



JOURNALISTS ON MEDIA FREEDOM: TEXTUAL ANALYSIS OF METAJOURNALISTIC DISCOURSE IN ONLINE MEDIA IN SERBIA

UDC 004.738.5(497.11)

Marta Mitrović, Marija Vujović

University of Niš, Faculty of Philosophy,
Department of Communicology and Journalism, Serbia

ORCID iDs: Marta Mitrović
Marija Vujović

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0549-7808>
 <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4479-707X>

Abstract. *Journalists in Serbia have been in a continuously challenging position in recent decades (Freedom House, Nations in Transit 2022; Kulić, 2020; Milutinović, 2019; Milivojević et al., 2011). The expectations that the change in the country's political system at the beginning of the 21st century would bring significant improvements in media freedom have been disappointed. Over the last decade, the media freedom index has been steadily declining, placing Serbia among the countries with a "problematic situation" regarding media freedom (Statista, Press Freedom Index). This study aims to analyze the metajournalistic discourse (Carlson 2016; Vos & Singer 2016; Ferrucci, Nelson and Davis 2020) in texts published in online media and address the research questions: RQ1: How do journalists in Serbia interpret "media freedom" through the discourse published in online media texts? and RQ2: What is the tone of that metadiscourse? The analyzed texts were published in ten online media outlets in 2021 and 2022. The texts were collected using the news-generating website naslovi.net, using the keyword "media freedom." A total of 230 texts were selected in which journalists served as sources of information, either through statements or in authored texts (columns, commentaries). Through further analysis, the texts were categorized into four categories, created based on the dominant discourse prevailing in the text. The majority of the texts fell into the category of "pressures and attacks" (142), followed by "state and media" (63), "ethics and the law" (22), while three texts were related to the "market." The results indicate a predominantly negative discourse, which is in line with the axiom that gaining media freedom in challenging political systems is a daily effort.*

Key words: *media freedom, journalism profession, discourse analysis, textual analysis, metajournalistic discourse.*

Received February 6, 2024 / Accepted April 29, 2024

Corresponding author: Marta Mitrović
University of Niš, Faculty of Philosophy, Ćirila and Metodija 2, 18000 Niš, Serbia
E-mail: marta.mitrovic@filfak.ni.ac.rs

1. INTRODUCTION

In this paper, journalism is approached as a product of cultural practices, an interpretative and discursive field, conditioned by the context in which it is produced, circulated, and received (van Dijk 2009; Carlson 2016). Journalists, as the main participants in this discursive field, constantly (re)define and legitimize their profession, but not without the influence of non-journalistic actors. Therefore, when analyzing the field of journalism or any of its segments, it is necessary to consider the entirety of the relationships between different participants, intertwining in the given context, shaping journalism as a profession, and determining the boundaries of that definition (Carlson 2016).

The research subject selected is a segment of the journalistic profession that is essentially normative, and is analyzed within the discursive field of journalistic and social practices that shape it. The key concept in this study is "media freedom," which is a normative issue, an ideal to strive for, and an integral part of the national regulatory framework in any non-authoritarian country, as well as a part of the journalistic profession's code of ethics. Journalists themselves, in their endeavor to socially legitimize their profession, often resort to normative ideals that include working in the public interest and upholding professional ethics (Fidalgo 2013), with media freedom being a prerequisite for fulfilling these normative requirements.

However, as this paper will demonstrate, media freedom, as one of the key concepts through which journalism as a profession is legitimized, goes beyond strictly normative boundaries when it enters the field of theoretical consideration of journalism as a news production practice. Through this practice, the concept of media freedom is continuously constructed, challenged, reconstructed, and becomes an object of interpretation. Therefore, it is important to take the practitioners – the journalists – as the starting point in researching this predominantly normative concept. Specifically, the texts they produce about media freedom, through which they construct a sort of professional discourse on such a significant issue.

