Chapter will appear as Peruško, Z. Mediatization: From Structure to Agency (and back again). In S. Hjarvard, G. Bolin, A. Hepp, O. Driessens, eds, *Dynamics of mediatization: understanding cultural and social change***, Palgrave, forthcoming (2017).**

Mediatization: From Structure to Agency (And Back Again)

Zrinjka Peruško

Abstract. The central argument of this chapter is that mediatization as a multi-level process needs to be empirically analyzed both at the institutional level and at the level of practice. Mediatization as structuration thesis (Hjarvard 2014) is expanded by relating the media system as structure to media use as agency. Several empirical studies that relate the structural and the action/practice level are examined as examples.

To map the differences in the state of mediatization of media systems, a set of indicators for macro level mediatization are proposed and tested comparatively in 33 east and west European countries. Five clusters of digital media landscapes are obtained according to likeness of the indicator values.

The chapter argues for further empirical study of the structuration process and the increased attention to agency within the institutional approach to mediatization, as well as for the adoption of a multi-level mixed methods research program for empirically investigating mediatization as a multi-level and multi-dimensional social process.

Key words: mediatization, structuration theory, structure, agency, multi-level research, mixed methods research, media system, media use, comparative research.

***

Mediatization is a non-linear (Esser 2013; Couldry 2014; Hjarvard 2013) and contextually sensitive process - conditions of structures and cultures influence its shape. In addition to (expected) variations in relation to macro contextual conditions, mediatization takes place in media related social practice/interaction at different levels of society (Couldry 2012; Krotz 2009, 2014; Hjarvard 2008, 2014; Hepp and Hasebrink 2014). From this, it follows that only a comprehensive social theory addressing both the variations at the structural level and at the level of social practice can fully explain it. Following from these premises, this chapter has two related theoretical aims.

First, it attempts to expand on the mediatization as structuration thesis (Hjarvard 2014a) by relating the media system as structure to media use as agency. Related to this is the proposal

for a multi-level mixed methods research program as especially appropriate for empirically investigating mediatization as a multi-level and multi-dimensional social process. With a view of providing an example of structuration approach in mediatization research, a set of empirical studies that relate the structural and the action/practice level – media systems/landscapes and media use (including both reception, sharing/distribution and production by the audiences) will be reviewed. Directions of further empirical study of the structuration process will be sketched, with the aim of increasing the attention to agency within the institutional approach to mediatization.

Second, focusing on the structural level, this chapter endeavors to show differences in the state of mediatization of media systems as structural macro conditions of mediatized practice. This will be explored by placing media systems research in a broader context of mediatization. As a contribution to de-westernizing mediatization, both west and east Europe is addressed in the discussion of mediatization in empirical terms. Despite recent attempts to expand the approach in geographical terms, there is still insufficient empirical evidence that the process/outcome of mediatization even exists outside of the "rich countries" (Couldry and Hepp 2017). This chapter aims to contribute to filling some blanks in this regard.

The chapter unfolds as follows. First, the structuration approach to mediatization is reconsidered in relation to its empirical usefulness and mixed methods research strategy is proposed as the most promising (as the main use of theory is to aid in our understanding of the empirical world, mediatization approach will only advance as fast as we are able to conceptualize, operationalize and measure/describe/understand mediatization in its different variations). Next, the focus is placed on the structural level with a discussion of dimensions describing contemporary media systems in relation to indicators that describe mediatization. The discussion of mediatization at the macro level proceeds with empirical examples of European country clusters/media systems and their different levels of mediatization. The third step brings back the level of media practice (theorized as agency in terms of the structuration approach, Giddens 1984) as varied aspects of media use which is related to the mediatized structural contexts.

1. A Mixed Methods Approach for Empirical Investigation of Mediatization

Research still seems to be divided by specific understandings of mediatization in the three approaches. The institutional approach to mediatization is most often linked to (post)positivist epistemologies and quantitative designs focusing on the institutional macro or mezzo levels, constructivist approaches are usually linked to interpretivist or critical epistemologies and qualitative designs and focus predominantly of practice or the micro levels, while the materialist/technological approaches put the spotlight on the way technology's affordances play a role (for overviews of the approaches see Lundby 2009, 2014a, 2014b; Livingstone and Lunt 2014; Bolin 2014). But, as recent work is increasingly noting, the process of mediatization spans the macro, mezzo and micro level – changes in institutions provide different contexts for media and communication related action for individuals, and changes in individual (or group) practices in time shape changes in the institutions.

There are several sociological theories that are good candidates for integrating the macro and the micro levels (or the field of structures with the field of actions) that have in one way or another been already addressed within mediatization research: Giddens's structuration theory (Hjarvard 2014a), Bourdieu's field theory (Couldry 2014; Bolin 2017), Habermas's theory of communicative action (Bolin 2010), while they are yet to see an empirical application (Benson's 2014 empirical application of field theory in a study of immigration news in France

and the USA in a multi-method comparative research design is an exception, but is on the outside of the mediatization conversation).

If mediatization is a multi-level social process at the micro, mezzo and macro levels of society with variable manifestations in different social fields (Hjarvard 2014a; Jansson 2002; Livingstone 2009; Strömbäck 2008), then these multiple levels can only be empirically approached in a mixed-method design including both quantitative and qualitative research strategies. Mixed methods research linking levels of individual agency (micro level, although agency can be at any level depending on the character of the actors) with the macro level structures has been used in conjecture with Bourdieu's reflexive sociology in the study of information systems (Fries 2009) and news (Benson 2014). Although Giddens's structuration theory is found "too lacking in specification to actively guide research" (Poole 2009: 583), the inspiration of the structuration thesis has often (Jones and Karsten 2008) been used as the backdrop in mixed methods research of information systems where the functional analysis is used to study structures, and "interpretive studies are need to illuminate the constitution of the system" (Poole 2009: 584). Bolin (2017) recently presented a cross-generational and cross-cultural analysis of mediatization and media use which leaned onto Bourdieu's field theory, and highlighted exactly the structure/agency relationship. The contribution of field theory to understanding agency as constitutive of the media field has so far placed more attention on journalists as actors (Bourdieu 2005; Benson and Neveu 2005).

Many empirical studies of mediatization have been undertaken in recent years, primarily in relation to mediatization of politics, religion, family, childhood play, migration, culture, sport (Scannell 2016; Hjarvard and Petersen 2013; Hepp et al. 2010; Lundby 2014a). Only a few attempts at comparative cross-national or longitudinal research exist, predominantly in respect to the spatial or temporal variations in the mediatization of politics in western European contexts (Magin 2015; Udris and Lucht 2014; Umbricht and Esser 2013). Bolin's (2017) cross-temporal and cross-cultural analysis of media generations in a comparative perspective of Sweden and Estonia is a rare exception.

