale. Moreover, the active minority does not come from society’s excluded groups that were earlier on deprived of the possibility to present opinions on a public forum, but from the young and well educated people from the middle classes.

The author dedicated a large part of the book to the role of public media in a democracy and the challenges that are put before them by the changing conditions of their functioning, technologically, economically and in the political and social spheres. A wave of reluctance growing from the 1980s, together with the de-monopolization of the market caused a “crisis of their identity, and the definition of their goal and the reason for being” (p. 176). Public media are fighting for survival not only because of the growing competition in the media market but even harder before the eyes of public opinion. Nowadays, on the free market of ideas, there are no — as Zygmunt Bauman said — people to “enlighten,” there are, however, “clients to seduce” (p. 180). In his situation the mission of public media — in the author’s opinion — should be modified whilst taking into consideration changes in society, especially the growing need of dialogue and social cohesion in polarized societies.

The transformation of media and democracy in the digital era included in the last, seventh chapter, were presented from the perspective of technological change, but without strong determinism from which the author clearly distances himself. The author conducts a critical analysis of opinions included the predictions that “future democracy will be a direct democracy and the new media are supposed to be a huge help …” (p. 198). Faith in the democratic potential of new media and digital technology reflects the career of terms such as: “teledemocracy,” “digital democracy,” “e-democracy,” “wikipolitics” or “electronic democratization” (p. 199). Such great hopes in the meaning of digital media for the development of a civil society are often formulated in literature, but what is the real situation? The author says that there are pessimists who see many obstacles and difficulties in the way to use the potential of new media for democracy. Eli Noam thinks that the internet is an outright “threat to the stability and will cause an even larger fragmentation, decrease the ability to reach a consensus, sharpen the pluralism of group interests” (p. 209). It is hard not to agree with that opinion when observing new media, their
focus on trivial contents and conflicts, disrupted perspective of viewing politics and helplessness towards threats or hate speech.

The author, just like other researchers, advises that “internet glasses” should be taken off in assessing the abilities of new media. Restraint should be shown in all cases, from the Arabic uprising to the movements of Occupy Wall Street, so willingly deemed as the “internet revolutions” (p. 219). Internet media are a technological revolution without precedence in history, but technology is only a tool for changes because “freedom cannot be won by tweeting” (p. 220). A similar anti-deterministic technological standpoint is presented by the author in many other matters by painting out skepticism towards the prompt arrival of a half-direct democracy. He deems that currently we cannot see solutions that could assure the demand to accomplish a deliberative democracy. In the author's opinion, the largest challenge of the digital era for new media will be their ability to adapt to similar tasks towards democracy that we expect from traditional media (p. 209). The book by K. Jakubowicz contains his diagnosis regarding the future on democracy and the role of the media, avoiding radical opinions and judgments. A diligent reader will find many interesting issues about the condition of democracy and media, and new roles for everyone in public communication which is created in the digital era, in which all of its participants must find themselves somehow.

Alicja Jaskiernia
UNIVERSITY OF WARSAW, POLAND


The book of Norbert Merkovity confers the area of political communication in two parts, so it concerns itself with both old and new political communication. His aim is to provide a theoretic summary to define, to extend and sometimes to control the achieved results of political communication from the last century until today and he tends to highlight the changes. He analyses the old and new era of political communication and points out the differences of these two periods. Based on Gianpietro Mazzoleni’s public dialogue model of political communication, Merkovity distinguishes the actors of political communication, therefore he examines the mentioned eras from the perspective of the political system, the media system and citizens/voters.

The book consists of twelve chapters which are divided into two parts. The first part's six chapters deal with old political communication. The first chapter starts with the definition of political communication and based on rich interpretations of international literature it describes the definition of political communication on three levels separately — space, public arena and strategy of struggle for power.
The following chapter is intended to give a brief historical overview of the praxis of political communication which has been missed by the author in Hungarian literature. According to the history of media the book presents the development of political communication divided in the pre-modern, modern and postmodern ages. According to the author we get a great thematic summary from ancient times, through the presence of the electronic media to today’s digital era. For the sake of transparency the summary can be read arranged in the table at the end of the chapter. The third chapter surveys the research history of political communication and it presents communication scientists’ studies with interesting examples.

