POLITICAL COMMUNICATION AND DELIBERATIVE DEMOCRACY

Toni Čabraja

PhD student, SKM Alma Mater Europaea, Slovenia

✉ *toni.cabraja@gmail.com*

Abstract: The problem of political abstention of voters leaves democratic institutions without content. That is why the role of political communication in the context of the essential development of democracy is becoming very relevant today. We are interested in how deliberative communication, as a model of political communication, is connected with the mobilization of voters in political processes, which is how democracy is realized. The meaning of deliberatization is based on the idea of bringing stakeholders closer to a consensus through a free and equal dialogue of political communication in the communication community. In this way, a better legitimacy of political decisions is achieved. It is a process of discursive political communication that "creates and maintains" the actions of the government. The research question of our article was how scientific and professional theory look at the role of deliberative communication, as a model of political communication, in the process of political participation of political stakeholders in the communication community today. We assumed (the hypothesis) that scientific theory looks optimistically at the role of deliberative communication. In the article, we used the descriptive method and the method of analysing scientific and professional texts. We carried out the research with a review of domestic and foreign editions of professional books, monographic publications, original scientific articles, and research results. We obtained data using the Cobiss and Google Scholar databases. The results of the research showed that scientific theory views deliberative communication as a promising experiment and evolution in the realization of deliberative democracy..

Keywords: democracy, communication, deliberative democracy, political communication, political participation

JEL classification: A10, P40

1. Introduction

Man is a social being, which means that symbolic social interaction (communication) is his immanent need and destiny. Sociability is not a matter of individual choice or will, but rather an expression of the impossibility of individual existence. This fact indicates that society (polis) is the result of numerous different interactions or communication processes. "Research has shown that a person spends 75 percent of his daily time communicating" (Tabbs Stewart, 2013 p. 33), which indicates the importance of communication, both in the life of an individual and, even more, in the life of social communities. Communicating is witnessing the existence of everything living in a biological sense, but also non-living things, such as different organizational structures in society and of course all social groups, associations, and communities that make up a particular society. Of course, the practice of social existence has profiled different types and sorts of contextual communication and models of communication. In our review, we focused on the research of political communication and its role in realizing discursive or deliberative democracy. However, it is practical to give in the introduction at least some of the many attempts of searching for a single, unique definition of the term communication, from which political communication as a type of communication became autonomous.

Communication specialist Prof. Dr. Mario Plenković states the following in his main work Komunikologija masovnih medija (Communicology of Mass Media): "Communication is a process in which information from the status *per se* appears in the so-called use value when it becomes a value for other people as well. Etymologically, to communicate means to talk *(communicatio-onis — conversation),* to converse with each other, to exchange information (Plenković. 1993, p. 66)." After browsing the selected literature, we found that there are few terms that have so many different attempts of defining as communication. However, what they all have in common is that it is "a process through which symbols are transmitted with the intention of provoking a reaction (L.A. Samovar et a1., 2007, 12)." In addition to the fact that communication is an interactive social process, a special dimension to this term was given by the doyen of Slovenian communication science, France Vreg, who stated: »The new communication paradigm is based on the assumption that communication is a form of cooperative interaction in which the process of conjunction and disjunction, the basic preservation of identity and personal interest, is latently present (Vreg,1998, p. 5)."

Interpersonal communication, by which we mean both diode and mass communication, is the basis of interpersonal relations in society. It is actually a way of existence, i.e., a way of connecting individuals and groups, one could also say that communication is equal to relationship, to community, i.e., politics. The nature of connection is based on the existence of disagreement, asymmetry, opposites, and above all in rationality. "That is why the model of mutual communication, which would be based on an equal partnership between the communicator and the recipient,

is a bare fiction. Theories of 'equal communication opportunities' are a vision of humane communication, but in reality, they remain a social utopia. The same applies to the idea of communicative action, which is directed towards the consensual power of communicative understanding to achieve cooperative action. Empirically more realistic is his category of 'strategic interaction,' which operates with external influence (gratification or threat, suggestion or deception) (Vreg, 1990, p. 304)." France Vreg continues, "communicating is a purposeful and active reaching into social processes with speech and other messages, it is an integration tool of social groups and global society (Vreg, 1990, p. 305)." In short, as France Vreg says, the equality of communicative possibilities of communicators is a fiction and a vision of humane communication. According to that vision, the model of deliberative communication is the one that, with its principles, means bringing that vision closer to its reality.

The liberal theory of democratic mass communication has suffered a lot of criticism due to the growing criticism of the traditional pluralistic model. For this reason, political scientists have developed a new paradigm of participatory democracy, primarily with the participation of workers or employees in the management of companies. Therefore, the theory of participatory democracy is first and foremost a scientific critique of the liberal theory of democratic communication and a step toward the promotion of the model of deliberative communication. Mc Quail very precisely established that the democratic participatory theory means, among other things, "disappointment with established political parties and the system of parliamentary democracy which, as it seems, has broken away from its human roots and would rather hinder than facilitate participation in political and social life" (Mc Quail, 1987, p. 122).