This chapter argues for a comparative cross-country multi-level structuration approach as an empirical research agenda of mediatization following Stig Hjarvard's (2014a: 124) structuration approach to mediatization where "the duality of structure and agency and … long-term institutionalization of media-influenced patterns of social interaction [are] at the heart of the theory of mediatization". In the following section, the structural level of media landscape will be further defined in relation to mediatization.

2. Structure

Many changes associated with mediatization are seen to originate with the mass media i.e. in the television era (Schulz 2004; Strömbäck 2008). Others find evidence of mediatization related changes since the times of the first communication technologies (Krotz 2009). Couldry and Hepp (2017) identify three *waves* of mediatization – mechanization, electrification, and digitalization including datafication as the last wave of deep mediatization (2017: 34). The notion of *regimes* of mediatization is developed by Hjarvard (2014b: 204) to picture changes in the relationships of power between institutions in the media field.

In this chapter mediatization is investigated in the current wave of digitalization in deep mediatization, when the process of media related change is not linked to any singular media but to the entire media environment or ensemble (Couldry 2012; Finnemann 2014). There are several competing terms for this: media system, media landscape, communication ecology, or media manifold (Couldry and Hepp 2017). Bolin (2017) uses the concept of "objective" media

landscapes to describe the structural level as opposed to "subjective" media landscapes which are composed of individually selected media and content.

As Friedrich Krotz (2014: 148f.) has emphasized, analysis of mediatization needs to start with the analysis of the changes in the media system. Seen as structural conditions of mediatization (Strömbäck 2008; Hepp et al. 2010; Hjarvard 2008; Krotz 2009; Schrott 2009) *media systems* (used here as a descriptive term and not as a theoretical proposition) have not been sufficiently analyzed (Deacon and Stanyer 2014; Livingstone and Lunt 2014; Magin 2015). Within the institutional perspective mediatization is seen "as an inter-institutional process in which particular practices of mediations ... are influenced by several institutional structures" (Hjarvard 2014b: 203). The attention to the transformations in the wider media ecology is highlighted in the technological mediatization perspective (Livingstone and Lunt 2014; Finnemann 2014; Deuze 2011), while the cultural constructivist perspective sees the surrounding media landscape as "material and mental environment" (Nowak 1996, cited in Bolin 2014: 188). In none of these texts is media system further conceptualized or defined.

The predominant understanding of media systems today is focused on the relationship of news media and politics (Hallin and Mancini 2004). The prevailing model by Hallin and Mancini (2004) defines media systems with five main dimensions/variables: 1) the political system, 2) the media market, 3) the degree of the autonomy and professionalization of journalism, 4) political parallelism and 5) the role of the state. Three models of media systems in Western Europe and North America were constructed based on case studies and research evidence: the liberal model is best represented by the USA (although UK and Ireland are also included), the democratic corporatist model includes the northern and central European countries, including Germany, and the polarized pluralist model in the Mediterranean part of Europe, including Italy and Greece. Comparative empirical operationalization of the model in east and west European countries (Peruško et al. 2013; Peruško 2016) and west Europe and North America (Brüggemann et al. 2014) have used current aggregated cross country data, but have not expanded on the definition of a media system in relation to the ongoing developments in the media. In his description of "hybrid media logics" and "hybrid" media systems, which can be seen to pertain to the digital phase of deep mediatization, Chadwick includes technologies as well as "genres, norms, behaviors, and organizational forms" (2013: 4), but without considering the broader institutional and political makeup of the legacy and digital media, nor the broadening of the concept of media system beyond political journalism.

In this chapter, we are concerned with the conceptualization, definition, operationalization and empirical testing of media systems as the macro condition of mediatization. The key question is how are differences at the level of common institutional structures linked to the degree to which a media system is mediatized? Put differently, we are looking here to make a systematic representation of what constitutes mediatization at the structural level of media landscape.

What dimensions reflect the most important characteristics of media systems in high modernity/ deep mediatization? Building on the accepted notion that a media system is not only a grouping of media or media related practices, but that institutions (in previous research predominantly political institutions) play an important role (Blumler and Gurevitch 1995; Hallin and Mancini 2004), a model of digital mediascape was developed (Peruško et al. 2015). In looking to describe the most important characteristics of media systems in high modernity, the model also sought to account for the critique of the dominant model of Hallin and Mancini (2004): a predominant focus on journalism and legacy media of press and television to the detriment of "new" media (at the time of the writing of their book deep mediatization was just starting), no accounting of the change to the status of the state in the network age, no accounting for media culture and global media developments (Hardy 2012). Four dimensions of digital mediascapes

have been proposed to account for the changes in purpose and scope of contemporary media systems: 1) the dimension of institutional inclusiveness, 2) the dimension of globalization; 3) the dimension of digitized media market; 4) the dimension of media culture (Peruško et al. 2015, 2016). Here they will be reviewed in relation to their contribution to describing the system level of mediatization.

The empirical studies: how media systems were measured and constructed, and related to audience practice

A series of empirical studies worked with these dimensions from a structuration perspective in looking for the relationship of the structural level of media system and media related practice – media use (Peruško et al. 2015; Peruško and Vozab 2015; Aroldi et al. 2015) and journalistic practice (Peruško et al. 2016), giving us an opportunity to review the results in terms of the role of the structural level of mediatization in media related practices. Before we proceed, a brief account of the conceptualization and measurement of the four dimensions and the description of research design and procedures is provided.