The analysis of metajournalistic discourse enables “a deeper understanding of how journalism, as an interpretive community, talks to itself” (Ferrucci, Nelson and Davis 2020, 1592). Journalists, through their metadiscursive practices, speak to themselves and about themselves, or rather, about their profession to others. According to Carlson (2016), the theme of metajournalistic discourse can be twofold: *reactive* and *generative*. The reactive theme relates to some incidental or individual case to which journalists assign meaning from the perspective of the profession, while the generative theme pertains to broader questions concerning journalism as a whole. In both cases, it is evident that these topics are mostly challenging for the profession and, therefore, of significant importance for journalism in the given context. Hence, there is a need for journalists themselves to interpret these themes.

In this regard, Carlson states: “Metajournalistic discourse conditions how news is to be understood by providing an interpretive structure that makes intelligible individual news items on a microlevel and the social place of journalism on a macrolevel” (Carlson 2016, 353).

Viewed as a social practice, journalism is inherently variable over time and space and inseparable from the context in which it is practiced. This is evident from numerous comparative studies of media systems, which have moved beyond normative frameworks of understanding journalism as the practice it should be (Siebert, Peterson & Schramm 1956; Christians et al. 2010). These studies have revealed numerous social, political, cultural, and historical influences that shape journalism within the confines of national or

regional boundaries, across space, time, and societal circumstances (Hallin & Mancini 2004; Hanitzsch 2009; Kleinsteuber & Thomass 2010).

In order to answer the research questions:

RQ1: *How do journalists in Serbia interpret "media freedom" through the discourse published in online media texts?* and

RQ2: *What is the tone of that meta-discourse?*

it is essential to understand the social, political, and even historical context in which journalistic practice in Serbia is conducted or has been conducted. In response to the question "How do we discover likely interpretations of texts?" in the Guide to Textual Analysis, McKee (2001) emphasizes the importance of "Context, context, context" (p. 149), highlighting the significance of context for analyzing texts as products of discursive practices. It is crucial to bear in mind that the production of discourse is not a one-way street. Journalists often shape public opinions on important topics, but at the same time, they produce news within an environment that is already discursively impregnated, as Carlson points out: "In certain moments, journalists pivot from their role as producers of media discourse to become its object as well" (2016, 352).

In this paper, the context in which the analysis was conducted was not explicitly outlined in a separate chapter but will serve to better understand the interpretation of the research findings presented later in the paper.

2. THE METHOD

This research used the method of analyzing metajournalistic discourse as described by Carlson (2016). Additionally, the analysis methodologically draws on the works of Vos and Singer (2016) and Ferrucci, Nelson and Davis (2020), who applied Carlson's methodology in their research on analyzing metajournalistic discourse. Carlson identifies three key discursive components of meta-journalistic discourse: *actors*, *sites/audiences*, and *topics* (2016, 7–10). Metajournalistic discourse is shaped by both journalistic and non-journalistic actors. In this analysis, journalistic actors were explicitly taken into account as sources of discourse on media freedom. However, implicitly, the interpretation of the findings also considers non-journalistic actors, such as government officials, regulatory bodies, etc., which were frequent subjects of journalistic statements.

The place where a discourse is produced is of great significance. Journalists may discuss challenges in their profession on public forums, their social media profiles, and through established media outlets. Depending on the place where discourse is produced, the target audience to whom it is directed also varies. In this paper, the discourse produced in online media, intended for a wide audience, was analyzed. The theme of discourse analysis in this paper is generative because media freedom as a normative concept pertains to the entire profession of journalism, not just specific incidents (reactive themes) (Carlson 2016).

Discourse analysis, as the overarching method, is often complemented by additional or auxiliary research methods (van Dijk 2009). In this paper, textual analysis was applied for obtaining the most likely interpretations of the texts (McKee 2001), while the methodology described by Coffey and Atkinson (1996) was used for the process of coding and moving towards the interpretation of the analyzed texts. Textual analysis, as a qualitative approach, does not entail answers that are "correct" or "incorrect" in interpreting texts: "When we perform textual analysis on a text, we make an educated guess at some of the most likely

interpretations that might be made of that text” (McKee 2001, 141). The texts were interpreted in relation to the context in which the research was conducted.

