MEDIA AS A FIELD OF CONFLICT:

THE TRANSFORMATION OF JOURNALISM UNDER HYBRID POLITICAL PROCESSES

Oleksandr HRYHORIEV
ORCID: 0009-0002-3975-358X
Journalist-Analyst, Reporter

Reviewer (acknowledged):
Valerii Herlanets
ORCID: 0009-0001-6289-3241
Honored Artist; Member of the Union of Writers of Russia; Member of the National Union of Theatre Professionals of Ukraine

Editorial Note

This article was first published in *Interview Ukraine*, No. 12-2020 (December 2020), as a reporter-style analytical piece examining the transformation of journalism and the media environment under hybrid political processes.

In 2020, the editorial board decided to republish the article in the *International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research*, Volume 1, Issue 1 (2020), due to its pronounced interdisciplinary nature and analytical relevance to research in media studies, political communication, and sociology.

Upon republication:

- the content of the article was not substantively modified;

- the structure and argumentation were preserved in the author's original wording;

- the material is presented as an author-archived version to ensure academic availability and international citation.

Abstract

This article analyzes the transformation of journalism under hybrid political processes characteristic of the early twenty-first century. It examines the changing role of media—from an institution of public information to an autonomous arena of conflict in which competing interpretations of social and political reality are produced and contested. Particular attention is given to the reporter as an active participant in the information process, as well as to the

ethical and institutional challenges emerging amid political polarization, digitalization, and mounting pressure on public discourse.

Introduction

In the early twenty-first century, journalism faced a fundamental shift in the conditions of its existence. The acceleration of information flows, the rise of digital platforms, and increasing political polarization led to a reassessment of the traditional model of media as a neutral intermediary between events and society.

Under these new conditions, media are no longer merely channels for transmitting information. They become an independent space of struggle over the interpretation of reality, legitimacy, and audience trust. This transformation is especially pronounced in states and regions where political instability coincides with a high density of conflict-driven narratives and external informational influences.

The purpose of this article is to analyze structural changes in journalism within the context of hybrid political processes and to demonstrate how the roles of the reporter, the editorial institution, and the media environment itself are being transformed.

1. Hybrid Political Processes as the Context of Media Transformation

The concept of *hybrid political processes* has entered academic and analytical discourse as an attempt to describe a qualitatively new type of socio-political dynamics in which traditional forms of political confrontation are supplemented and, in many respects, replaced by indirect, distributed, and information-mediated mechanisms of influence. Unlike classical political conflicts, hybrid processes do not have clearly defined beginnings, endings, or a single center of control. Their key characteristic is **multilayered structure and asymmetry**.

Within such processes, political action is increasingly carried out not through formal institutions of power, but through:

- information campaigns;
- competing interpretations of events;
- management of agenda-setting and emotional responses of audiences;
- the use of digital platforms as spaces of political influence.

Under these conditions, journalism ceases to function as an external observer of political reality and becomes an integrated element of the very structure of the hybrid process.

1.1. The Blurring of Boundaries Between Politics and Information

One of the key features of hybrid political processes is the blurring of boundaries between political decision-making and informational communication. Political significance is acquired not only by laws, official statements, and actions of public officials, but also by the interpretations of these actions within the media space.

For example, the same event—such as a protest, a parliamentary vote, or an international statement—under hybrid conditions exists simultaneously in several parallel forms:

- as a factual occurrence;

- as an interpretation;

- as an emotional image;

- as an element of a broader narrative.

Media do not merely record an event; they **construct its meaning**, determining whether it will be perceived as a crisis, a norm, a threat, or a secondary episode. In this way, information coverage becomes part of political action, and the journalist acts as an intermediary between the fact and its political function.

1.2. The Information Space as a Field of Conflict

In hybrid political processes, the information space is transformed into an independent field of conflict, comparable in significance to the economic or institutional level. Competition unfolds not so much over control of territory or resources as over control of interpretation.

In this context, journalism faces several fundamentally new challenges:

- the acceleration of the news cycle, in which analytical depth gives way to speed of publication;

- fragmentation of audiences, whereby different social groups exist within their own informational environments;

- the loss of a unified center of trust previously associated with major media institutions.