The institutional dimension was originally operationalized as the quality of democracy and social and economic inclusiveness, and measured with The Economist Intelligence Unit Democracy Index and UNDP Human Development Index (HDI), respectively (Peruško et al. 2015). The dimension was later expanded to include additional variables on the type of regime (also based on the EIU Democracy Index), and freedom of expression, operationalized by averaging the Reporters without borders and Freedom House Freedom of Expression Indexes (Peruško et al. 2016). Media market was operationalized with newspaper circulation (per capita), TV audience concentration (C 3), broadband Internet (fixed (wired) broadband subscriptions per 100 inhabitants), social media penetration (percentage of population using social media), fixed telephone change 2003-2013, smartphone penetration (percentage of population owning a smartphone. The dimension was in the 2016 study extended with the market position of public television (rank in the first three audience preferences). The dimension of media culture was measured with per capita import and export of media culture and included newspapers, journals and periodicals; cinematographic films, video games and consoles and recorded media (CDs, DVDs, gramophone records etc.) (Peruško et al. 2016). The aggregate statistics were obtained from published data by international institutions and associations - the European Audiovisual Observatory, ITU, WAN-IFRA, EUROSTAT, UNCTAD (Peruško et al. 2015, 2016). Globalization was operationalized with the KOF Index of Globalization, which measures the concept on 3 dimensions: "economic globalization, characterized as long-distance flows of goods, capital and services as well as information and perceptions that accompany market exchanges; political globalization, characterized by a diffusion of government policies; and social globalization, expressed as the spread of ideas, information, images and people" (Dreher 2006: 1092).

Variables were linked with standardized values as described above and hierarchical cluster analysis was performed twice to group countries into media systems (Ward's method with Euclidean distance was used as a measure of similarity, and elbow method was used in identifying the number of groups; variables were standardized as z-scores). In the first study 23 east and west European countries were analyzed (Peruško et al. 2015: Table 1, 349; values in Table 2, 351). The second cluster analysis with the use of the extended model was performed on 33 east and west European countries (Peruško et al. 2016). The country groupings will be presented bellow together with the characteristic of the digitized media systems related to mediatization, which are developed in the next section.

After the cluster analyses of media systems, regression analysis was performed on audience data, in some of the studies after factor analysis. The audience data were collected in 2013 with

the same questionnaire on representative national samples of on-line audiences in 9 participating countries (N=10,742) in a cross-European project (Jensen and Helles 2015).

Three studies which are used as examples in this chapter were performed on the same data set of audiences and media systems to account for differences or similarities in media related practices: in terms of preference of the type of media (Peruško et al. 2015), audiences' online engagement practices (Peruško and Vozab 2015) and spaces of media use (Aroldi et al. 2015). Audience studies were only performed in 9 countries: Belgium, Croatia, Denmark, Germany, Hungary, Israel, Italy, Poland and Portugal (comparative project is described in Jensen and Helles 2015). Since these countries cluster in the same media systems in the original and the expanded model, regression analysis of macro-level influences on media use will be interpreted with both media system clusters. Audience practices constitute agency in respect to the structuration approach.

The four dimensions of digital media systems will now be engaged in the mediatization perspective and related to criteria for evaluating mediatization empirically at the media systems level.

Inclusive institutions dimension

Hjarvard finds that "mediatization is, obviously, dependent on the proliferation of various media forms, but the transformative process of mediatization is a result of various institutions' changing access to and varying control over these vital resources" (2014b: 204). The type of political regime is one of the key points in the Hallin and Mancini (2004) model of media systems, and the names of the three types are derived from the predominant characteristics of their political field. In choosing to move beyond journalism in constructing a new media system model, the institutional field needs to be seen in a broader perspective. Mediatization has also been identified with the advent of autonomous media institution (Hjarvard 2008; Strömbäck 2008)[1]. The concept of inclusive institutions developed by Acemoğlu and Robinson (2012) illuminates this point. Inclusive institutions – as found in democracies - promote free expression and free invention, as well as ensure the necessary freedom for the "creative disruption" that is a basis for technical and social innovation and economic progress (Acemoğlu and Robinson 2012). While the processes that drive mediatization have not so far been systematically analyzed, most authors who date mediatization with high modernity and later expect commercialization to play a part in increased mediatization (Strömbäck 2008; Udris and Lucht 2014).

In addition to the usual strong relationship between the HDI, democracy, globalization (Norris and Inglehart 2009) and media freedom, the correlation analysis performed on the digital mediascape model found strong or moderate correlations between democracy and several variables describing the digitized media market – Internet diffusion, newspaper circulation, smart phone and social media penetration as well as the strong position of PSB (see Table 1). HDI is additionally strongly related to newspaper circulation, and Internet diffusion.

This would suggest that those media systems with higher inclusiveness in both the political and the socio-economic field are more mediatized.

---

[1] Linking of mediatization to autonomous institutions (Hjarvard, 2008) in terms of their autonomy from state would mean that there could be no mediatization in, for instance, China, because its media institutions are not autonomous in this sense even though their operation in the entertainment media (not in the news) is highly commercialized. China is an example of a country with a strong spread of communication and media technology which is linked to higher mediatization, and some evidence of audience behavior shows amalgamation and substitution practices described by Schulz (2004).

Globalization

Globalization has long been associated with contemporary developments of media and communication technologies, which are seen as its drivers. Manuel Castells (1996) and Arjun Appadurai (2000[1990]) are the most well-known among social theorists who investigate this relationship (Ampuja 2012). While important critiques of the media system approach come from those who challenge the primacy of nation state as an analytical unit (the methodological nationalism critique of Ulrich Beck), the importance of the national media system remains as the place of media use and regulation – Flew and Waisbord (2015) show in cross-country comparisons of Internet that states maintain legal control of the boundaries also in the digitized media system. Without a doubt, thought, contemporary media systems are affected, and can be differentiated, by their participation in the global flows.

Globalization of media markets is expected to promote convergence of media systems (Hallin and Mancini 2004; Voltmer 2012 quoted in Flew and Waisbord 2015: 626). Globalization as a process is seen to be connected to mediatization (Hepp et al. 2010) where globalization is expected to support the spread of mediatization and centrifugal, fragmenting forces in media consumption (Hjarvard 2008). Correlation analysis performed on the digital mediascape model shows significant and moderate relations between the degree of globalization and that of Internet diffusion (Table 1). Higher globalization can then be considered an indicator of higher mediatization. Higher degree of globalization would also expect to be linked with higher audience fragmentation (in television, this would show as lower television channel concentration in terms of audience size in a multichannel environment).

Digital media market

The dimension of technology is where the change is most readily visible in the digitized media system, and technology has been underlined as an area that should figure more prominently in mediatization research (Finnemann 2014). Increase in mediatization is very much linked to media innovations in the digital age and the increase of media and media channels.