As it follows from the sociological axiom about man as a social being, »a democratic republic needs both motivation and public dialogue. It needs engaged citizens, who can coordinate their knowledge, messages, and actions. It needs opposing forces to compete for attention and support in the public sphere. If the conflict does occur, a healthy democratic republic needs forums where dissenters can debate, negotiate and convince others on the basis of known facts, agreed conditions, clearly defined problems, and a series of offered answers or solutions (Siva, 2018, p. 21). The very principles of dialogue presented in their own way identify the foundations of discursive or deliberative democracy, which Jürgen Habermas also talks about. Habermas's theory of communicative action, to summarize, rests on the idea that social order ultimately depends on the ability of actors to recognize the intersubjective validity of various claims on which social cooperation depends.

1.1. Methods

In the article, we used the descriptive method, the text analysis method, and also the comparative method. With comparison (comparison as a method), we connected certain terms, i.e., keywords, and searched for common denominators of those terms through analysis. We made a review of professional and scientific literature based on a review of domestic and foreign editions of professional books, monographic publications, scientific and professional articles. We obtained data using the Cobiss and Google Scholar databases. In order to exclude the breadth of terms, we focused on keywords such as deliberative communication and deliberative democracy in the search strings. For the term deliberative communication, 282 references were found, and in Cobiss only 18. For the purposes of explaining our research question, we also used an overview of the daily press and selected only certain interesting and inspiring articles. This relatively smaller number of references is a consequence of the more recent use of the term "deliberativeness" in the development and functioning of democracy.

1.2 Aim

The aim and purpose of this work is to search through and present the literature in the field of political communication, i.e. deliberative communication as a model and deliberative democracy. Therefore, we want to search scientific and professional literature as well as articles in print media that refer to our topic. With this search or research, we wanted to obtain an indication for the identification of a new research question in the area of deliberative communication (as a process) or deliberative democracy. The purpose of the article search is certainly also the publication of the article, whichwould also encourage other researchers to conduct similar research in the area of new contents of deliberative communication, i.e., new ways of conceptualizing the communication functions of contemporary societies.

2.Literature review

2.1 *On political communication and communicative action*

Nothing exists outside of politics, and political communication as a way of its materialization or realization. The multitude of social interactions in organizational structures of different levels and social areas is nothing but political communication. "Every attempt to define political communication and to present it as a subject of scientific research faces its limitlessness and great complexity, according to U. Saxer (1998). Political communication is, therefore, according to the opinion advocated by Saxer (1998), something more than a mere means of politics. It is itself also politics" (Tomić, 2020, p. 74). The conclusion is often made that communication models political power, however T. Đorđević believes that "political communication is an

inseparable component of each of the mechanisms of the political system of government, which means that it itself is modelled in the shadow of political power and the dominance of one class over other classes, groups or strata structures" (Đorđević, 1988, p. 15).

Communication professor R. M. Perloff from Cleveland University defines political communication as a "process by which national leadership, media and citizens exchange and give messages related to the implementation of public policy" (R, M. Perloff, p. 8-9). In this sense of connecting political communication with the public discourse of action, we cite another definition of political communication as "public discussion on the allocation of public resources (income), official authority (which is given the power to make legal, legislative and executive decisions) and official sanctions (what the state rewards or punishes)" (Denton and Woodward 1990, p. 14). McNair understood the previous definition according to his view of the role of communication in politics as "purposive communication in politics". According to him, this includes:

"1. All forms of communication used by politicians and other political actors for the purpose of achieving specific goals;

2. Communication directed towards these actors by non-politicians such as voters and newspaper columnists; and

3. Communication about these actors and their activities as found in reports, editorials, and other forms of media discussion about politics" (McNair 2003, p. 12).

Regardless of the fact that the main purpose of our literature review is deliberative communication as a model of political communication, it should be pointed out for a more holistic view that the model of persuasive communication is the most widely used in political communication. "In politics, political communication, international relations, and diplomacy, persuasive communication is used in order to convince the interlocutor, group or public with arguments of the correctness of the opinions, actions, attitudes of individuals or groups, and to additionally strengthen the state, personal or party position. This is especially true for diplomacy, the main purpose of which is 'to enable states to achieve the goals of their foreign policies without resorting to force, propaganda or the law'" (Tomić 2016, p. 955). Persuasion is only one of the communication skills in the field of political influence among actors on the political scene. It is unusual, but we have established, that persuasive communication is mostly used in the form of pre-election activities in so-called political campaigns. "Communication in a political campaign has one clear goal: to convince voters that a certain candidate is a better choice than his opponent or opponents" (William and Pamela Benoit, 2013 p., 239).