The unit of analysis in this paper is the texts characterized by metajournalistic discourse on media freedom. A total of 230 texts were collected, published in 2021 and 2022, from 10 online media outlets. The keyword “media freedom” was used for the search, and the texts were gathered using the news-generating website *naslovi.net*. Initially, a pilot study was conducted, covering January 2021, considering all media whose content is generated on the mentioned website. Subsequently, 10 media outlets were selected, which published the highest number of texts matching the keyword and were subjected to further investigation.

A database containing all the collected texts was created, and researchers accessed the data through three steps, following the approach described by Coffey and Atkinson (1996). The first step involved researchers familiarizing themselves with the data by going through it. Then, they revisited the data, this time attempting to identify themes that reflect the research question. Part of this second step is the coding process, which includes exploring the identified themes, connecting them with other segments of the data, and identifying categories to classify the data. Finally, researchers go back to the data once more, now with developed categories in mind, searching for additional meanings and approaching interpretation (Coffey & Atkinson 1996, 38–45).

The data was now coded, categorized, and fragmented, and the next step involved its interpretation. “Interpretation involves the transcendence of ‘factual’ data” (Coffey & Atkinson 1996, 46) and engaging in analytical thinking about what to do with the data next. Since coding is “a mixture of data reduction and data complication” (Coffey & Atkinson 1996, 31), organizing and categorizing the data is just the first step. Researchers then enter a broad field open to various interpretations.

3. FINDINGS

During the analysis of the collected articles, four themes/categories emerged, and their further interpretation contributes to answering the research questions:

- The first theme encompasses articles where the dominant topic is *pressures and attacks* on journalists.
- The second theme relates to the relationship between *the state and the media*.
- The third theme is concerned with issues of *ethics* and rights within the journalistic profession.
- The fourth theme is related to *the market*, specifically its freedom from influences, as a significant element that contributes to media freedom or, conversely, degrades it.

As the analysis in this paper focuses on the discourse of the journalistic field as a whole (Vos & Singer 2016; Ferrucci, Nelson and Davis 2020), the findings will not name the sources of the excerpts from the analyzed articles. These sources include journalists, whether they serve as interviewees providing information or authors of articles such as columns and commentaries. The specific media outlets in which the articles were published will also not be mentioned explicitly. A summary of the media and the number of texts per category can be seen in Table 1.

By not naming the sources, be it journalists or media outlets, the focus remains on the metajournalistic discourse taken as a whole, similar to the approach of Vos and Singer

(2016). The research focuses on the discourse built within the journalistic field, regardless of specific names of journalists or media outlets. Including additional information about the sources would divert attention from the main focus of the paper and potentially favor certain media outlets or journalists. On the other hand, for readers outside of Serbia, knowing the name of a specific journalist may not hold much significance, whereas understanding the discourse their article contributes to can offer valuable insights into the media landscape in Serbia.

Table 1 Media included in the Analysis

Media name	Pressures and attacks	The state and the media	Ethics and the law	The market	Grand Total
Cenzolovka	55	23	9	2	89
Danas	35	14	7	0	56
nova.rs	16	11	4	0	31
N1	19	7	1	1	28
RTS	5	2	0	0	7
Insajder	3	3	0	0	6
RTV	2	3	0	0	5
Alo	4	0	0	0	4
Politika	2	0	1	0	3
Vreme	1	0	0	0	1
Grand Total	142	63	22	3	230

3.1. Pressure and Attacks: “Reports of attacks on journalists are a sign of the times – those who trample democracy”

The discourse surrounding media freedom in the analyzed articles is predominantly negative, indicating that journalists in Serbia feel unsafe and are under constant pressure, mostly originating from the ruling structures. The theme that encompasses the largest number of analyzed articles (N=142) is precisely the one defined as “Pressure and Attacks.” Within articles under this theme, it is often claimed that there is a “clear stigmatization and targeting of journalists” and that pressures come in various forms “from open threats, not only from the audience and their comments,” to “open media campaigns by certain outlets against journalists who write critically about the government.”