Media system is composed of a comprehensive media matrix, a set of available media together with their different institutionalizations and usages which vary across media systems according to political, economic, and cultural contexts (Finnemann 2014: 299). Emerging media systems in the digital age are affected by the changes in media technologies, institutions and practices: digitization, mobility, media abundance, network architecture and mass self-communication and a hybridization of old and new media logics in media institutions and formats (Castells 2009; Couldry 2012; Chadwick 2013). Fortunati (2005) describes it as the mediatization of the Internet and the internetization of the mass media. From flow (Williams 2003[1974]) to torrent flow (Gittlin), from television galaxy (McLuhan, Castells) to network flow (Castells 1996), the cross-media environment (Hasebrink and Domeyer 2012) of today is a result of converging social forces including technological developments, policy decisions, interconnectedness of people and countries, institutions and new social practices.

The spread of different media (in terms of their penetration or use) can thus be used to gauge the degree of mediatization. In relation to the present-day digitized media landscapes, it is expected that higher penetration of digitized media is related to higher mediatization, and the broader the multimedia matrix, the higher the mediatization.

Bivariate correlation confirmed that the spread of broadband is related to openness of the creative economy, as well as to social media and smartphone penetration (Table 1).

Media culture

Media systems are more than containers of news; they should also be seen as systems of cultural production and consumption and in terms of cultural flows in increasingly globalized mediascapes (Appadurai 2000[1990]; Esser 2013; Peruško and Čuvalo 2014). While the focus on political institutions and the news media-politics dynamic makes sense in relation to political communication or mediatization of politics, a broader view is necessary to show a more comprehensive interplay between media, culture and society in terms of mediatization. Entertainment and not news is the largest business in both the legacy and digital media. Rantanen (2013) also argues against methodological structuralism that naturalized the political in media system research to the detriment of new media cultures.

Mediatization is expected to expand the realm of media culture (Jansson 2002, in Hjarvard 2008: 108), so the size of the sector of media culture, or the export and import of cultural goods, can be used as an outcome indicator of the degree of mediatization. Even if the media is a global business, a great majority of large media corporations are "national corporations with international operations" (Flew and Waisbord 2015: 627), so it makes sense to take account of the cultural production and exchange as one of the media system dimensions. In this respect, mediatization is seen as driving the increase in the media culture sector, not the other way around.

Mediatization in European media landscapes

Based on these conceptualizations of drivers of mediatization at the level of digital media systems, we can distill a set of propositions as indicators of mediatization at the structural level. In evaluating the variations across European digitized media landscapes in terms of the presence or degree of mediatization, we could be guided by the following set of premises. Higher degree of mediatization is in times of deep mediatization positively related to:

> a) the higher spread of all the media, and especially the digital media, which is also linked to a higher commercialization of the overall media market,
>
> b) the larger sector of creative industries or media culture,
>
> c) higher globalization
>
> d) higher audience fragmentation, and
>
> e) more inclusive political and social institutions.

Obviously, no absolute measures of the degree of mediatization can be attached to these dimensions, but the proportionate levels of mediatization need to be "calibrated" on the basis of comparative analysis. It is expected that the levels of mediatization will be dynamic, both internally (i.e. within one media system) as well as in comparison between media systems; since mediatization is a multi-causal affair, different development in assorted dimensions over time in various media systems may influence mediatization in varied ways.

Based on the variations in variables constructing the dimensions presented above, five main clusters/types of digitized media landscapes were identified in the two empirical studies (Peruško et al. 2015, 2016): the *Inclusive media landscape*, the *Convergent mainstream media landscape*, the *Peripheral media landscape*, the *Non-Inclusive media landscape*, and Israel which clustered separately (Table 2).

The most mediatized *Inclusive* cluster, composed of countries that are part of the democratic-corporatist model (Hallin and Mancini 2004) – Denmark, Sweden, Finland, Iceland, Austria and Netherland - shows the highest values in political and social inclusiveness and in the diffusion of digital media. It also shows highest globalization values, and the highest exports

and imports of the cultural industry. Moderate levels of TV concentration, so a lesser fragmentation of audiences, go hand in hand with the highest position of PSB in television viewership. The highest institutional inclusiveness in this cluster with the largest spread of digital media supports the argument that inclusive institutions allow for the most disruptive technological development that is necessary for economic development. New media landscape in the Inclusive countries is characterized by digital technology; regulatory changes of increased liberalization and concentration of ownership bringing about also market changes with increasing position of transnational media organizations, for instance, Netflix has a larger audience share in the Nordic countries that in the rest of Europe (Schwarz 2016). Despite increased commercialization and tabloidization in some countries (Finland), and a decline of the importance of political press, PSB still holds the highest position in Europe (Herkman 2012: 376). The Inclusive cluster exhibits highest values in all the proposed indicators of mediatization, except regarding audience fragmentation (therefore, the relationship of mediatization and audience fragmentation should be further examined).

The *Convergent* cluster is composed of European old democracies, that take part in all three of the Hallin and Mancini (2004) models: France, Italy and Spain from the Mediterranean model, Germany and Belgium from the democratic corporatist model, and Ireland and UK from the liberal model, Malta, plus post-socialist Slovenia and Estonia. The Convergent European digitized media system shows the second largest creative economy sectors *per capita*, high democracy and human development values, higher than average globalization indicators with the expected lower concentration of television audiences, signaling a more fragmented television audience, but only a moderately to highly developed digitized media market. This gives the Convergent cluster the second place in relation to degree of mediatization in Europe. By comprising two countries from new EU member states in CEE, this cluster gives further argument for the thesis of media systems convergence. The drivers of convergence need to be further investigated, as most Central and Eastern European countries cluster expectedly in the next cluster.

The *Peripheral* cluster is composed of peripheral European countries of the south and east, including countries from the Hallin and Mancini (2004) Mediterranean model – Greece and Portugal, post-socialist EU members Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Hungary, Latvia, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, as well as Cyprus, FYRM and Serbia. This cluster is characterized by lower than average values for political and social inclusiveness, lower spread of digital media, lower globalization, less open creative economy, and higher TV concentration. In this case, smaller television audience fragmentation is not due to strong PBS, but to the less developed new technological and institutional affordances, linked to weak markets. This digitized mediascape is characterized by lower mediatization indices in all the indicators proposed than the previous two types of media landscapes, showing a group of countries on the east and the south of Europe which are lagging in terms of their structural conditions, both institutional and technological, which promote mediatization.

The Israeli media system clustered separately in the first analysis (if was not included in the second round), showing a divergence in main characteristics from the previous three media systems. It is characterized by higher social inclusiveness and social media diffusion accompanied with highest television audience concentration in a moderately developed media market. It scores lower on political inclusiveness, globalization and openness of creative economy (Peruško et al. 2015). These contradictory findings are an invitation to further investigation as well.