Political communication can also be understood as "the area where the conflicting speeches of the three main movers, who have the legitimacy to speak publicly about politics, are exchanged, namely politicians, journalists, and public

opinion through polls" (Wolton, 1989, p. 28). Of course, there are many definitions for persuasive communication as well. One of them is the following: "Persuasion is a developmental communication activity in which one communicator tries to convince another to shape, confirm or change his reactions and support or create new habits towards a certain object or group of objects, whereby the persuader uses trained and planned verbal and non-verba1 behaviors" (Reardon, 1998, p.114-116). We are talking about a model of communication which comes closest to and belongs to the area of strategic communication. Of course, the source of strategic communication has its roots for understanding in politics, i.e., in political communication, especially mass communication with different publics.

Since political communication can also be understood as a communicative strategic action in the public sphere, it is good to look at the characteristics of the theory of communicative action and communicative competence according to Jurgen Habermas. "Communicative competence is the ability of the speaker (communicator), who is ready to understand or to 'combine' an understandable sentence into the relations of communicative reality. The theory of communicative competence, therefore, presupposes an 'ideal speech situation' as pure intersubjectivity — without brakes in the communication process. Habermas believes that the conversation makes sense if at least two subjects act in the agreement or agree on something. The ideal speech situation according to Habermas is as follows;

"1. All participants have equal opportunities to choose what to talk about;

2. An equal distribution of possibilities, reasoning, assertions, explanations, and justifications, and substantiation of the 'requirement that something is valid' must be established; speakers must not lie to themselves or others about their intentions;

3. Only speakers, as communicators, are allowed to have equal opportunities to use representatives (which are given the pragmatic meaning of the speaker's self-identification; see, think, allow, keep silent, etc.). Such a speech situation is certainly a utopia. It should lead to consensus in dialogue. Communicative action is directed towards the consensual power of spoken communication, in order to achieve useful cooperation of action" (F. Vreg, 1989, p. 216-226). Communicative action, as can be seen, is a consensual form of social coordination, in which actors "use the potential for rationality," which they discursively construct using a communicative argument, in order to finally arrive at a rational decision.

2.2 On democracy and deliberative communication

The first outlines of what we now call democracy or the rule of the people can be found in ancient Greece. Even then, the intention appeared that democracy would have to act according to the concept of rule and be ruled. "In democratic states, all citizens have the right to participate in all state affairs" (Aristotle, 1970, p. 235). In

Aristotle, in his capital work Politics (Held,1990), we also find the foundation of the basic principle of democracy, according to which the majority has the right, i.e., the rule of the majority over the minority. "The basis of the popular (or democratic) state order is freedom. And one of the freedoms is to alternately rule and obey. Because in popular (national b.v.) rule, what is just is what is equal according to number, not according to dignity... since it is justly placed in this way, supremacy necessarily belongs to the majority, and whatever the majority approves becomes the goal and what is just. This is how it happens in national (popular) governments, that the poor have more power. Because there are more of them, and the decision of the majority is paramount" (Aristotle, 1988). We are talking about the rule of the people, the characteristics of which are: "for all positions in the government, everyone is chosen from among everyone; everyone rules over everyone individually and each individual alternately over everyone, and no one can hold the same position twice" (Held, 1990, p. 33). "In ancient Greece, the Athenians practiced democracy in small cities — states. There, all free people could directly comment on events in the community, and politicians had the opportunity to directly contact the people" (Tomić, Zoran 2020, p. 71). After the Second World War, democracy was the most frequently represented political idea and type of order. Different regimes declared themselves democracies. As a rule, the more questionable the democratic nature of a regime was, the more it tried to legitimize itself by appealing to democracy. The term democracy thus lost its actual meaning, and the need for additional labels and distinctions increased.

"R. Dahl listed eight criteria for defining and measuring democracy that is still widely accepted: 1) the right to vote, 2) the right to be elected, 3) the right of political leaders to compete for support and votes, 4) free and fair elections, 5) freedom of association, 6) freedom of expression, 7) alternative sources of information, and 8) institutions for mating public policies depend on votes and other expressions of preferences" (A. Lijphart. 2014, p. 55). However, mere participation and the creation of a certain majority is not the only problem of democracy. "Democracy thrives when the masses have the opportunity to actively participate in defining the priorities of public life, not only through voting but also through discussion and through autonomous organizations. It is ambitious to think that a large number of people with a real interest will participate in true and genuine debate and compete in setting political agendas and that they will consciously engage in following events and political issues" (C. Crouch, 2007, p. 9). Colin Crouch is not satisfied with the minimum requirements of liberal democracy, because it gives birth to something he calls "post-democracy." According to that model, although democratic elections are conducted and governments are formed based on their results, the electoral debate is a tightly controlled spectacle led by opposing groups of professionals, experienced in persuasion techniques, and dealing with issues chosen by a narrow circle of people. The mass of citizens plays a passive role, compliant, even apathetic, limiting itself to reacting to the signals it receives. My thesis is that we are increasingly moving towards a post-democratic pole, and this explains the widespread feeling of

disappointment and dissatisfaction with the level of participation and relations between the political class and the mass of citizens in many, perhaps the largest number of developed countries" (C. Crouch, 2007, p. 10).