The impression that pressures on journalists in Serbia are instigated by the ruling party is dominant among journalists who critically report on the government's work. This impression arises because, as one source points out, “attacks on journalists are often preceded by calling out and labeling journalists by state officials or local politicians, which actually encourages violence and attacks against professional journalists.”

The “public media in Serbia is facing daily political and economic pressures,” as evidenced by annual reports from various national and international organizations and associations. According to the database of the Independent Association of Journalists of Serbia on attacks against journalists, the years 2021 and 2022 (the years analyzed in this paper) had the highest number of attacks since 2008. Specifically, in 2021, 156 attacks were recorded, while in 2022, 137 attacks on journalists were documented. The majority of attacks were classified as ‘pressure,’ followed by attacks defined as “verbal threats,” “physical assaults,” and “attacks or threats to property.” The Freedom House report for

2023 testifies to the continuation of this negative trend, stating: “Journalists have faced physical attacks, smear campaigns, online harassment, and punitive tax inspections” (Freedom House, Freedom in the World 2023)¹.

In addition to open pressures and attacks on journalists, another way of influencing media freedom is recognized in “exhaustive tax inspections,” as well as “SLAPP lawsuits.” The first refers to exhaustive tax audits that can last for several months or even years and are conducted in media premises that have been critical in their reporting about the authorities². The second refers to SLAPP suits, or strategic lawsuits against public participation, which are lawsuits seeking enormous monetary amounts. These lawsuits are often filed by influential individuals or large companies whose financial stakes are not in question.

The discourse often includes local media, as well as local journalists, who are recognized by the sources to be under the highest level of pressure on freedom of expression and reporting (Mitrović & Milojević 2022). Regarding them, one source states: “They struggle daily to report on what they consider important and investigate things that many others wouldn't, because how can you challenge the environment where everyone knows each other, where the subjects of your articles are neighbors or people you meet every day on your way to work? How can you write about local power figures, whether they are in power or close to it, if your only protection is the support of colleagues, which is often short-lived.”

In the described social atmosphere covered by the analyzed discourse, one source believes that “the only protection for journalists and their interviewees is the public, as there is no protection from institutions. They are completely broken – the prosecution, the court, and the police are under the influence of politics.”

3.2. The State and the Media: “The media are free only on paper.”

The question of the relationship between the state and the media emerged as the second topic resulting from the analysis of the metajournalistic discourse. It could be expected that in the analysis of the discourse on media freedom in Serbia, the issue of the state and its role and influence would be quantitatively prominent (N=63). The consequences of inconsistently implemented socio-political changes from the beginning of the 21st century – changes in the political system and the transformation and democratization of society – are visible more than two decades later. Clientelistic practices in the media, characteristic of societies “resistant to reforms” (Milinkov 2018), combined with a high level of political parallelism and a low level of journalistic professionalism, contribute to the strengthening of the role of the state (Hallin & Mancini 2004), which dominates all segments of society, including the media system. Although the process of media privatization in Serbia was completed almost a decade ago, the state remains a significant factor of influence, both through visible mechanisms such as subsidizing media through projects, acting as an advertiser, and being a source of information, and through more sophisticated mechanisms, which were often discussed by sources in the analyzed

¹ Report available through the link: <https://freedomhouse.org/country/serbia/freedom-world/2023> (Retrieved July 2, 2023).

² One example was an inspection of a regional media portal “Južne vesti”: <https://www.juznevesti.com/Drushtvo/Novinarska-udruzenja-Vlast-koristi-inspekcije-protiv-medijskih-sloboda.sr.html> (Retrieved July 2, 2023).

articles. There were two ways in which sources connected the state and the media. First, through criticizing the work of state institutions in the media sector, and second, through criticizing attempts to associate journalists' work with anti-state activities.