The *Non-inclusive digitized media landscape* (Peruško et al. 2016) is composed of Turkey and the Russian Federation, both of which have low scores of institutional inclusiveness (Turkey is

classified as hybrid regime, and Russia as authoritarian regime) and freedom of expression, as well as low HDI. Additionally, they share the lowest globalization scores, have low Internet diffusion but at the same time the most fragmented television audience market. They also share medium values of smartphone diffusion. Unfortunately, these countries were not included in the comparative audience study, but the aggregate data on the digital media market provide also some pointers. It is obvious from all the examples that television audience fragmentation is not a linked with high Internet diffusion or high globalization in all media systems.

Table 1. about here

Table 2. about here

3. Agency

In his review of mediatization research in relation to theories of social change, Lundby (2014b) finds that all three approaches to mediatization engage with the relation between structure and agency: the institutional approaches favor the structural level in the institutional logic, the constructivist approaches favor agency in micro level process of symbolic interaction as the vehicle for the social construction of reality, and the material approaches (which are also stronger on the material conditions i.e. structures) favor technological affordances as vehicles of change. The proposal in this chapter is to enhance the attention to the aspect of agency within the institutional perspective, by integrating multi-level and multi-method research designs with quantitative and qualitative research strategies which would be capable of accounting not only for the structural level and aggregate individual level variations, but also the meanings and *raison* associated with communication and other media related social practice. In defining grounds for a mixed methods research strategy, Creswell and Plano Clark (2011) acknowledge that certain theoretical perspectives require both quantitative and qualitative data – this is especially highlighted in approaches that relate structure and agency (their example is Bourdieu's field theory). In this proposal pertaining to mediatization research, two more of the listed reasons apply: one data source is not enough – to understand mediatization we need to examine both the institutional and the level of practice; and, there is a need to explain initial results – qualitative studies need to complement quantitative results to add meaning and insight into the process of (mediated) social construction.

In the following section, some examples of surveyed media practices in the analyzed media system will be presented as illustrations of practice in mediatization as structuration. No claim is made about a return causal relationship between the audience behaviors/practices studied here and the change in the type of media system; in the regression analyses performed in the example studies a lot of variance was left unexplained, suggesting that there are additional variables at play. The patterns of audience practices in different digitized media systems need to be complemented by qualitative studies looking at the self-reflexive aspects of these practices as *praxis*. Even then, the change to the structures will be evident only in the future – the direction of which we might only guess.

Three empirical studies linking the macro-institutional level of media system and media related practices of citizens/audiences/consumers are reexamined below in view of the mediatization process and the empirically grounded variations in mediatization in four European digitized

media landscapes. All studies show the prevailing influence of the structural institutional level on user practice ("strategy follows structure" Benson 2014). While individual variables of gender, age, education and income expectedly explain some of the variance, the structural context of the media system where the practices took place explains additional variance. Audience studies were only performed in some of the countries included in the media system analysis: Denmark is the only in the Inclusive media system, Belgium, Germany and Italy in the Convergent media system, Croatia, Hungary, Poland and Portugal in the Peripheral media system, and Israel. Audience studies were not conducted for the countries in the Non-inclusive system.

The largest (in terms of the percent of explained variance) impact of the institutional context in respect of the use of legacy or on-line media was found in relation to reading habits in the digital media, especially for reading newspapers on Internet news sites (Peruško et al. 2015: 356). The *Inclusive system* exhibits the greatest diffusion of digitized media and the highest institutional inclusiveness, but the lowest use of news on the Internet - audiences in the *Peripheral* digitized mediascape exhibit the highest scores in this variable. This is an unexpected finding if we expect higher structural level mediatization to transpose to higher level of practices; this finding would suggest that we are not dealing with a linear relationship.

Regarding patterns of digital engagement, European audiences were found to diverge along the information and entertainment practices, or public (Couldry et al. 2007) vs. private connection. The public connection activities like writing entries at debate sites and blogs, writing and reading e-mails, getting news, reading entries at debate sites and blogs, using websites concerning interests or hobbies, and online shopping and banking is more likely in the *Convergent* digitized mediascape (Peruško and Vozab 2015). Playing computer games online, using social network sites, downloading music, film or podcasts and using chat programs all clustered in the private and social connection practices. Audiences in the *Peripheral* cluster spend more time on social networks and reading news, but less on practices of higher engagement like writing blogs and engaging in online debates, where the *Convergent* audiences are in the lead.

Online audiences in all the studied European countries are also structured according to the versatility of their online repertoires and cluster into three groups, *Passive* users as the least versatile (mostly e-mails and online news), and the most versatile being the smallest group of *Active/versatile* users who are more likely to be found in the *Peripheral* digitized media landscape. *Social networkers,* who only differ from the *Passive* cluster by their use of social networks, are more likely to be from Denmark (Peruško and Vozab 2015).

Regarding micro/mezzo spaces of media use (Vittadini et al. 2015) Israel was found to have the most diverse media mix in domestic private spaces as well as in public institutional spaces of work and school and the public interpersonal sharing places, while the *Inclusive* and *Convergent* media system clusters show most varied media use in the common domestic spaces. Internet is used in the largest number of micro/mezzo places in Israel, followed by the *Inclusive* media system. Newspapers are also consumed in the largest number and type of places in Israel. Television spatial spread is very similar, while radio is used in most analyzed spaces in the *Peripheral* digitized media system (Aroldi et al. 2015). Two of the types of users are particularly interesting in view of mediatization: *Flexible* user prefers slightly the public spaces of the home but uses media a lot also in private and shared public spaces. This type is more likely in the *Peripheral* media system. The *Ubiquitous* user who equally uses different media in all private and public spaces is more likely in Israel and the *Peripheral* digitized mediascape (Aroldi et al. 2015). Of course, we have no yardstick against which to gauge if one practice or another is more or less mediatized. As mediatization is seen as the degree of change in social

practice related to media and communication, larger number of spaces of media use would suggest opportunity for more social practices to experience mediatization

4. And Back Again

This chapter aimed to expand on the structuration approach to mediatization by a stronger focus on the agency aspect of the process in terms of media use, and in relation to the media system as the structural institutional level. A multi-level approach was able to show influences of the structural level on variation of media practices (Peruško et al. 2015; Peruško and Vozab 2015; Aroldi et al. 2015). Mixed methods research strategy combining quantitative and qualitative research was suggested as the way to move mediatization research forward in terms of the possibility of explaining the mediatization process which is at the same time entrenched in both structure and practice in different social areas.