The author — as against the vernacular — considers it necessary to contrast political communication and political marketing. This means that the next two chapters examine political communication and marketing separately but he draws the conclusion that the two disciplines are closely related to each other and one should not ignore the other. Merkovity examines political communication with the help of the above mentioned Mazzolenis’s public dialogue model and shows us how the actors of the triangle could connect to each other. After the theoretic introduction of political marketing he deals with party and electoral marketing from practical aspects. At the end of the chapter he collects the main differences and compares political communication as “room” where the aim of the actors of the political system is good communication towards the media system and citizens and political marketing as an “office” where the target is the successful sale of politics.

Closing the first part, chapter six leads us from the age of old political communication to the new era, where according to the author, the line can be determined not by the political and media system but more likely by the citizens/voters, who have new tools in their hands in the digital era.

The second part of the book examines political communication in the digital age. “Newness” appears because the online world has become the main arena for political activity so political communication is focused on this new “networked” world. The change is exemplified by the author with the analysis of five phenomena which are the following: decentralization, openness, mobilization, pro-am stratum and multipoint communication.

In the following four chapters the author examines the actors in relation to the new conditions. First he analyses the media system and shows its changes. He adjusts Bernard Cohen’s idea — the media tells us what to think about — to today’s media, nowadays come into prominence the idea of what we should think about. This chapter tells us about the concentration of the commercial aspect and partisanship. We can read about the theory of agenda setting and in this context the author confers the phenomenon of agenda melding. According to agenda melding the main question nowadays is what the consumer can do with the media, not vice versa, and this is where citizens could potentially rise up.

In the ninth chapter the author examines the age of new communication technologies from the aspect of the political system. He demonstrates this with
quantitative and comparative analysis of Hungarian and British party websites which show “how it looks like if the political system tries to fill in the role of the media system” and this effect towards citizens? Merkovity shows us the Hungarian party websites from the nineties very precisely, the readers can follow easily how the interactive and informative elements became increasingly important for parties and their websites.

After this he compares two governmental/governance paradigms, the new public management and the digital era governance whereby he presents us theories of e-democracy, deliberative democracy and e-cognocracy. Merkovity demonstrates with these theories that how citizens can interact with political systems with the help of new communication techniques.

Finally, the author deals with the largest actor of political communication, with the group of citizens/voters. Merkovity separates active and inactive networks and compares them. He uses illustrative examples to support his arguments (US presidential campaigns, Arab Spring, etc.). In the final chapter Merkovity examines the three actors again, but now he relates to the new communication technologies.

The author concludes at the end of the book that (1) the political system has new types of online contents and interaction to involve citizens in the political process. (2) Digital networks have increased the political activities of citizens, or at least, they have more opportunity to participate in the political communication processes. (3) The media have lost their monopoly over the main communication channels, its role in political communication has fallen back.

Due to the variety of its examples the book is legible and it demonstrates very well its statements with different illustrations and schedules. The aim of the author was to write a book not only for professionals. The “introduction” nature of the book is also suitable for using it in higher education, even for academics and students interested in political science or communication. In addition to this in his book Norbert Merkovity highlights the areas which have remained mostly untapped in Hungarian literature, but — in some cases — in the international research field, as well.
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“The broader achievement of WikiLeaks was to put freedom of information on the agenda, all over the world, and make whistleblowing a viable option in
the fight against criminal behavior in the public, military, and private sectors,” says Birgitta Jónsdóttir in her foreword to *Beyond WikiLeaks, Implications for the Future of Communications, Journalism and Society*, a new book dedicated to WikiLeaks and its legacy in the contemporary global media environment. A member of the Icelandic Parliament and ex-WikiLeaks staffer, her perspective is as broad as she is articulate. Her introduction emphasizes the unprecedented role of WikiLeaks as potentially the most influential player entering the media scene since the Internet established itself as an information ecosystem. The book aims to expand on this point, adding new layers of depth and contextualization to the Wikileaks saga.