An illustrative example is a situation in which audiences pre-interpret any news through the lens of loyalty or distrust toward the source, regardless of the actual content. Under such conditions, journalism ceases to function as an arbiter of facts and becomes involved in struggles over trust and legitimacy.

1.3. Hybridization as a Long-Term Condition Rather Than a Crisis

It is important to emphasize that hybrid political processes do not represent a temporary crisis phenomenon. On the contrary, they form a **stable model of the functioning of the public sphere**, in which conflict and competition of interpretations become the norm.

For journalism, this implies a transition:

- from episodic event coverage to continuous analytical engagement;
- from linear narratives to multiple versions of reality;
- from the illusion of complete objectivity to a conscious reflection on its own limitations.

Within this model, the reporter can no longer occupy a position "outside context." Any message is automatically embedded within an existing system of narratives and is used by various actors to confirm pre-established interpretations.

1.4. The Role of Journalism Under Hybrid Political Processes

Under conditions of hybrid political processes, journalism performs a dual function. On the one hand, it remains a source of information and analysis. On the other hand, it becomes an element of the environment in which public perception of reality is formed.

This leads to a paradoxical situation in which journalism simultaneously:

- strives for neutrality;
- inevitably influences the dynamics of interpretive conflict.

Failure to recognize this duality leads either to a naïve reliance on outdated models of objectivity or to the complete dissolution of journalism into activism or propaganda. By contrast, acknowledging the hybrid nature of political processes allows for the development of more sustainable professional strategies based on analytical depth, contextualization, and responsibility toward audiences.

1.5. The Significance of the Hybrid Context for Further Analysis

Understanding hybrid political processes as the structural context of media transformation is critically important for the analysis of all subsequent aspects of journalistic activity. This context explains:

- changes in the role of the reporter;
- increased pressure on editorial independence;
- the crisis of trust in media;

- the growing importance of analytical journalism.

Thus, hybrid political processes do not serve as a background, but as a **key factor** determining the logic of transformation of contemporary journalism and the conditions of its existence within the public sphere.

2. The Reporter Between Professional Distance and Involvement

While Chapter 1 describes the "environment" of hybrid political processes as a structural context, Chapter 2 focuses on the most sensitive point within this environment—the position of the reporter. It is precisely at the level of individual professional action (the choice of topic, tone, format, visual material, and sources) that hybrid processes are transformed from an abstract model into concrete practice. As a result, the classical figure of the journalist as an observer increasingly gives way to the journalist as an actor embedded in conflicts of interpretation, trust, and identity.

It is important to avoid simplification here. The issue is not that the reporter "necessarily becomes an activist" or "necessarily serves someone's interests." Rather, the social and technological architecture of the media environment itself makes full professional distance difficult to achieve and, in some cases, professionally ineffective. Involvement becomes not a matter of personal conviction, but a characteristic of the context in which journalism operates.

2.1. Professional Distance: A Normative Ideal and a Practical Problem

Professional distance is a normative principle that presumes the reporter:

- separates fact from evaluation;

- verifies information through independent sources;

- maintains equal critical distance toward competing positions;

- does not use journalistic material as an instrument of direct audience mobilization.

Historically, professional distance was linked to the institutional logic of traditional media. Editorial offices and reporters acted as "intermediaries" between events and mass audiences, while sources of information had relatively stable hierarchies (official representatives, experts, archives, on-site correspondents). In the digital environment, this hierarchy has been disrupted: any participant in an event may become a source, and the speed of dissemination may outweigh subsequent verification.

The practical problem of distance lies in the fact that audiences increasingly evaluate not the quality of fact-checking, but rather "which side" a journalist is perceived to be on. As a result, even a strictly neutral report may be read as a "hidden position" and used as an argument

within another agenda. This produces an effect of "forced politicization": the reporter may not seek involvement, but the context involves them automatically.