The chapter developed an empirical analysis of the similarities and differences of mediatization in media systems at the structural level. Five main dimensions that affect mediatization at the macro level were proposed and examined in relation to media landscapes of 33 countries. Higher degrees of mediatization were associated with a) higher spread of all the media, and especially the digital media, linked to a higher commercialization of the media market, b) larger and more active sector of creative industries or media culture, c) higher globalization d) higher audience fragmentation, and e) more inclusive political and social institutions.

Media system related changes that feed the last phase of deep mediatization were systematically and cross-culturally mapped by portraying the structural institutional configurations that characterize mediatization in Europe at the beginning of the 21st century. Five media landscapes with varied levels of mediatization were found: *Inclusive, Convergent, Peripheral, Non-inclusive*. Israel was also included in the analysis, but clustered separately (this obviously points to the need for including more countries in the analysis to observe other patterns of variation). Three of the clusters include also post-socialist CEE countries, which are for the first time systematically viewed from a mediatization perspective. These groupings of digitized media landscapes are historically and culturally specific, and represent the shape of things in the present time according to the employed model of digital media landscapes; no claim is made of the exhaustiveness of the model. Also, present structures are the result of multi-causal historical processes (for an example of historical institutionalism for empirical analysis of media systems see Peruško 2016). Hopefully this first analysis of structural media system mediatization will be extended in breadth and in depth in future research.

The comparative cross-cultural analysis of media systems was accompanied with the analysis of practices of media use as agency, which allows some tentative inferences regarding audience practices in relation to degrees of mediatization at the structural level. While in all the studies the macro-level showed statistically significant influences on audience practices, the influence is more significant/stronger in relation to on-line activities related to civic practices (i.e. news reading and writing blogs, commenting and sharing, as opposed to only entertainment practices), in relation to Internet related media use more than in legacy media practices. There appear two types of media users in relation to where they use media that might be significant to mediatization: the Flexible and the Ubiquitous types, who use diverse media in different public and private spaces, and thus presumably also for greater number of social purposes. As a broader spread of the spatial use of media is an indicator of mediatization, as well as the increased number of social practices affected or created by the media (Schulz 2004), this is a potentially important finding.

Some practices that we would expect with deep mediatization are found in less developed structural contexts (i.e. the Ubiquitous media user is more likely in Israel and the Peripheral media system), the Active users with the most versatile media repertoire are found in the Peripheral media landscape, although the participation in more active public connection practices like blogging and discussing online is most prevalent in the Convergent mainstream media landscape. This speaks to the importance of the inclusive democratic institutional tradition and the habits of participation, more developed in old democracies, but also contradicts our expectation that the most mediatized structure (the Inclusive media system) will have the most diverse media related practices. Here again we have perhaps more questions than answers, but the type of question we need to ask about types of audience practice and their meanings and consequences has been refined. The multi-level design should be complemented by interpretive studies aimed at explanations and meanings of these structuring practices. Audience practice emerges as an important dimension for studying mediatization, while the findings presented here point to rich possibilities for mediatization specific mixed-methods research designs in historically specific digitized media landscapes.

References

Acemoğlu, Daron, and James A. Robinson. 2012. *Why nations fail: The origins of power, prosperity, and poverty*. New York: Random House.

Ampuja, Marko. 2012. Globalization theory, media-centrism and neoliberalism: A critique of recent intellectual trends. *Critical Sociology* 38 (2): 281–301. Originally published online 21 September 2011. DOI: 10.1177/0896920510398018.

Appadurai, Arjun. 2000[1990]. Disjuncture and difference in the global cultural economy. In *Readings in contemporary political sociology*, ed. Kate Nash, 100-114. Oxford UK: Blackwell.

Aroldi, Piermarco, Antonija Čuvalo, Marina Micheli, Francesca Pasquali, Zrinjka Peruško, Nicoletta Vittadini, and Dina Vozab. 2015. Spaces across Europe: Where people use media. Paper presented at the 65th ICA Annual Conference "Communication across the Life Span", 20-25 May, 2015, San Juan, Puerto Rico.

Benson, Rodney. 2014. Strategy follows structure: A media sociology manifesto. In *Media sociology: A reappraisal*, ed. Silvio Waisbord, 25-45. Cambridge UK, Malden MA: Polity.

Benson, Rodney, and Erik Neveu. 2005. *Bourdieu and the journalistic field*. Cambridge UK, Malden MA: Polity Press.

Blumler, J.G., & Gurevitch, M. 1995. *The Crisis of Public Communication*. London, New York: Routledge.

Bolin, Göran. 2010. Media events, Eurovision and societal centres. In *Media events in a global age*, eds. Nick Couldry, Andreas Hepp, and Friedrich Krotz, 124-138. London, New York: Routledge.

Bolin, Göran. 2014. Institution, technology, world: Relations between the media, culture, and society. In *Mediatization of communication*, ed. Knut Lundby, 175-198. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Bolin, Göran. 2017. *Media generations. Experience, identity and mediatised social change*. London: Routledge.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 2005. The political field, the social science field, and the journalistic field. In *Bourdieu and the journalistic field*, ed. Rodney Benson, and Erik Neveu, 29-47. Cambridge UK, Malden MA: Polity Press.

Brüggemann, Michael, Sven Engesser, Florin Buchel, Edda Humprecht, and Laia Castro. 2014. Hallin and Mancini revisited: Four empirical types of Western media systems. *Journal of Communication* 64(6):1037–1065.

Castells, Manuel. 1996. *The rise of the networked society*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Castells, Manuel. 2009. *Communication power*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chadwick, Andrew. 2013. *The hybrid media system: Politics and power*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Couldry, Nick. 2012. *Media, society, world: Social theory and digital media practice*. Cambridge: Polity.

Couldry, Nick. 2014. Mediatization and the future of field theory. In *Mediatization of communication*, ed. Knut Lundby, 227-245. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Couldry, Nick, and Andreas Hepp. 2017. *The mediated construction of reality*. Cambridge: Polity.

Couldry, Nick, Sonia Livingstone, and Tim Markham. 2007. *Media consumption and public engagement: Beyond the presumption of attention*. Basingstoke, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Creswell, John W., Vicky L. Plano Clark. 2011. *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. Los Angeles: Sage.

Deacon, David, and James Stanyer. 2014. Mediatization: Key concept or conceptual bandwagon? *Media, Culture & Society* 36(7): 1032 –1044.

Deuze, Mark. 2011. Media life. *Media, Culture & Society* 33(1): 137–148.