*Beyond Wikileaks* features 16 chapters analyzing WikiLeaks from different perspectives within communication sciences. Attention is given to different issues touched by WikiLeaks since it began operating, such as digital rights and privacy, new challenges for professional journalism, transparency and hacktivism. The book, edited by Benedetta Brevini (University of Sydney, former City University London), Arne Hintz (Cardiff University) and Patrick McCurdy (University of Ottawa) follows a single coherent path: to give WikiLeaks the broader and most comprehensive definition three years after its major megaleaks about wars in Afghanistan and Iraq and “Cablegate” which gave the whistleblowing website international visibility. According to Yochai Benkler, author of “WikiLeaks and the Networked Fourth Estate” chapter, WikiLeaks plays a part in the new media landscape “no less than the protesters who shoot videos on the streets of Teheran, Tunis, or Cairo and upload them to the Web, or the bloggers who exposed the Rather/CBS story.” WikiLeaks, according to Benkler, “intersects with larger trends in the news industry” and presents itself as a player professional journalists have to deal with when it comes to investigative journalism. Regarding WikiLeaks’ relationship with the mainstream media, all the chapters dealing with this topic (Lisa Lynch’s and Chris Elliott’s in particular, along with Benkler’s) follow Charlie Beckett’s “Networked Journalism” framework (Beckett, 2011) and agree on one point: When it comes to journalism, WikiLeaks has pushed the dichotomy between offline and online worlds to extreme consequences, bringing them to a meeting point. According to Hopeton S. Dunn, author of “‘Something Old, Something New...’ WikiLeaks and the Collaborating Newspapers — Exploring the Limits of Conjoint Approaches to Political Explo- sures” chapter, the emergence of Web 2.0, new media and all other non-professional authors “has effectively altered the coveted gatekeeping and public agenda-setting roles usually ascribed to traditional media. At the same time, a new relationship is emerging between these Web 2.0 media platforms and their traditional media counterparts, especially print media.”

To this extent, the partnership between a hacker organization such as WikiLeaks with established media outlets such as the *New York Times*, the *Guardian* and *Der Spiegel*, among others, represents an absolute novelty becoming a new standard
for investigative journalism in this era: new, non-professional organizations and online players from different fields — hacktivist groups, ONGs and bloggers, for instance — provide professional journalists with new tools and ways of dealing with information. The impact of WikiLeaks extends far beyond journalism: it has proved, for instance, how whistleblowing itself has changed thanks to new possibilities facilitated by the Internet. A chapter of the book, “From the Pentagon Papers to Cablegate: How the Network Society Has Changed Leaking” by Patrick McCurdy puts WikiLeaks’ releases/declassifications/revelations in historical continuum with the Pentagon Papers revealed by Daniel Ellsberg in 1971. According to McCurdy, “the rise of networked society has fundamentally altered how information is generated, accessed, controlled, distributed and, ultimately, leaked.” Two of the most notable shifts from the era of Daniel Ellsberg to that of Bradley Manning can be observed in the technology involved in the process of leaking and the democratization of the process, caused by the openness of networks and access to them possible thanks to digital archives and the number of people who can actually access classified information.

According to McCurdy, “Daniel Ellsberg was a real insider … Ellsberg worked close to the seat of power on the very dossier he eventually leaked. Manning, on the other hand, was a low-level security analyst, a node in a vast industry of networked individuals authorized to access SIPRNet.” If Ellsberg had, with the help of Tony Ross, to manually photocopy thousands of pages on paper to be distributed to the New York Times and other newspapers, Manning could alone download and burn classified files on a CD-R labeled “Lady Gaga” and, with some encryption and security skills, hand them over to WikiLeaks, transforming those files into some of the biggest leaks ever.

Moreover, Beyond WikiLeaks sheds a light on other critical issues. Jillian C. York analyses WikiLeaks’ consequences on transparency, Stefania Milan and Gabriella Coleman deal with digital activism and Anonymous in the wake of WikiLeaks and Dwayne Winseck writes about the digital tracking of users and privacy on the Internet starting from personal data infringement against WikiLeaks supporters and staffers such as Birgitta Jónsdóttir and Jacob Applebaum. The book closes with a transcript of an interview with Amy Goodman (Democracy Now!), Julian Assange and Slavoj Žižek held in London in 2011 and Geert Lovink and Patrice Riemens’s famous “Twelve Theses on WikiLeaks.”