2.2. Involvement as a Structural Effect of the Hybrid Environment

In this study, involvement does not refer to the journalist's emotional reaction or the presence of a personal position as such (which every individual possesses). Rather, it refers to the structural inclusion of the reporter in conflicts of meaning, in which:

- any journalistic choice (topic, order of facts, headline, photograph, quotation) becomes part of narrative competition;

- the reporter effectively participates in the redistribution of trust among groups, institutions, and opinion leaders;

- the journalistic message begins to exist independently—being removed from context, reformatted, "revoiced," and returned to the public space as "evidence" of another version of reality.

Such involvement may be unconscious (when the journalist believes they are "simply reporting facts") or forced (when refusal to cover an event becomes an accusation of bias). In a hybrid environment, the following logic applies: not only what is said, but also what is left unsaid constitutes a message.

2.3. Three Levels of Pressure on the Reporter: Political, Platform-Based, and Audience-Based

To understand why professional distance erodes, it is important to identify three levels of pressure operating simultaneously.

(a) Political pressure
This does not always take the form of direct censorship. More commonly, it includes:

- attempts to "negotiate" with editorial offices through access to sources;

- selective "leaks" of documents to shape a desired narrative;

- discrediting reporters through accusations of bias;

- the creation of an atmosphere in which journalists are required to constantly justify their work.

(b) Platform-based pressure
Digital platforms shape priorities of visibility—what is promoted in feeds, what becomes viral, and what disappears. This pressure manifests as:

- dependence on click-through metrics;

- incentives for emotionally charged content;

- competition for attention in real time.

Even when editorial standards are preserved, reporters are compelled to think in platform logic: "how it will be perceived," "how it will spread," "how it will be excerpted," and "which fragment will become a meme."

(c) Audience-based pressure
Audiences cease to be passive consumers and become active participants in media production:

- they comment on and evaluate journalistic work immediately;

- they organize campaigns of support or harassment;

- they demand from reporters not only information, but also a moral position.

As a result, the reporter finds themselves between two risks:

- losing the trust of some groups by being overly cautious;

- losing the trust of others by being overly rigid or unequivocal.

2.4. "The Reporter as an Event": When the Journalist Becomes Part of the News

In a hybrid environment, the reporter increasingly becomes not merely a narrator, but an object of attention. This phenomenon may be described as "the reporter as an event." It manifests when:

- the personality of the journalist becomes more significant than the material itself;

- a publication is perceived not as analysis, but as a "strike" against one side;

- the report is measured by reactions to it rather than by its content.

A typical scenario under hybrid conditions may be described as follows:
the reporter publishes a piece → the material is fragmented → individual quotations circulate without context → accusations emerge → the reporter is compelled to explain → the explanations are interpreted as weakness or confirmation of "guilt."

This creates a self-reproducing conflict in which the journalist becomes an actor not by choice, but by circumstance.

2.5. The Shift from "Objectivity" to "Transparency": A New Professional Norm

A paradox of the hybrid environment is that the former rhetoric of "absolute objectivity" no longer convinces audiences. This does not, however, imply abandonment of standards. On the contrary, the value of transparency increases:

- clear differentiation between established facts and interpretation;

- indication of sources and limitations of access to data;

- explanation of the logic behind material selection;

- disclosure of verification methodology, even in brief form.

Transparency becomes a new language of trust. Where objectivity is perceived as an unattainable ideal, transparency appears as an honest professional approach.

2.6. Typology of Involvement: Three Models of Reporter Behavior

In order to avoid moralization, it is useful to identify three models commonly encountered in hybrid environments. These models are not "good" or "bad," but reflect different strategies of survival and effectiveness.

Model 1. Normatively distant
The reporter seeks to adhere strictly to standards: balance, verification, and cautious language.
Risk: being accused of "spinelessness" or of implicitly supporting one side due to refusal to use evaluative labels.

Model 2. Contextual-analytical
The reporter records the fact and develops explanation: causality, context, alternative interpretations, and probabilities.
Advantage: resistance to manipulation, as the audience receives tools for understanding rather than slogans.
Risk: requires time and trust in analytical formats.