“There is no independent regulatory body”, one source states. The Regulatory Authority for Electronic Media (RAEM) was the most frequently criticized entity in the analyzed articles. Considering the overall discourse about RAEM, it gives the impression that sources consider this body responsible for the unfavorable position of electronic media that are not pro-regime oriented, while at the same time providing positive incentives to electronic media that are sympathetic to the current government.

The discourse about regulatory bodies suggests that they are also responsible for the difficult position of journalists who perform their professional duties. In this context, one source mentions: “We hope that the members of the RAEM Council will realize the seriousness of the moment and work towards ensuring the unhindered exercise of freedom of expression. Through their previous decisions, they indirectly contributed to the disrespect of the Journalists' Code of Ethics and created an atmosphere that encourages threats and violence against journalists.”

“To improve the media landscape in Serbia, politics should not influence the media,” is one of the thoughts frequently found in the analyzed articles. The majority of articles convey the message that “politics is making a great effort to control journalism.”

In post-transitional countries, those that have been striving to catch up with developed democratic countries for decades, while their nationalist legacy hinders their progress and serves as an incubator for hate speech and divisions, the labels of “state enemies” and “foreign mercenaries” are well-tested techniques of manipulation used by the government. Journalists are a frequent target of state officials who employ a technique that treats any critical opinion as an act against the state, and those journalists who report critically are often publicly labeled as traitors or mercenaries.

In a socio-political atmosphere based on divisions, it is expected that “there is no reasoned debate and discussion on key issues” on the public stage. State officials serve as a source of information to “favorable” media outlets, while they either ignore or label the others. Debates are absent because “the government refuses to participate in them.”

3.3. Ethics and the law: “Slaves cannot sing about freedom”

The third most prominent theme identified in the analysis of the discourse on media freedom pertains to the journalists' attitude towards their profession and their role in shaping or maintaining the current social climate. This theme is labeled “ethics and the law” and includes articles (N=22) where journalists acknowledge some responsibility for the state of the profession, not solely attributing it to external influences such as the state and politics.

The journalism profession in Serbia has not been particularly esteemed in recent years; on the contrary, “Today, the journalism profession is disreputable, non-prospective, and undesirable. It is highly stressful, labor-intensive, lacking creativity, tabloidized, and ‘financially humiliating’” (Matić 2015, 74). The position of journalists in Serbia, as well as the overall media landscape dominated by low-quality and politicized content, is influenced by various factors. These factors include the precarious job status of journalists, low salaries (below the national average wage in Serbia), the global commercialization of news,

domestic tabloidization of important socio-political issues, political pressures, and clientelistic practices (Milinkov 2018, 230).

In one study where journalists from Serbia were surveyed about their position in society and the journalism profession in general, it was noted that journalists perceived themselves both as victims of the system and as contributors to maintaining the existing status quo. The study also pointed out the persistent division between “pro-regime” and “independent” media, and consequently, “pro-regime” and “independent” journalists, which dates back to the 1990s and continues to shape the discourse today (Matić 2015, 76–77). This legacy is evident in the analysis of the discourse in this category of articles.

Journalists often feel the need to prove their professionalism by emphasizing that they are not like “those other journalists” who serve the regime. They make a clear distinction, stating: “We are not the same. All those others have one editor-in-chief note: the editor-in-chief referred to in the text is the president of the country). They are all his, but we are yours”.

However, despite the challenging socio-political circumstances, the discourse in the articles of this category cannot be described as negative or pessimistic regarding the pursuit of media freedom. The sources demonstrate a desire to fight for “the job we chose” while acknowledging the negative circumstances and difficult position. They take some responsibility for “a better media image in the future” and eagerly emphasize their work as a heroic act: “We have shown that it is possible, even in such an environment, under constant regime pressure, and despite daily threats, to work in the interest of citizens, our readers.” We can conclude that journalists in this category predominantly see themselves as fighters who are constantly at the forefront of defending the integrity of their profession and the public interest: “Freedom in this country is not something that is simply given to you; you have to fight for it”.