Beyond Wikileaks is one of the most exhaustive analyses of WikiLeaks thus far. Thanks to its multidisciplinary approach, the book gathers cutting-edge authors and brilliant contributions, finally exposing WikiLeaks and its implications in a unique frame reaching different interests and disciplines in communications.

Philip Di Salvo
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The book of Michał Grech refers to the current understanding of the concept of the university and its image in the Polish population. The book is an attempt to describe the way in which the image of the university is communicated in language and in the wider acts of communication, rather than in some excerpts of written texts such as articles in newspapers or TV news.

The main issues considered by Grech in his book are the cognitive categories that are useful to describe the image of the university, its internal dynamics and the external environment. What is interesting, is that the university about which we read is surprisingly different from the institutions that we know from academic life.

The usage of a cognitive perspective helps to find out what the current image of the university is, and which of its attributes are recognized by the representation of Poles. The author claims that the book does not have any particular hypothesis focus on the factor that might be verified or overthrown. Instead of that he presents a limited number of directions which help to achieve the description of the current image of the university.

The book consists of four chapters and a short ending. In the first chapter, called “History and the presence of the university” the author shows the social and historical context of the university in the world and in Poland. At first, Michał Grech focuses on the way in which the concept of the university was understood in the past from the medieval model of *studium generale* to Humbolt’s conception of the university as an institution both responsible for higher education and research. Then, he shows the most vivid problems of the contemporary universities, and especially the reform of higher education taken by the Polish Government in recent years.

The second chapter provides a solid theoretical background of the analyzed problems. In this part of the book, Grech has not omitted the most valuable theories and methodological orientations such as the general system theory, the cognitive theory of the communication or the linguistic image of the world. The reader can find references to the works of well-known Niklas Luhmann, Roland W. Langacker as well as researchers and theorists from Poland, including communication concepts of Michael Fleischer or the concept of the language representation of the world of Jerzy Bartmiński. However, there are some difficulties with the language of the narration, the second chapter makes a solid introduction to the general methodology of the research on the image of some part of the world.

The third chapter of the book focuses on the particular methodology of research on the image of the university in the Polish population. This short part of the book seems to be unnecessarily separated from the previous chapter. In fact, it is an extension and application of Fleischer’s theory of communication.
The next chapter describes all the important aspects of the image of the university. Grech represents the image of the university based on the results of a query that consists of eighteen questions. The results of the research are quite surprising. As he shows, the concept of the university is seen by Poles as an institution of education and there is no trace of its research activity. Poles see the university in a positive way. It is a treasure of knowledge, prestige and a chance to gain better social status. On the other hand, in opinions of people with higher degrees, the university is also a workplace of many incompetent people.

In addition, in the last chapter of the book, Grech makes an excellent analysis of the attributes that help to build an adequate image of universities in the Polish population.

There is no part of the book that we may disagree with. The only lack in Grech’s work is that the author based his research only on the cognitive perspective which strongly determines the limitation of categorizing the data. Without doubt, the constructive perspective of the research would show us other facts on the image of the university.

The book is a very valuable piece of work, as it is a successful attempt at describing the cognitive definition of the university. It constitutes solid empirical research based on such an important problem as the social understanding of the concept of the university. Supported by both full and synthetic historical and cultural context of the theoretical background of the university makes the book by Grech worth reading by all academics, not only communication researchers and philologists and but also deans and other university representatives responsible for academic structures.