However, liberal democracy is not a guarantee for the flourishing of communicative rationality. In fact, the social institutions in modem capitalist societies which should ideally be of a communicative nature — e.g., society, politics, and education — according to Habermas embodied only 'strategic' rationality. Such institutions are increasingly overwhelmed by economic and bureaucratic forces which are not guided by the ideals of mutual understanding, but rather by the principles of administrative power and economic efficiency (Jürgen Habeimas' e-book Philosophy and Social Theory). "In thèse first years of the 21ᵗ century, democracy is going through a period of significant paradoxes. A recent report by the Trilateral Commission — a body chosen between European, Japanese and American researchers — came to the conclusion that not all is great about the democracies of those countries. The authors believe that this is primarily due to a decrease in the legitimacy of politicians' actions, caused by the decreasing participation of voters in elections. They could expand their analysis by taking into account the problem of the public which distrusts politicians more and more" (C. Crouch, 2007, p. 8).

The idea of deliberative communication implies communication in which (a) different views meet each other and give the arguments for those different views time and space to be articulated and presented, (b) there is tolerance and respect for the concrete other and the participants learn to listen to the argument of the other person, (c) elements of collective will formation are present, i.e. an effort to reach consensus or at least temporary agreements or to draw attention to differences (Englund 2016, 58). It follows from what has been said that the so-called social truth is hidden in the respectful confrontation of different views and their coexistence. More specifically, the communicative aspect of deliberation means that through communicative practice we encourage respect for the so-called deliberative principles in such a way that the participants in the discussion listen to each other, rationally base their positions, show mutual respect, and at the same time reflect on their interests and needs from the aspect of their generalization (Bachtiger in Steenbergen 2004, p. 1; Asen 2015, p. 9). The role of the public is also significant, and it should also get involved with its views (Degelnik et a1, 2015, p. 131: 114—121).

We note that quite a few authors, who talk about deliberation, often mention the notion of mutual respect between communicators in the discursive process. Therefore, mutual respect plays an important role and means, "that the participants in the discussion, in addition to expressing their opinions and demands, and at the same time reflecting their own interests and needs, should listen to and respect each other" (Steenbergen et a1., 2003). Even if access to the discussion and participation in it are among the fundamental conditions for deliberation, this still does not ensure mutual listening and mutual respect of the communicators. This is exactly the function of mutual respect because it enables quality deliberation (Steiner, 2012). in

most discussions about deliberation, respect is understood as an intersubjective phenomenon, where for a quality discussion and effective achievement of consensual and constructive solutions, it is important that the speaker respects the listener and vice versa (Mansbridge et al., 2010), (Petriñ, G. and Atanasova, S. 2015, 1143/1144). Of course, like all other concepts, the concept of respect has different interpretations, however, most agree that it's about mutual respect, i.e., about not ignoring the participants in the discussion.

However, although deliberative democracy is discussed much later, John Stuart Mill himself expressed all those features that define deliberative democracy in his concern for the development of democracy. And because J.S. Mill is recognized as the founder of liberal democracy, i.e., the one who combined the foundations of liberalism and democracy in the best way, in his work we also find the ideas of rational democracy. "The idea of a rational democracy does not consist in the fact that the people themselves rule, but that the people have a guarantee that they will be well ruled. No government will have as its goal the interests of the people, except where the people can disempower their leaders as soon as their loyalty to the interests of the people is in question. The people must be a master, but a master who will employ servants more skilful than himself (J.S. Mill, 1988,p 31). "Mill was particularly concerned about the possibility of encouraging people to accept the will of the majority, destroy debate, criticism, and intellectual life in general, thereby supporting uniformity and dull conformity. Simply put, the majority is not always right: wisdom cannot be achieved by simply giving up. Mill's ideas thus found their way into the basic concept of deliberative, i.e. parliamentary democracy" (E. Hayvud, 2004,p. 149). We can conclude that J.S. Mill is one of the founders or at least the visionary of deliberative democracy.

Dahlberg understands deliberativeness as "a form of communal life where controversial issues, including the conditions under which communal life is even possible, are decided on the basis of 'public deliberation'" (Dahlberg, 2001, p. 623). "According to the advocates of deliberative democracy, the formation of political decisions is legitimate, if the policies are formed in the process of public discussion, in which citizens and their representatives overcome their own interests in favor of common interests and the common good" (Bohman 1996, p. 5). Deliberative communication is based on the idea that a decision gains legitimacy by being the result of a consensus reached through a free and equal deliberative procedure of all participants based on rational discourse (Lozo, 2020). Therefore, on the basis of the above deliberative democracy is a form of democracy in which the need for discourse and discussion is emphasized in order to determine and legitimize the public interest. Deliberative democracy expects citizens to be informed about various social and political issues, including facts, and different value perspectives on these issues, along with political interest and willingness to participate in political discussions (Vozab, Perusko, and Čuvalo, 2017, p. 113).