Model 3. Mobilizational-value-based
The reporter consciously adopts a position and writes as a "voice" of a group or value system.
Advantage: strong emotional connection with the audience.
Risk: vulnerability to accusations of propaganda and loss of trust among neutral or opposing groups.

The key conclusion is that the hybrid environment encourages Model 3, but the most professionally sustainable model in the long term is Model 2—the contextual-analytical approach.

2.7. The Micro-Mechanics of Involvement: How "Technical Details" Become Political

Involvement manifests not only in major editorial decisions, but also in micro-level details. In a hybrid environment, political significance is acquired by:

- lexical choices (for example, "clashes" versus "crackdown"; "demonstration" versus "riot");

- the order of facts (what is presented first is perceived as causally primary);

- headlines (often more influential than the body text);

- visual materials (images of aggression versus peaceful scenes create different realities);

- quotation selection (a single phrase may transform a subject into an "expert" or a "marginal figure").

These elements become entry points for manipulation: changing a headline, removing a paragraph, or substituting an image can invert meaning without direct falsification of facts. Therefore, the professional task of the reporter in a hybrid environment is to consider not only what is communicated, but also how the message may be reused.

2.8. Professional Safety: Ethics, Psychology, and Social Resilience

Under hybrid conditions, the issue of reporter safety extends beyond physical security. The concept of professional resilience emerges, encompassing:

- protection of reputation (prevention of distortion, documentation of facts);

- psychological resilience (work with traumatic content, harassment, stress);

- ethical resilience (maintenance of standards under pressure to "take sides").

Editorial offices are compelled to develop new practices: legal support, protocols for verifying user-generated content, and rules for responding to discrediting campaigns. These measures are no longer "external services," but part of the professional infrastructure of contemporary journalism.

2.9. Conclusions to Chapter 2

In a hybrid political environment, the reporter inevitably operates between distance and involvement. The primary choice, however, is not between "neutrality" and "positioning," but between:

- mechanical reactivity (submission to platform logic and emotional conflict); and

- analytical responsibility (context, transparency, method, and disciplined presentation).

It is the latter strategy that enables journalism to preserve its public function as an instrument for understanding reality rather than accelerating conflictual polarization.

3. Media Reality and the Competition of Narratives

One of the key consequences of hybrid political processes is the formation of a distinct layer of social perception that may be defined as **media reality**. Unlike empirical reality, which is accessible through direct experience, media reality represents a constructed space of meanings, images, and interpretations that emerges at the intersection of journalism, digital platforms, political communication, and audience perception.

Under conditions of hybrid processes, media reality becomes the primary field of political competition. The conflict shifts from the level of "what happened" to the level of "what this means," and subsequently to the question of "who has the right to define this meaning."

3.1. The Concept of Media Reality: From Reflection to Construction

Classical theories of journalism were based on the assumption that media primarily reflect reality, albeit with inevitable distortions. In the contemporary media environment, however, this assumption proves insufficient.

Media reality is formed as the result of:

- the selection of events (what is considered worthy of attention);

- the hierarchical ordering of facts (what is primary and what is secondary);

- interpretive accompaniment (explanation, context, commentary);

- visual and emotional framing.

Thus, journalism does not merely report reality but participates in its symbolic production. For a significant portion of the audience, media reality becomes the only accessible form of "presence" within political and social processes.

3.2. Narrative as the Basic Unit of Media Conflict

Under hybrid conditions, the basic unit of competition is not an individual fact, but the **narrative**. A narrative is a coherent account in which:

- protagonists and antagonists are identified;

- causal logic is established;

- moral evaluation is present;

- a direction for future interpretation is implied.

Facts are integrated into narratives not as autonomous elements, but as confirmation of an already established interpretive framework. The same fact may serve as evidence for diametrically opposed conclusions depending on the narrative within which it is embedded.

In this context, journalistic material is often evaluated by audiences not according to its accuracy, but according to which narrative it reinforces or weakens.