3.4. The market: “The story about the freedom of the market is completely meaningless”

The least common theme (N=3) in the discourse about media freedom was the theme called “market.” This category includes articles whose dominant topic was the freedom of the media and/or telecommunications market in Serbia. Although least represented, this theme is significant for understanding the overall discourse of journalists about media freedom.

In order to provide clarity on the discourse about the media market, it is necessary to provide the context in which the analyzed articles were published. The context is related to the period of the so-called “cable war” between the cable operators Telekom Srbija, a state-owned company, and Telenor, a company close to the government, on one side, and the United Media Group, a company recognized in Serbia as critical of the government, on the other. Specifically, Telekom and Telenor signed a cooperation agreement, which United Media claims is in violation of antimonopoly laws and aims to suppress the third player in the market, namely United Media.

In one of the analyzed articles, it was stated: “Prime Minister Ana Brnabić accused the United Group on public television of being responsible for slowing down Serbia's EU integration process because they complained about the plan of Telekom Srbija and Telenor to destroy and stifle independent media. The United Group had previously pointed out that the destruction and obstruction of funding for their media was not an insinuation or assumption, but it is stated in the strategy of Telekom Srbija, which is publicly available. Some opposition parties and movements are demanding the resignation of Telekom's General Director,

Vladimir Lučić, due to the open planning of the destruction of media not under the control of the government.” In this example, we can observe a similar discourse as in the previous categories: high-ranking state officials publicly labeling specific media groups, blaming them for Serbia's failures on the path to EU membership; there is a noticeable emphasis on the division between “opposition” and “pro-government” media. One source states: “The story about freedom and the market in Serbia is ridiculous because a narrow circle of people decides on all deals, tenders, purchases of both media and state-owned companies.”

The free market for cable operators in Serbia is of great importance for overall media freedom and citizens' access to information. Media outlets that are perceived as “non-pro-government” in Serbia do not have national frequencies and are only available through the cable operator SBB United Media Group). Taking away a portion of the market from United Media under illegal or unfair conditions would mean reducing the number of citizens who can access television channels through the SBB operator. Therefore, even though this theme was the least represented during the analyzed period, it was significant for understanding the discourse on media freedom in Serbia.

4. DISCUSSION

Finally, let us return to the research questions and try to provide answers based on everything analyzed. *How do journalists in Serbia interpret “media freedom” through the discourse published in online media texts?* Based on the categories that stood out as significant in the process of coding the analyzed texts, it could be said that journalists in Serbia most often view “media freedom” through the perspective of the state and politics. They see them as the biggest “enemies” of media freedom. These external participants, mostly politicians, who were not explicitly taken into account in the analysis of the discourse, imposed themselves as important non-journalistic participants that influence the journalists' discourse on media freedom. Even in the category that apparently does not refer to politicians, the market, the interpretation of the texts showed that in these articles the most important objects of expression are politicians.

As for the question *What is the tone of the metadiscourse?*, it is not difficult to answer it, since it was predominantly negative, as observed in almost every text. The only category where a positive tone was noticeable is “ethics and the law.” In this category, the discourse themes were related to journalists' self-encouragement not to give up the fight for media freedom: “Time passes, politics and regimes change, but our common goal remains the struggle against undemocratic tendencies that contradict freedom of expression, basic human rights, and internationally recognized criteria of civil liberties and openness, which should characterize democratic societies and responsible authorities.” However, even in this category, there is an underlying critique of the current socio-political circumstances.