Deliberative communication implies communication in which different views are faced with each other and the arguments for these different views are given time and space to articulate and present; there is tolerance and respect for the specific other and the participants learn to listen to other people's opinions and attitudes (Jalil, 2015). (Mansbridge et al., 2010, p. 66-67) sees this process as communication, which in an unforced way encourages reflection on preferences, values and interests. According to the classic ideal of deliberativeness, individuals enter deliberation with conflicting opinions, but by expressing and listening to different opinions, they come closer to one single solution. Although Siedschlag Aleksander mainly talks about digital democracy, he still talks about deliberative democracy as a blueprint for the politics of the information age. "Deliberative democracy as a blueprint for information age politics includes different channels: government-to-citizen or 'G2C' communication, as well as citizen-to-government or 'C2G' communication and citizen-to-citizen or 'C2C' communication. Combining traditional and digital ways and means of democracy, digital democracy primarily aims to revive civil society — defined in this context as the interface between the institutions of democracy and the general public. In digital democracies, political decisions would ideally not be prepared, made, legitimized, and implemented by the elite, but would emerge from a broad discussion focused on the level problem" (Siedschlag 2005,p 6).

Habermas argued, "that human interaction in its fundamental forms is of a 'communicative' rather than a 'strategic' nature, insofar as it is directed at mutual understanding and agreement, not at the achievement of individual's self-interested goals (e-source Philosophy and social theory of Jürgen Habermas). Here we find a clear line between the so-called communicative and strategic nature of communication. Likewise, Jane Mansbridge talks about conflict or at least asymmetry of opinion as the first stage, discussion as the second stage, and the determination of common interest as the third stage of deliberation. According to the classic ideal of deliberativeness, individuals enter the deliberation with conflicting opinions, but by expressing different opinions and listening carefully to each other, they come closer to a single solution. An ideal deliberation is understood to be one that is based on reason and strives for consensus and the public good.

Thinking about the essence of discursive democracy without the role of the media in the communication process is incomplete or even impossible. Just as communication is a prerequisite for the transfer of information from the status of 'per se' to the communicative (non) value of 'per nos,' the media is also the second assumption of the useful (non) value of information. Namely, without transposing the information into some communication medium (speech, visible/visual communication channel, letter, electromagnetic and electronic waves, etc.) it remains silent and invisible to all recipients except the author himself. For these reasons, we can assert that 'the useful (un)value of information depends on the medium.' In a deliberative democracy, citizens not only elect their representatives, but they also incorporate their own ideas and opinions into public discourse, which

is based on a strong civil society (Riedl, 2019, p. 1378). The role of the media in the area of strengthening deliberative communication is to initiate and maintain a basic deliberative discourse, with the aim of identifying social problems and reaching agreements or solutions.

Journalists play a huge role in the development of deliberative communication and thereby creating the possibility of realizing deliberative democracy. Regardless of the type of media, the journalist is a key driving force. That's why "journalism should provide contextual information about possible backgrounds, evaluations and consequences, as well as solutions to social problems"

(Seethaler, 2015, p. 20). "In the interest of inclusion in political life, the media should invite various civil society actors and engage them to jointly discuss relevant social issues in dialogue. Therefore, their goal is to establish a forum for discussion with a multitude of different perspectives and opinions where the strongest argument wins" (Habermas, 2006, p.416). Min (2018), speaking about the role of journalism in this topic, considers deliberative (participatory) journalism important in creating and enabling public discussions among citizens. A much more important aspect of opening a discussion is that between citizens and authorities as well as other interested stakeholders. A very important aspect of discussion, which Min raises to the pedestal of value, is exactly the equal conversation made possible by technological development (Min, 2020, p.627).

Nah and Chung 2020 define participatory journalism in an interesting futuristic way as the "ecology of public communication," seen in the context of the public sphere."The ecology of public communication should be based on a healthy public sphere in which communication is linguistically limited and a certain type of discourse is practiced, and it should enable open, fair and equal access to the public sphere for everyone" (Nah, Chung, 2020, p.13). Reality, as the argument goes, is accessible only through the discourse that we have in order to give it meaning. Perception is a process of meaning-making, and meaning is a product of discourse. "Natural or objective reality does not carry meaning by itself — to prove this, it is enough just to look at how different the interpretation of universal nature is in different cultures. Discourse, as we know, is not only a product of culture but, at least in industrialized societies, also a product of society and political power relations within it (J. Fiske 1987, p. 42).