3.3. Narrative Architecture: The Hidden Structure of Meaning

In order to understand narrative competition, it is necessary to examine their internal architecture. As a rule, a stable media narrative includes several mandatory elements:

- identification of the subject — who "we" are and from whose perspective the story is told;

- designation of a threat or problem — what disrupts the norm;

- causal explanation — why this occurred and who is responsible;

- moral framing — who is right and who is wrong;

- an implicit appeal — what should be considered acceptable or necessary.

Journalism in a hybrid environment often operates within existing narrative architectures, even when this is not consciously recognized. An attempt to "exit the narrative" may be perceived by audiences as betrayal, manipulation, or "playing on the opponent's side."

3.4. Narrative Competition and Audience Fragmentation

One of the most visible effects of media reality is the fragmentation of the public space. The audience ceases to function as a unified whole and instead divides into groups, each existing within its own version of media reality.

This fragmentation is reinforced by:

- digital platform algorithms;

- social networks and recommendation systems;

- practices of selective information consumption.

As a result, public dialogue is increasingly replaced by the parallel existence of incompatible interpretations, each perceived by its audience as the only rational and morally justified one.

3.5. Emotion as an Instrument of Narrative Competition

In a hybrid media environment, emotion becomes not a secondary effect of information, but a strategic instrument. Emotionally saturated messages spread more rapidly, generate stronger reactions, and retain audience attention for longer periods.

The most in-demand emotions include:

- fear;

- indignation;

- humiliation;

- moral superiority.

This creates a risk of substituting analytical understanding with emotional response. Even high-quality journalistic material may be "reframed" through an emotional lens during dissemination—via headlines, memes, short quotations, or visual fragments.

3.6. Manipulation Without Falsification: Distortion of Meaning

A distinctive feature of hybrid processes is the possibility of distorting meaning without direct falsification of facts. This is achieved through:

- removal of quotations from context;

- alteration of the order of presentation;

- replacement of neutral terms with evaluative ones;

- visual displacement of emphasis.

Under such conditions, journalism faces a paradox: a formally accurate piece of material may become an instrument of manipulation once it leaves editorial control. This increases the responsibility of the reporter for the structure and clarity of presentation, not only for the accuracy of individual facts.

3.7. Media Reality and the Crisis of Trust

Narrative competition leads to a systemic crisis of trust in media. Audiences increasingly perceive information through a lens of suspicion: "who benefits," "whose line is being promoted," and "what is hidden between the lines."

This crisis does not result in a decline in news consumption. On the contrary, consumption increases, but trust becomes selective and tied not to institutional standards, but to identities, values, and group loyalties.

Journalism loses its status as a universal intermediary and increasingly functions as a node within a network of competing realities.

3.8. Analytical Journalism as a Counterbalance to Narrative Polarization

Against the background of dominant narrative competition, analytical journalism acquires particular importance. Its function is not to dismantle narratives, but to:

- demonstrate their structure;

- identify hidden assumptions;

- compare alternative interpretations;

- explain the logic of meaning formation.

An analytical approach does not promise immediate effect, but it creates a long-term reserve of trust among that part of the audience that seeks understanding rather than confirmation of pre-existing beliefs.

3.9. Conclusions to Chapter 3

Media reality under conditions of hybrid political processes becomes the primary space of social conflict. Within this space, it is not facts that compete, but narratives; not arguments, but interpretive frameworks.

Journalism operating in this environment inevitably influences the formation of media reality, regardless of its intentions. Awareness of the mechanisms of narrative competition and the architecture of meaning is a necessary condition for preserving professional autonomy and the analytical function of journalism.

4. Ethical and Institutional Challenges of Contemporary Journalism

If the previous chapters describe the structural context (hybrid processes), the position of the reporter (distance and involvement), and the nature of media reality (competition of narratives), this chapter focuses on the **internal constraints of journalism as an institution**. The emphasis is placed not so much on external pressure as on the ethical and institutional contradictions that are formed within the media system itself under the influence of the hybrid environment.

Contemporary journalism faces a situation in which classical professional norms are preserved at the declarative level, while their practical implementation becomes increasingly complex and ambiguous. A gap emerges between the normative model of the profession and the real conditions of its functioning.