At the very end, it is important to highlight the limitations of the conducted research. Undoubtedly, a period longer than two years would be recommended for analysis. However, it should be kept in mind that according to all research conducted by international organizations, Serbia has maintained its position as a “problematic country” regarding media freedom over the past 10 years. Analyzing different periods, such as the time when the Democratic Party was in power and the period before the democratic changes, and comparing them with the current metanarrative discourse, would be a more comprehensive research endeavor. The chosen period in this study was convenient because the text database

was readily accessible, which may not have been the case for earlier periods. Hence, this research aims to be a modest exploratory endeavor. It provides an overview of the state at a specific moment in time and circumstances and does not claim to be an indisputable representation of current conditions or a prediction of the future.

Furthermore, not mentioning the sources, especially the names of the media in which the analyzed texts were published, also has its drawbacks. The advantage, as previously highlighted, is the focus on the field of journalism. However, the interpretation of the data would gain at least one additional perspective if the sources were taken into account. Almost all of the media analyzed in Serbia are recognized as “anti-regime.” It would be interesting to consider this indicator and pose an additional research question –Why does the metadiscourse of journalists in pro-government media omit the topic of media freedom? If researchers were to revisit the data with these indicators in mind, the interpretation would undoubtedly be enriched. This could also serve as a recommendation for future studies in this field.

REFERENCES

- Carlson, Matt. „Metajournalistic discourse and the meanings of journalism: Definitional control, boundary work, and legitimation“. *Communication theory* 26, 4 (2016): 349–368.
- Christians, Clifford G., Theodore Glasser, Denis McQuail, Kaarle Nordenstreng, and Robert White. *Normative theories of the media: Journalism in democratic societies*. Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2010.
- Coffey, Amanda and Paul Atkinson. *Making sense of qualitative data: Complementary research strategies*. Sage Publications, Inc, 1996.
- Ferrucci, Patrick., Jacob. L. Nelson, and Miles. P. Davis. „From ‘Public Journalism’ to ‘Engaged Journalism’: Imagined Audiences and Denigrating Discourse“. *International Journal of Communication* 14 (2020): 1586–1604.
- Fidalgo, Joaquim. „Journalism is changing – and what about journalism ethics?“. Paper presented in the IAMCR 2013 Conference Ethics of Society and Ethics of Communication Working Group Dublin – Ireland, 25–29 June, 2013 URL: <https://core.ac.uk/reader/55629750>
- Freedom House (n.d.). „Nations in Transit 2022“. Retrieved July 2, 2023, <https://freedomhouse.org/country/serbia/nations-transit/2022>
- Hallin, Daniel. C. and Paolo Mancini. *Comparing media systems: Three models of media and politics*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Hanitzsch, Thomas. „Comparative Journalism Studies“. In *The Handbook of Journalism Studies*, edited by Karina Wahl-Jorgensen and Thomas Hanitzsch, 413–427. Routledge, 2009.
- Kleinstaub, Hans. J., and Barbara Thomass. „Comparing media systems: the European dimension“. *CM časopis* 5, 16 (2010): 5–20.
- Kulić, Milica. „Redefinisanje uloge novinara u novom medijskom okruženju: ideologija novinarstva, polarizacija medija i socioekonomski položaj novinara“. *CM časopis* 15, 48 (2020): 115–135.
- Matić, Jovanka. „Tri nivoa odbrane novinarskog profesionalizma. In *Indikatori profesionalnog/ neprofesionalnog ponašanja novinara i medija – mogućnosti za poboljšanje stanja*, edited by Rade Veljanovski, 73–84. Beograd: Fakultet političkih nauka, 2015.
- McKee, Alan. „A beginner's guide to textual analysis“. *Metro Magazine: Media & Education Magazine* 127/128 (2001): 138–149.
- Milinkov, Smiljana. „Uticaj klijentelističke prakse na medijski sadržaj i slobodu medija“. *Godišnjak Filozofskog fakulteta u Novom Sadu* 43, 1 (2018): 217–233.
- Milivojević, Snježana, Mirosljub Radojković, Maja Raković, Ana Milojević, Aleksandra Ugrinić and Marijana Matović. *Profesija na raskršću – novinarstvo na pragu informacionog društva*. Beograd: Fakultet političkih nauka, Centar za medije i medijska istraživanja, 2011.
- Milutinović, Irina R. „Križa profesionalnog novinarstva u tranzicionom društvu Srbije“. *Sociološki pregled* 53, 3 (2019): 1046–1070.
- Mitrović, Marta and Ana Milojević. „Professional Identity of Journalists Then and Now: A Perspective of Journalists From Southeast Serbia“. *Media Studies and Applied Ethics* 3, 1 (2022): 53–67.
- News generator. „Naslovi.net“. Retrieved October 10, 2022, <https://naslovi.net/search.php?q=sloboda+medija&sel=1&izvori%5B%5D=137&start=151>