Damian Guzek
UNIVERSITY OF SILESIA, POLAND


A vigorously changing and developing postmodern world inevitable alters, pertaining to the mass media and journalism. Nowadays, researchers studying the dynamic processes in mass media structures have to deal with the phenomenon of media convergence and vibrant rearrangement of the traditional approaches within the study over communication. Progress of the new social media, crisis of the traditional ones, especially in the field of printed media, unclear visions of future media (r)evolution, profoundly impact on the general need to introduce and expand the new criteria and theoretical background for the typology and generic study of media and journalistic messages. Obviously, the cultural, economic and political
circumstances and factors create pronounced odds for direct implementation of Western definitions and theories. Diverse democratic experience and the different shape of the media market call for the particular analysis of the Polish case. This perspective is delivered by Janina Fras in her excellent work *O typologii wypowiedzi medialnych i dziennikarskich*. Professor Fras is the specialist in theoretical analysis of journalism and mass and political communication. She is an author and editor of significant works concerning these issues, among others: *Dziennikarski warsztat językowy* (1999), *Komunikacja polityczna* (2005), *Studia nad mediami i komunikowaniem masowym* (2007). The new monographic book published in 2013 by Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego seems to be a successful attempt to describe dissimilar scientific and colloquial approaches to mass media content and messages. Furthermore, it is an introduction to renewed typology of media and journalistic genres, which could be an appealing possibility to broader surveys. 

The most valuable feature of the author’s proposal is the multi-level and multidisciplinary perspective based on the crucial poststructuralist and postmodern discourse elements connected with communication and media research. The compound topic of the dissertation requires from the researcher a deep analysis of extremely varied academic fields, which face the questions and hypothesis linked with media messages and genres. According to the core assumption underlined in the introductory chapter, understanding and knowledge of the typology of genres is necessitated to proper usage of media content. Moreover, the metaphors of the contemporary media messages illustrated as “rapid torrent,” “conglomerate” or “mosaic” necessitated the need for a description of the perspectives far from the academic ones. This viewpoint, joining the intellectual theoretical reflections with ordinary comprehensions entails that the volume possesses great utilitarian value habitually outsized for academic works.

The book is divided into five main chapters dealing with the most common and vital aspects influential for the analysis of media messages. The splendidly framed and planned structure gives the opportunity for a gradual deepening and broadening of understanding the typological proposition of the author. In particular, this idea seems to be useful for those readers who are not familiar with the achievements of contemporary mass media research. The first part of the manuscript is a summary of the differential views on the issue of the media message due to colloquial and everyday custom meanings. The number and diversification of the actors professionally attached with the dilemma as long as the universal character of the genres typology, causes the necessity for the presentation of common approaches to the question. In consequence, this part is a substantial and indispensable cognitive preface for the scientific approach consisting of diverse perspectives as the following: common approach, utilitarian-educational approach, economic-producer approach and regulatory-formal approach. As far as the diversification of the cognitive approaches are reasoning the need of the multi-aspect reflection, the same attribute determines the overview of the analytical examinations of mass media content and
messages. Expansion and development of communication and interdisciplinary nature of the conceptual frameworks within its research field, generate the exigency of the description of approaches based on the different methodological perspectives included, among others, linguistic analysis, analysis of content, information-communication analysis, media-event analysis or generic analysis. This account is delineated in the second chapter. The third part of the volume examines the question of possession of the right to implement new terminology of media messages and the general features of the media message in postmodern media convergence. The author exemplifies the problems connected with the “in between” character of messages and its hybrid shapes. The chapter is an attempt to answer the question of whether media typology should be an effect of a natural process or an artificially held action whose purpose is to protect customs and traditional rules of language. In the fourth chapter Professor Fras describes her own proposal for understanding media message. Based on the communication theory alleging from M. Bakhtin’s works, the author devotes the sense of the genre as a principal concept of culture, and in consequence, using the messages genre arrangements as an elementary unconsciousness act of every oral, written and non-verbal communication. After these four chapters include theory as far as empirical results of research, in the last part the reader has the possibility to encounter the practical approach to the analysis of the role of journalists in the improvement of generic typology. Within the structure of vivid changes of the character of journalism (the increasing role non-professional journalists, broadening of specializations and so on), the importance of those co-authors of media messages for the question of genres seems to be essential.

The monographic manuscript O typologii..., gives the impression of the valuable scientific work joining theoretical knowledge with practical-utilitarian perspectives. The book is a great example of a well-prepared compilation and summary of modern communication and linguistic approaches to analysis of media content and genres. Besides this fact, it is also an interesting proposal of a multi-level analysis of the case of genre and media message recognized as an abstractive and cultural primary terms definition for understanding of the entire mass media content.

Bartłomiej Krzyszton
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