4.1. Self-Censorship as a Systemic, Rather Than Individual, Phenomenon

One of the most sensitive challenges is self-censorship, which in a hybrid environment should be regarded not as a manifestation of personal weakness on the part of the journalist, but as a systemic adaptive mechanism.

Unlike direct censorship, self-censorship:

- does not require formal prohibitions;

- operates preventively;

- is embedded in professional thinking.

A journalist may exclude in advance:

- certain topics;

- specific formulations;

- sources;

- analytical angles,

not due to an explicit editorial ban, but based on an assessment of possible consequences, such as loss of access, reputational attacks, legal risks, pressure on the editorial office, or personal insecurity. In a hybrid environment, self-censorship becomes a rational survival strategy, but at the same time gradually narrows the space of public discussion.

4.2. Economic Logic of Media and Pressure on Editorial Sustainability

The institutional crisis of journalism is intensified by economic factors. Media organizations operating in a digital environment are compelled simultaneously to:

- maintain financial sustainability;

- compete for audience attention;

- preserve professional standards.

These objectives often come into conflict. The economic logic of platforms stimulates:

- simplification of complex topics;

- personalization of conflicts;

- emotionalization of presentation;

- reduction of analytical formats.

As a result, editorial decisions are increasingly made not only on the basis of the public significance of material, but also with regard to its "market potential." This does not necessarily lead to deliberate degradation of content, but it creates a structural shift in priorities—from long-term analysis to short-term engagement.

4.3. Blurring of Boundaries Between Journalism and Activism

Hybrid political processes contribute to the convergence of journalism and activism, creating serious ethical dilemmas. On the one hand, journalists increasingly operate in environments where neutrality is perceived as moral evasion. On the other hand, an activist position undermines trust in journalism as an institution of public mediation.

This blurring of boundaries manifests in:

- the use of journalistic formats to promote value-based campaigns;
- refusal to verify alternative viewpoints;
- replacement of analysis with moral declarations.

It is important to emphasize that the presence of a value position in itself does not constitute a violation of professional norms. The problem arises when a value-driven goal replaces the analytical function, and journalistic material ceases to distinguish between description, explanation, and evaluation.

4.4. Institutional Vulnerability and the Crisis of Editorial Autonomy

In a hybrid environment, editorial autonomy is subject to dual pressure:

- from external actors (political, economic, and platform-based);
- from internal constraints (resources, staffing, and production speed).

Editorial offices increasingly function in a mode of constant reaction, in which strategic planning gives way to tactical survival. This reduces the capacity of media organizations to:

- sustain long-term thematic focus;
- invest in investigative journalism;
- develop specialized analytical expertise.

Institutional vulnerability is also reflected in the increasing visibility of individual journalists relative to the editorial institution itself. This intensifies the personalization of responsibility while simultaneously weakening collective protection of professional standards.

4.5. Ethical Standards as a Form of Resistance

Under hybrid conditions, journalistic ethics cease to function merely as a formal set of rules and instead become an instrument of resistance to institutional erosion. Fact-checking, transparency of sources, and the separation of fact from commentary acquire significance not only as professional practices, but also as public safeguards.

It should be noted that adherence to ethical standards in a hybrid environment does not guarantee the absence of conflict or accusations. However, it creates a reproducible foundation of trust that allows journalism to preserve its identity even under conditions of pressure and polarization.

4.6. A New Professional Ethics: From Universal Rules to Contextual Responsibility

Hybrid political processes require a reconsideration of ethics as a set of universal and abstract norms. At the forefront emerges **contextual responsibility**, which presupposes:

- awareness of the potential consequences of publication;

- analysis of the vulnerability of sources;

- assessment of secondary effects of information dissemination;

- balancing public interest against potential harm.

Such an ethical approach does not abolish basic principles, but demands a higher level of reflection and professional maturity from journalists.

4.7. Professional Solidarity and Institutional Forms of Protection

One of the least discussed, yet critically important, factors in the sustainability of journalism is professional solidarity. In hybrid environments, individual journalists are particularly vulnerable, while institutional forms of support—editorial protocols, professional associations, and legal mechanisms—become essential.