3. Discussion

Based on the review (analytical reading) of targeted literature sources, which refer to the theoretical analysis of the process of symbolic social interaction or communication, we found that communication and communicating are a constant interest and challenge for man. From the texts we have analysed, it follows that communication as an immanent, natural and social need for man is the subject of

research by a wide circle of scientists. Namely, man's natural dimension, based in the ego, and his social nature, i.e., the need to be in the company of others, represents a constant process of interactions of consensual and disjunctive trends. In any case, communication was and still is today a way of coexistence and seeking reconciliation between those two human dimensions. In addition to the fact that communication is an interactive social process, a special dimension is given to this term by the doyen of Slovenian communication, France Vreg, who claims: "The new communication paradigm is based on the assumption that communication is a form of cooperative interaction in which the process of conjunction and disjunction, the basic preservation of identity and personal interest is also latently present" (Vreg, F. 1998, 11/5). Communication is, therefore, the basic process by which relationships are formed in communities of all levels and in all areas of social life. Of course, most authors, in their attempts to define the term communication, generally start from the fact that it is a relationship between at least two people, who mutually exchange experiences, cognitions, knowledge, information and messages.

The authors generally agree that communication power is very important in regulating relations in society, but they also point out that the direction of action of that power is conditioned by political power or political ideologies. Political communication is only, as most authors say, a way of concretizing or materializing political ideas and the goals set on them. Of course, the need for methods or models of communication, which could establish equality among communication stakeholders, which is reflected in equal opportunities, mutual respect and cooperation, is becoming increasingly apparent. Therefore, in the texts of authors whom we have chosen for analysis, new aspects of communication are visible. It is about the ethical and moral principles of communication, as basic assumptions for the realization of democracy, which represent the best tests of the political system model so far. However, as France Vreg says, equality of communication possibilities of communicators is a fiction and a vision of humane communication. According to that vision, the model of deliberative communication is the one that, with its principles, brings that vision closer to its reality.

What is important for many authors, when it comes to democracy and political communication, is the knowledge that the existing model of democracy is communicatively non-propulsive for mediating the best will of the largest number of people, when it comes to the formation of government. The role of communication diagnosed in this way is a research challenge in the field of communication science. Just as democracy needs communication, communication needs democracy, which enables freedom of speech and human rights. Human history tells us that the forms of human rule, as assumptions of interpersonal respect, coexistence and equality, are the greatest human ideals which are currently realized in the human community up to the level of states. Thus, as far as logic, efficiency and sense of law can reach. Namely, every community as well as its government is communicatively mediated, which is why the nature, type, method, and models of communication are very

important. For the development of communities, and especially for the constitution of 'power' within them, as determined by the majority of analysed articles, public or political communication based on the model of deliberative communication is very important. The authors, whose works we reviewed, interpret the concept of deliberation fairly uniformly, differing only in that they emphasize certain aspects or significance of deliberation more or less. Back in his time, Aristotle with his normativistic understanding of politics emphasized the elements of deliberation. He was convinced that only those who know how to communicate tolerantly, patiently and with respect to the interlocutor, and how to talk about the common good of the Polis, are capable of maintaining their rule.

In the process of searching through the literature, we also noticed that throughout the so-called history of democracy from the beginning to the present day, elements of deliberative democracy appear, from ancient times, through liberal democratic and participatory democracy. Today's state of democracy in the free and developed world is looking for solutions offered by the theory of communicative action for the realization of deliberative democracy.

4. Conclusion

Based on the selected and reviewed sources and literature for this paper, we can conclude that the area of symbolic social interaction or communication is very relevant for research. We also concluded that in a contextual sense interpersonal, mass and public communication are the most common forms of political communication. Likewise, in the reviewed and analysed sources (literature), we noticed that deliberative communication, in the field of political communication, is an emerging model and a relatively new area of research. However, the actuality of researching new communication models in the process of the political life of communities stems from the need for political practice to develop better models of democracy. Namely, many authors led by J. Habemas, C. Crouch and others indicate that in today's globalization the content of democracy is being lost from democratic institutions and that the meaning of democracy is also being lost as civilization is entering the era of post-democracy or its development is moving towards 'democrature.' At the same time, the role of communication as a tool and the essence of democracy in the creation of a political system is increasingly emphasized. Therefore, the government as the bearer and feature of the political system is communicatively established, and it acts and is maintained by communicating. Of all forms of political communication, the most attention was paid to the first phase of persuasive communication or, in other words, to political campaigns. As for the second phase or the phase of permanent communication, the stakeholders replaced the main political interactions with one-way and bureaucratic communication as the most common form of political communication. The third phase of the political communication process, which mainly includes certain evaluations of the results from the programs of parties and institutions, has mostly been lost.