Dreher, A. (2006). Does globalization affect growth? Evidence from a new Index of Globalization, *Applied Economics, 38*(10), 1091–1110.

Esser, Frank. 2013. Mediatization as a challenge: Media logic versus political logic. In *Democracy in the age of globalization and mediatization*, ed. Hanspeter Kriesi, Sandra Lavenex, Frank Esser, Jörg Matthes, Marc Bühlmann, and Daniel Bochsler, 155-76. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Finnemann, Niels O. 2014. Digitization: New trajectories of mediatization? In *Mediatization of communication*, ed. Knut Lundby, 297-321. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Flew, Terry, and Silvio Waisbord. 2015. The ongoing significance of national media systems in the context of media globalization. *Media, Culture and Society* 37(4): 620–636. DOI: 10.1177/0163443714566903.

Fortunati, Leopoldina. 2005. Mediatization of the net and internetization of the mass media. *Gazette: The International Journal for Communication Studies* 67(1): 27–44. DOI: 10.1177/0016549205049177.

Fries, Christopher J. 2009. Bourdieu's reflexive sociology as a theoretical basis for mixed methods research. An application to complementary and alternative medicine. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research* 3(4): 326–348.

Giddens, Anthony. 1984. *The constitution of society*. Berkley, Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Hallin, Daniel C., and Paolo Mancini. 2004. *Comparing media systems. Three models of media and politics*. Cambridge UK: Cambridge University Press.

Hardy, Jonathan. 2012. Comparing media systems. In *The handbook of comparative communication research*. ICA Handbook Series, eds. Frank Esser, and Thomas Hanitzsch, 185-206. New York, London: Routledge.

Hasebrink, Uwe, and Hanna Domeyer. 2012. Media repertoires as patterns of behaviour and as meaningful practices: A multimethod approach to media use in converging media environments. *Participations. Journal of Audience and Reception Studies* 9(2): 757–779.

Hepp, Andreas, and Uwe Hasebrink. 2014. Human interaction and communicative figurations. The transformation of mediatized cultures and societies. In *Mediatization of communication*, ed. Knut Lundby, 249-271. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Hepp, Andreas, Stig Hjarvard, and Knut Lundby. 2010. Mediatization: Empirical perspectives: An introduction to a special issue. *Communications* 35: 223–228. DOI 10.1515/COMM.2010.012.

Herkman, Juha 2012, Convergence or intermediality? Finnish political communication in the New Media Age, *Convergence: The International Journal of Research into New Media Technologies* 18(4) 369-384

Hjarvard, Stig. 2008. The mediatization of society. A theory of the media as agents of social and cultural change. *Nordicom Review* 29(2): 105–34.

Hjarvard, Stig. 2013. *The mediatization of culture and society*. New York: Routledge.

Hjarvard, Stig. 2014a. From mediation to mediatization: The institutionalization of new media. In *Mediatized worlds. Culture and society in a media age*, eds. Andreas Hepp, and Friedrich Krotz, 123-142. Basingstoke, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Hjarvard, Stig. 2014b. Mediatization and cultural and social change: An institutional perspective. In *Mediatization of communication*, ed. Knut Lundby, 199-226. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Hjarvard, Stig, and Line N. Petersen. 2013. Mediatization and cultural change. *Special issue of MedieKultur. Journal of media and communication research* 54: 1–7.

Jansson, André. 2002. The mediatization of consumption: Towards an analytical framework of image culture. *Journal of Consumer Culture* 2: 5. DOI: 10.1177/146954050200200101.

Jensen, Klaus Bruhn, Helles, Rasmus 2015. Audiences Across Media. A Comparative Agenda for Future Research on Media Audiences. Introduction. *International Journal of Communication*. (9) 291-298.

Jones, Matthew R., and Helena Karsten. 2008. Giddens's structuration theory and information systems research. *MIS Quarterly* 32(1): 127–157.

Krotz, Friedrich. 2009. Mediatization. A concept with which to grasp media and societal change. In *Mediatization: Concepts, changes, consequences*, ed. Knut Lundby, 19-38. New York: Peter Lang.

Krotz, Friedrich. 2014. Mediatization as a mover in modernity: Social and cultural change in the context of media change. In *Mediatization of communication. Handbooks in Communication Science*, ed. Knut Lundby, 131-162. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Livingstone, S (2009) On the mediation of everything. *Journal of Communication*, 59(1): 1 – 18.

Livingstone, Sonia, and Peter Lunt. 2014. Mediatization: An emerging paradigm for media and communication research? In *Mediatization of communication. Handbooks in communication science,* ed. Knut Lundby, 703-724. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Lundby, Knut. 2009. *Mediatization: Concepts, changes, consequences*. New York: Peter Lang.

Lundby, Knut. 2014a. Introduction. Mediatization of communication. In *Mediatization of communication. Handbooks in communication science*, ed. Knut Lundby, 3-38. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Lundby, Knut. 2014b. A pattern in social theories of change within mediatization research. Paper for the panel in the TWG on Mediatization, ECREA Conference Lisboa Nov 2014 13.10.2014.

Magin, Melanie. 2015. Shades of mediatization: Components of media logic in German and Austrian elite newspapers (1949–2009). *The International Journal of Press/Politics* 20(4): 415–437. DOI: 10.1177/1940161215595944.

Norris, P., & Inglehart, R. (2009). *Cosmopolitan communications. Cultural diversity in a globalized World*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.Peruško, Z. (2013). Rediscovering the Mediterranean characteristics of the Croatian media system. *East European Politics and Societies*, *27*(4), 709– 726. doi:10.1177/0888325413494770

Peruško, Zrinjka. 2016. Historical institutionalist approach in comparative media systems research: The case of Post-Yugoslavia. *Javnost – The Public* 2. DOI: 10.1080/13183222.2016.1210461.

Peruško, Zrinjka, and Antonija Čuvalo. 2014. Comparing socialist and post-socialist television culture. Fifty years of television in Croatia. *View – Journal of European Television, History & Culture* 3(5): 131–150. http://www.viewjournal.eu/index.php/view/article/view/96/109. Accessed: 22 April 2017.

Peruško, Zrinjka, and Dina Vozab. 2015. Mediatization of political engagement in digital mediascapes: Comparing European online audiences. Paper presented at the ECREA Communication and Democracy Section Conference: "Political Agency in the Digital Age", 9-10 October, 2015, Copenhagen.