The absence of solidarity amplifies the effects of self-censorship and the personalization of pressure. Conversely, collective ethical frameworks make it possible to reduce risks and uphold standards even in unfavorable conditions.

4.8. Conclusions to Chapter 4

Ethical and institutional challenges of contemporary journalism are not secondary effects of hybrid political processes, but their integral components. Self-censorship, economic pressure, the blurring of boundaries with activism, and editorial vulnerability form a complex environment in which professional norms require constant reassessment and protection.

Journalism preserves its public significance not due to the absence of pressure, but due to its ability to develop sustainable professional practices under conditions of uncertainty, conflict, and structural constraint.

5. Analytical Journalism as a Form of Public Responsibility

Against the background of hybrid political processes, competition of narratives, and institutional pressure, analytical journalism acquires particular significance—not as a genre of increased complexity, but as a functional response of the profession to the transformation of the public sphere. Unlike news-oriented or reactive journalism, the analytical approach is oriented not toward the mere recording of events, but toward identifying their structure, context, and long-term consequences.

Analytical journalism does not eliminate conflicts of interpretation, but alters their character: instead of emotional polarization, it offers instruments of understanding; instead of mobilization, it offers reflection.

5.1. Analysis Versus Reactivity: Differences in Professional Logic

In a hybrid media environment, reactive logic predominates: journalism is compelled to respond to events rapidly, under conditions of information scarcity and platform pressure. Analytical journalism operates within a different temporal and semantic framework.

Key distinctions of analytical logic include:

- prioritization of causal relationships over chronology;

- attention to structures rather than solely to actors;

- engagement with probabilities and scenarios rather than unambiguous conclusions;

- rejection of simplified binary moral frameworks.

Thus, analytical journalism does not compete with the speed of news production, but complements it by creating a second level of public understanding.

5.2. Explanation as a Public Function

Under hybrid conditions, explanation becomes a central public function of journalism. For a significant portion of the audience, the problem lies not in a lack of information, but in the inability to connect disparate facts into a coherent picture.

Analytical journalism:

- demonstrates the assumptions underlying different interpretations;

- distinguishes between facts, evaluations, and forecasts;

- explains why different groups perceive the same event differently.

This function is particularly important in fragmented audiences, where dialogue is replaced by the parallel existence of incompatible media realities.

5.3. Responsibility Without Moralization

The public responsibility of analytical journalism is not equivalent to moralization or value imposition. The objective is not to impose a "correct position," but to create conditions for informed judgment.

Responsible analytical work:

- avoids categorical statements where uncertainty is appropriate;

- acknowledges limitations of data and sources;

- allows for the existence of alternative explanations;

- does not replace analysis with emotional indignation.

Such an approach may be perceived as "insufficiently decisive" in polarized environments, yet it is precisely this approach that ensures long-term stability of trust.

5.4. Analytical Journalism and the Restoration of Trust

The crisis of trust in media characteristic of hybrid environments cannot be overcome solely through declarations or reputational campaigns. Trust is restored through reproducible practices that demonstrate professional competence.

Analytical journalism contributes to this process because it:

- makes the logic of information work transparent;

- reduces the effects of manipulative reuse of content;

- forms critical perception skills among audiences.

It is important to emphasize that analytical journalism is not oriented toward immediate mass loyalty; rather, it forms a core audience capable of engaging with complex and ambiguous explanations.

5.5. The Limits of Analytical Journalism

While recognizing the importance of analytical journalism, it is necessary to identify its limitations. Analytical work:

- requires time and resources;

- presupposes a higher level of media literacy among audiences;

- is not always compatible with platform-driven visibility logic.

In addition, analytical journalism does not eliminate conflicts of interests or interpretations, but makes them more intelligible. Nevertheless, this quality renders it indispensable under conditions of hybrid political processes.

Conclusion

Journalism at the beginning of the twenty-first century operates under conditions of hybrid political processes in which the information space becomes not a reflection, but a field of

conflict. Within this environment, all key elements of the profession are transformed: the role of the reporter, the institutional logic of editorial offices, the structure of media reality, and the mechanisms of public trust.