- Siebert, Fred, Theodore Peterson, and Wilbur Schramm. *Four theories of the press: The authoritarian, libertarian, social responsibility, and Soviet communist concepts of what the press should be and do*. University of Illinois Press, 1956.
- Statista. „Press freedom index in Serbia from 2013 to 2021“. Retrieved April 28, 2023, <https://www.statista.com/statistics/1026485/serbia-press-freedom-index/>
- van Dijk, Teun, A. „News, Discourse, and Ideology“. In *The Handbook of Journalism Studies* edited by Karina Wahl-Jorgensen and Thomas Hanitzsch, 191–204. New York and London: Routledge, 2009.
- Vos, Tim. P. and Jane B. Singer. „Media Discourse about Entrepreneurial Journalism: Implications for Journalistic Capital“. *Journalism Practice* 10, 2 (2016): 143–159.

NOVINARI O SLOBODI MEDIJA: TEKSTUALNA ANALIZA METANOVINARSKOG DISKURSA U ONLAJN MEDIJIMA U SRBIJI

Novinari u Srbiji poslednjih decenija su u stalnom izazovnom položaju (Freedom House, Nations in Transit 2022; Kulić 2020; Milutinović 2019; Milivojević i dr. 2011). Očekivanja da će promena političkog sistema zemlje na početku 21. veka doneti značajna poboljšanja u oblasti slobode medija su izneverena. Tokom poslednje decenije, indeks slobode medija je u stalnom opadanju, što Srbiju svrstava među zemlje sa „problematičnom situacijom“ u pogledu slobode medija (Statista, Indeks slobode medija). Ova studija ima za cilj da analizira metanovinarski diskurs (Carlson 2016; Ferrucci, Nelson and Davis 2020; Vos & Singer 2016) u tekstovima objavljenim u onlajn medijima i odgovori na istraživačka pitanja: IP1: Kako novinari u Srbiji tumače „slobodu medija“, kroz diskurs u tekstovima onlajn medija? i IP2: Kakav je ton tog metadiskursa? Analizirani tekstovi objavljeni su u deset onlajn medija tokom 2021. i 2022. godine. Tekstovi su prikupljeni na sajtu naslovi.net za generisanje vesti, koristeći ključnu reč „sloboda medija“. Odabrano je ukupno 230 tekstova u kojima su novinari služili kao izvor informacija, bilo kroz izjave ili u autorskim tekstovima (kolumne, komentari). Daljom analizom, tekstovi su razvrstani u četiri kategorije, kreirane na osnovu dominantnog diskursa koji preovladava u tekstu. Najviše tekstova spada u kategoriju „pritisci i napadi“ (142), zatim „država i mediji“ (63), „etika i pravo“ (22), a tri teksta se odnose na „tržište“. Rezultati ukazuju na pretežno negativan diskurs, koji je u skladu sa aksiomom da je ostvarivanje slobode medija u izazovnim političkim sistemima svakodnevni izazov.

Ključne reči: *sloboda medija, novinarska profesija, analiza diskursa, tekstualna analiza, metanovinarski diskurs.*