The entire political process of constituting each of the organizational structures and all levels and areas of social life is based on communication. Due to this fact, research into new forms, types and models of communication has become a constant research activity. These are communication models or, as stated by State et al., applicative creations, ideas and notions of individuals or groups of authors about the conceptualization of content and communication functions (State et al. 2015, p. 310). One of the newly conceptualized contents and communication functions is the testing of the deliberative communication model of the realization of deliberative democracy. It should be noted that deliberation with all its principles is a model of communication that can be used in all organizational structures. Deliberative communication actually has countless attempts at definitions, but what they have in common is that it makes the process of creating, executing and maintaining power in the political sphere interesting for citizens and voters. Interesting in the sense of the possibility of effective voter participation in creating reality, i.e., the conditions of life in the community. In other words, to bring decision-making closer to the consensual principle or to the ancient understanding of democracy according to the principle of 'rule and be ruled.' According to the summarized views on the usefulness of deliberative communication from the aspect of community width, we can see that this effectiveness is greater in smaller communities. However, by reviewing the data on the website of the government of the Republic of Slovenia, we noticed that the interest of voters in local elections is 25% lower than that for elections at the national level. Likewise, voter turnout at the local level is consistently below 50%, which relativizes the legitimacy of local authorities. Thus, with a review of the literature and other sources on our topic, we came to the realization that the theory and practice of deliberative communication diverge. With this, we have found a reference area for our further research, but also opened up the possibility of discussion and research by other researchers.

References

Aristotel, (1970). *Politika,* Kultura, Beograd.

Asen, R. (2015). *Democracy, deliberation, and education.* University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press.

Bächtiger, A. and Steenbergen, M. R. (2004). The Real World of Deliberation. A Comparative Study of its Favorable Conditions in Legislatures. *EUI Working Paper SPS No. 2004717.* Published in Italy.

Bohman, J. (1996). *Public deliberation: pluralism, complexity, and democracy.* The MIT Press.

Crouch, C. (2007). *Postdemokracija,* Izbori sutrašnjice, Zagreb.

Dahlberg, L. (2001). The internet and Democratic Dicourse — Exploring the Prospects of Online Deliberative Forum Extending the Public Sphere Infomation, *Communication & Society,* 4,4, pp. 615-633.

Degelnik, C et al. (2015). Which public and why deliberate? - a scoping review of public deliberation in public health and health policy. *Soc Sci Med* 131: 114-121.

Denton, R. E. & Woodward, G. C. (1990). *Political Communication in America.* New York: Praeger.

Đorđević, T. (1988). *Komunikacija i vlast,* Mladost, Beograd, 15.

Englund, T. (2016). On moral education through deliberative communication. *Journal of Curriculum Studies* 48(1): p.58-76.

Fiske, J. (1987). *Television Culture,* London: Methuen.

Habermas, J. (2006) Political Communication in Media Society: Does Democracy Still Enjoy an Epistemic Dimension? The Impact of Nomative Theory on Empirical Research, *Communication Theory,* 16 (4), 411-426. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2885.2006.00280.

Habermas. J. (2014). Stanfordska enciklopedija filozofije, downloaded from:

https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/habermas/, accessed: 21. November 2022.

Held, D. (1990). *Modeli demokracije,* Školska knjiga, Zagreb

Heywood, A (2004), *Politika,* Clio, Beograd.

Lijphart, A. (2014). *Modeli demokracije,* Fakultet političkih znanosti, Zagreb 55

Lozo, L. (2020). *Deliberativna demokracija i Habermasova teorija komunikacijske racionalnosti: strukturni preduvjeti implementacije.* Master's thesis / Diplomski rad. Zagreb: Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Filozofski fakultet.

Mansbridge, J.& Bohman, J. &, Chambers, S.&, Estlund, D.,& Føllesdal, A.&, Fung, A.&, Jose L. & Martí, J. L. (2010). The place of self-interest and the role of power in deliberative democracy. *Journal of Political Philosophy,* 18, (1): 64-100.

Matustik, M.B. Filozofija in družbena teorija Jürgena Habermasa, downloaded from: https://www.britannica.com/biography/Jurgen-Habermas/Philosophy-and-social-theory, accessed: 8. November 2022.

McQuail, D. (1984) 1987. *Mass Communication* Theory, (2 nd ed). London.

McNair, B. (2003). *Uvod u političku komunikaciju.* Zagreb: Fakultet političkih znanosti Sveučilišta u Zagrebu.

Mill, J.S. (1988). Prilog načelima dobre vladavine, Izabrani politički spisi, *Informator, Biblioteka politička misao,* Fakultet političkih nauka, Zagreb.

Min, S. J. (2018). *As Democracy Goes, So Does Journalism. Evolution of Journalism in Liberal, Deliberative, and Participatory Democracy.* Manham Maryland: Lexington Books

Nah, S. & Chung, D. S. (2020) *Understanding citizen Journalism as Civic Participation.*

New York: Routledge.

Petrič, G. & Atanasova, S. (2015). Spoštljivost v deliberacji: *Konceptualni premisleki, alternativna operacionalizacija in empirična validacija.* Teorija in praksa let. 52, (6), 1143- 1166.

Plenković, M. (1993). *Komunikologija masovnih medíja,* Barbat, Zagreb.