The conducted analysis demonstrates that:

- hybrid processes form a stable context rather than a temporary crisis;

- the reporter is inevitably involved in competition of interpretations, regardless of intent;

- media reality is constructed through narratives rather than facts alone;

- ethical and institutional challenges are systemic in nature;

- analytical journalism becomes a key form of public responsibility.

Journalism preserves its public significance not through the illusion of complete neutrality, but through its capacity for analytical reflection, transparency, and professional discipline under conditions of pressure and uncertainty.

In a hybrid media environment, the future of journalism is determined not by technological innovations as such, but by whether the profession can preserve and develop its explanatory function—the ability to help society understand a complex, conflict-driven, and fragmented reality without reducing it to simplified or mobilizational schemes.

References

International (English-language) Sources

Castells, M.
Communication Power.
Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.

Couldry, N., Hepp, A.
The Mediated Construction of Reality.
Cambridge: Polity Press, 2017.

Entman, R. M.
Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm.
Journal of Communication, Vol. 43, No. 4 (1993), pp. 51–58.

Habermas, J.
The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere.
Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1989.

Kaldor, M.
New and Old Wars: Organized Violence in a Global Era.
Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2012.

Livingstone, S.
On the Mediation of Everything.
Journal of Communication, Vol. 59, No. 1 (2009), pp. 1–18.

McNair, B.
Journalism and Democracy: An Evaluation of the Political Public Sphere.
London: Routledge, 2000.

McQuail, D.
McQuail's Mass Communication Theory.
6th ed. London: Sage Publications, 2010.

Papacharissi, Z.
Affective Publics: Sentiment, Technology, and Politics.
Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015.

Schudson, M.
The Sociology of News.
New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2011.

Tuchman, G.
Objectivity as Strategic Ritual: An Examination of Newsmen's Notions of Objectivity.
American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 77, No. 4 (1972), pp. 660–679.

Ward, S. J. A.
Ethics and the Media: An Introduction.
Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011.

Wolfsfeld, G.
The Politics of Provocation: Participation and Protest in Israel.
Albany: SUNY Press, 1988.

Zelizer, B.
Taking Journalism Seriously: News and the Academy.
Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 2004.

Ukrainian Authors

Pocheptsov, G. G.
Information Wars.
Kyiv: Vakler, 2000.
(Original in Russian)

Pocheptsov, G. G.
Meanings and Wars: Ukraine and Russia in Information and Semantic Warfare.
Kyiv: Kyiv-Mohyla Academy Publishing House, 2016.
(Original in Russian)

Romanenko, Yu. V.
Media as an Instrument of Political Mobilization in a Conflict Society.
Ukrainian Sociological Journal, No. 1 (2014), pp. 45–58.
(Original in Ukrainian)

Demyanenko, N. M.
Transformation of the Public Sphere under Conditions of Media Digitalization.
Scientific Notes of the National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy. Sociology, Vol. 180 (2016), pp. 23–31.
(Original in Ukrainian)

Zernetska, O. V.
Global Media and National Information Spaces.
Kyiv: Institute of World Economy and International Relations, National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, 2012.
(Original in Ukrainian)

Russian Authors

Manoylo, A. V.
Hybrid Wars and Technologies of Managed Chaos.
Bulletin of Moscow University. Series 12: Political Science, No. 2 (2015), pp. 33–45.
(Original in Russian)

Kara-Murza, S. G.
Manipulation of Consciousness.
Moscow: Eksmo, 2000.
(Original in Russian)

Fedotov, M. A.
Journalism and Public Trust: Institutional Challenges.
Journalist. Social Communications, No. 3 (2011), pp. 12–21.
(Original in Russian)

Zasursky, I. I.
Mass Media and Politics: New Forms of Publicity.
Moscow: Moscow State University Press, 2007.
(Original in Russian)

Soldatov, A., Borogan, I.
The Red Web: Security Services, the Internet, and the State.
Moscow: Corpus, 2015.
(Original in Russian)