Peruško, Zrinjka, Dina Vozab, and Antonija Čuvalo. 2013. Audiences as a source of agency in media systems: Post-socialist Europe in comparative perspective. *Medialni Studia* (Media Studies) 2: 137–154.

Peruško, Zrinjka, Dina Vozab, and Antonija Čuvalo. 2015. Digital mediascapes, institutional frameworks, and audience practices across Europe. *International Journal of Communication* 9: 342–364.

Peruško, Z., Vozab, D., Čuvalo, A. Mediatization of Journalism: Comparing European Digital Mediascapes. Paper presented at the 6th European Communication Research and Education Conference (ECREA), Prague9 – 12. 11. 2016.

Poole, Marshall S. 2009. Response to Jones and Karsten, "Giddens's structuration theory and information systems research". *MIS Quarterly* 33(3): 583–587.

Rantanen, Terhi. 2013. A critique of the systems approaches in comparative media research: A Central and Eastern European perspective. *Global Media and Communication* 9(3): 257–277. DOI: 10.1177/1742766513504175.

Scannell, Paddy. 2016. Media and religion. (Editor's introduction to the special issue). *Media, Culture and Society* 38(1): 3–7. DOI: 10.1177/0163443715615410.

Schrott, Andrea. 2009. Dimensions: Catch-all labels or technical terms. In *Mediatization. Concept, changes, consequences*, ed. Knut Lundby, 41-62. New York: Peter Lang.

Schulz, Winfried. 2004. Reconstructing mediatization as an analytical concept. *European Journal of Communication* 19(1): 87–101.

Schulz, Winfried. 2014. Mediatization and new media. In *Mediatization of politics: Understanding the transformation of Western democracies.*, eds. Frank Esser, and Jesper Strömbäck, 57-73. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Schwarz, Jonah Andersson, 2016, Public Service Broadcasting and Data-Driven Personalization: A View from Sweden. Television and New Media, 17(2) 124-141

Strömbäck, Jesper. 2008. Four phases of mediatization: An analysis of the mediatization of politics. *Press/Politics* 13(3): 228–246. DOI: 10.1177/1940161208319097.

Udris, Linards, and Jens Lucht. 2014. Mediatization at the structural level: Independence from politics, dependence on the market. In *Mediatization of politics: Understanding the transformation of Western democracies*, eds. Frank Esser, and Jesper Strömbäck, 114-136. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Umbricht, Andrea, and Frank Esser. 2013. Changing political news? Long-term trends in American, British, French, Italian, German, and Swiss press reporting. Working paper no. 57. National Centre for Competence in Research (NCCR), Challenges to Democracy in the 21st Century. 32 p.

Vittadini, Nicoletta, Marina Micheli, Francesca Pasquali, and Piermarco Aroldi. 2015. Spaces across Europe: Where people use media. *International Journal of Communication* 9: 412–434.

Williams, Raymond. 2003[1974]. *Television. Technology and cultural form*. London, New York: Routledge.

Table 1. Bivariate correlation between all digitized media landscapes variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
Democracy	1													
Social & economic equality	.82**	1												
Political regime	.71**	.34*	1											
Media freedom	.91**	.79**	.69**	1										
Newspaper circulation	.68**	.64**	0.21	.55**	1									
TV audience	0.23	0.04	0.17	0.21	0.27	1								
Market position of public television	.46**	.58**	-0.01	.4*	.47**	0.13	1							
Internet	.74**	.82**	0.32	.67**	.67**	0.05	.51**	1						
Social media	.5**	.35*	0.21	0.33	.51**	.5**	.37*	.45**	1					
Telephone change	.47**	.43*	0.17	.42*	.55**	0.17	0.15	0.31	0.27	1				
Smartphone	.51**	.59**	-0.03	0.29	.64**	-0.04	.61**	.57**	.49**	.44**	1			
Cultural import	.51**	.62**	0.19	.54**	.45**	-0.12	.44*	.61**	0.3	0.25	.54**	1		
Cultural export	0.29	.39*	0.13	.38*	0.2	-0.15	0.26	.4*	0.13	0.09	0.31	.88**	1	
Globalization	.57**	.71**	0.32	.67**	0.28	-0.06	0.33	.47**	0.1	0.31	0.27	.6**	.4*	1

Note: *p ≤ .05; **p ≤ .01

Source: Peruško, Vozab & Čuvalo 2016

Table 2 Digitization of European media landscapes in deep mediatization

Media landscape	Countries*	System characteristics	Mediatization
Inclusive	Austria, **Denmark**, Finland, Iceland, Netherlands, Sweden	Highest political inclusiveness, highest social inclusiveness, highest globalization, highly developed digital media market, highest imports & exports in cultural industry sector and moderate TV concentration	Most pronounced structural mediatization indicators, except TV audience fragmentation; Internet and radio used in more places than in most other types (except Israel); most varied media use in common domestic places (with Convergent media system)
Convergent	**Belgium**, Estonia, France, **Germany**, Ireland, **Italy**, Malta, Slovenia, Spain, United Kingdom	High social and high political inclusiveness, highest globalization, higher to moderately developed digital media market, low TV concentration, and developed and open cultural industry sector	High to moderate structural mediatization indicators, Most active online audiences in public connection/ civic participation
Peripheral	Bulgaria, **Croatia**, Cyprus, Czech, FYRM, Greece, **Hungary**, Latvia, **Poland**, **Portugal**, Romania, Serbia Slovakia	Lower political and social inclusiveness, lower globalization, less developed digital media market and not significant cultural industry sector, higher TV concentration	Less advanced structural mediatization indicators More than average ubiquitous media use, on-line news use, points towards mediatization of practices (agency over structure)
Non-inclusive	Russian Federation, Turkey	Lowest political, social and economic development, lowest globalization, low Internet, but medium smartphone penetration, most fragmented TV audiences, lower position of public television, lowest import and export of culture	The lowest scores on all mediatization indicators except audience fragmentation; only moderate smartphone diffusion might speak to practices of mediatization.
Israel	**Israel**	Lower political and higher social inclusiveness, lower globalization, moderately developed digital media market (but highest social media diffusion), less open creative economy and highest TV concentration	Less advanced structural mediatization indicators, except social media penetration (linked to higher HDI) Most ubiquitous media users, points to mediatization of practice.

Adapted from Peruško, Vozab & Čuvalo, 2015, 2016.

* In bold are countries included in the comparative audience study (Jensen & Helles 2015).

Two countries changed clusters between the first and second study: Austria clustered in the Convergent system in the 2015 study, and Slovenia in the Peripheral system.