Plenković, M. (2019). Što je medij? (Holistčko jedinstvo sredstava za prijenos informacija i komunikatora) *Media, Culture and Public Relations,* 10, 2019, 1, 1-5.

Perloff, R. M. (1998). *Political Communication:* Politics, Press, and Public in America, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah.

Ravlić, S. (1998). Millova teorija liberalne demokracije, *Politička misao,* Vol XXXV, FPZ, Zagreb, p.145, downloaded from: https://hrcak.srce.hr/file/51258, accessed: 14 November 2022.

Reardon, K. K. (1998) *Interpersonalna komunikacija: Gdje se misli susreću,* Zagreb: Alinea.

Riedl, A. (2019) Which Journalists for Which Democracy?, *Journalism Studies,* 20 (10), 1377-1399. doi: 10.1080/l461670X.2018.1519638.

Safaei, J. (2015). Deliberative democracy in health care: current challenges and future prospects. *JHealthc Leadersh* 16(7):123-136.

Samovar, L.A. et al. (2007) 2010: *Communication between cultures,* (6 th ed.), Thomson-Wadsworth, Australia, 12.

Seethaler, J. (2015) Qualität des Tagesaktuellen Informationsangebots in den österreichischen Medien. Vienna: RTR.

Siedschlag, A. (2005). Digital Democracy and Its Application to the International Arena — From "Deliberation" to "Decision." University of Innsbruck, *School of Political Science and Sociology,* downloaded from: http://www.esci.at/eusipo/digitaldemocracy.pdf, accessed: 14 November 2022.

State, C et al. (2015). Experimental Research, New models of Organizational, downloaded from: https://www.management.ase.ro/reveconomia/2015-2/11.pdf, accessed: 14 November 2022.

Tabs, S. (2013). *Komunikacija —principi i konteksti,* Clio, Beograd.

Teršek. A. (2017). Današnja politična filozofija: realnost namesto idealov. IUS-INFO portal. Downloaded from: https://www.iusinfo.si/medijsko-sredisce/kolumne/206768, accessed: 4. November 2022.

Tomić, Z. (2022). *Političko komuniciranje,* Sveučilište u Mostaru, Sveučilište Sjever, SYNOPSIS d.o.o., Zagreb SYNOPSIS d.o.o., Sarajevo

Vadhyanathan, S. (2018). *Antidruštvene mreže — kako nas Fejsbuk razdvaja i podriva demokratiju,* (podržala fondacija za otvoreno društvo), Clio, Beograd.

Vozab, D., et al. (2017). Treći medijski sektor iz perspektive demokratski angažiranih publika, *Politička misao,* 54 (3), 108-132.

Vreg, F. (1998). *Humana komunikologija,* Hrvatsko komunikološko društvo & Nonacom, Zagreb.

Vreg, F. (1990). *Demokratično komuniciranje,* Založba Obzorja, Maribor.

Benoit, W. L. & Beniot, P. J. (2013). *Persuazivne poruke — proces utjecanja,* Naklada Slap, Zagreb.

Wolton, D. (1989). *La communication politique. Construction d'un modèle,* Hermes.

POLITIČKA KOMUNIKACIJA I DELIBERATIVNA DEMOKRATIJA

Apstrakt: Problem političke apstinencije birača ostavlja demokratske institucije bez sadržaja. Zato uloga političke komunikacije u kontekstu suštinskog razvoja demokracije danas postaje vrlo aktualna. Zanima nas kako je deliberativna komunikacija, kao model političke komunikacije, povezana s mobilizacijom birača u političkim procesima. Smisao deliberatizacije temelji se na ideji približavanja dionika konsenzusu kroz slobodan i ravnopravan dijalog političke komunikacije u komunikacijskoj zajednici. Na taj način se postiže bolji legitimitet političkih odluka. Istraživačko pitanje našeg članka bilo je kako znanstvena i stručna teorija gledaju na ulogu deliberativne komunikacije, kao modela političke komunikacije, u procesu političke participacije političkih dionika, Pretpostavili smo da znanstvena teorija optimistički gleda na ulogu deliberativne komunikacije. U članku smo se koristili deskriptivnom metodom i metodom analize znanstvenih i stručnih tekstova. Istraživanje smo proveli s prikazom domaćih i stranih izdanja stručnih knjiga, monografskih publikacija, izvornih znanstvenih članaka i rezultata istraživanja. Podatke smo dobili pomoću baza podataka Cobiss i Google Scholar. Rezultati istraživanja pokazali su da znanstvena teorija deliberativnu komunikaciju vidi kao obećavajući eksperiment i evoluciju u ostvarenju deliberativne demokracije.

Ključne reči: demokratija, komunikacija, deliberativna demokratija, politička komunikacija, političko učešće

Author's biography

Tona Čabraja holds a master's degree in business economics with more than 17 years of work experience in the economy, ie as a manager. Together with his team of experts, he attracted various foreign companies to invest in Slovenia and open more than 250 new jobs.