André Haller
Hendrik Michael
Martin Kraus
(Eds.)

Scan-dal-ogy

An Interdisciplinary Field

HERBERT VON HALEM VERLAG

HH

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists the publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the Internet at http://dnb.dnb.de.

André Haller / Hendrik Michael / Martin Kraus (Eds.)
Scandalogy: An Interdisciplinary Field
Köln: Halem, 2018

ISBN (Print): 978-3-86962-248-4
ISBN (PDF): 978-3-86962-249-1

http://www.halem-verlag.de
info@halem-verlag.de

TYPESETTING: Herbert von Halem Verlag
EDITOR: Imke Hirschmann, Köln
COVERDESIGN: Claudia Ott, Grafischer Entwurf, Düsseldorf

André Haller / Hendrik Michael / Martin Kraus (Eds.)

Scandalogy:
An Interdisciplinary Field

HERBERT VON HALEM VERLAG

Die Herausgeber

ANDRÉ HALLER, Dr., is researcher at the Institute of Communication Studies at the University of Bamberg. His research focuses are political and strategic communication (particularly campaign communication), scandals and media and new developments in journalism. His dissertation Dissent as a communicative instrument (2013) examined intentional self-scandalization by politicians during campaigns.

MARTIN KRAUS works at the Department for Modern German Literature Studies at the University of Bamberg. He focuses on German literature of the19th and 20th century (e.g. in the era of Romanticsm, in the Weimar Republic, in the GDR) as well as on Lyrics in pop songs. His dissertation is titled *Scandals in Literature in the Weimar Republic* (2018).

HENDRIK MICHAEL is a research assistant at the Institute of Communication Studies at the University of Bamberg. His research focuses on theories of journalism, journalistic genres and narrative forms. In his doctoral thesis he analyzes how reportorial practices and narrative strategies are utilized to report on urban poverty in American and German mass periodicals of the late 19th century.

Inhalt

ANDRÉ HALLER / HENDRIK MICHAEL / MARTIN KRAUS

Scandalogy.
An Introduction to an Interdisciplinary Field

April 2016 was a special month for scandal research. On April 3rd, journalists revealed the so called ›Panama Papers‹, confidential documents of a Panamanian offshore company, in a concerted campaign. The Panama Papers were rather special: Journalists all over the world, connected in the International Consortium of Investigative Journalism (ICIJ), investigated and published the documents in a joint venture. The scandal itself affected persons and organizations in various countries – a global scandal was born. In the following days the telephones in Bamberg rang constantly. Journalists wanted to hear our opinions about the Panama Papers. Thereby most of them became aware of an event which took place for the first time: the 1st International Conference in Scandalogy at the University of Bamberg.

In retrospect, it was a twist of fate that the Panama Papers were disclosed only a few days in advance of the academic event. We were often ironically asked by journalists and colleagues if the conference team intervened in the scoop for strategic reasons, which we declined of course. However, coincidentally, while an international consortium of investigative journalists uncovered a global scandal, an international network of experts in scandal research gathered for the first time in Bamberg.

The Panama Papers show us one thing: Scandals are a social phenomenon which does not stop at borders. In addition to that, scandals do not exclusively take place in politics and economics but can basically occur in every social field. The scope ranges from doping scandals to scandalous movies, from scandal authors to judicial scandals. In the field of literature we already notice a diverse and interdisciplinary scandal research (BARTL/KRAUS 2014).

In many cases social fields are overlapping and constitute the scandal: Political scandals are often no pure ›political‹ affairs but occur sometimes when politicians and economic leaders illegally make deals. Most scandals take place when there are transgressions in hidden sub-fields (THOMPSON 2000) which are then revealed. Consequently, other actions can become a scandal in public, for instance when grievances are scandalized (KEPPLINGER/EHMIG/HARTUNG 2002). This type of scandal can also be seen when politicians make controversial statements which can then be the starting point of a scandal (EKSTRÖM/JOHANSSON 2008). A special type of scandal is intentional self-scandalization (HALLER 2014), which occurs when an actor deliberately provokes to produce a scandal to obtain public attention. Groundbreaking works were especially written in political and communication science: Robert M. Entman's *Scandal and Silence* (2012) explains the production of political scandals in the USA; Hans Mathias Kepplinger's works on scandals in the media and their effects (2012) and Steffen Burkhardt's book (2006) on media scandals are some of the most prominent works in scandal research. The conference ›Scandalization and Victimization by Media Coverage‹ at the German Sport University in Cologne brought communication researchers together in 2015. A subsequent book (LUDWIG/SCHIERL/VON SIKORSKI 2016) showed the outcomes of the presented studies. Nevertheless, interdisciplinary research on scandals still remains neglected.

The question if grievances lead to public outrage is an indicator for the specific scandal culture (HONDRICH 2002) of a society. For instance, sex scandals can end political careers in the USA; the recent case of Anthony Weiner illustrates this point. Nevertheless, the case of Silvio Berlusconi shows us that there is a different mediterranean scandal culture. In Germany power scandals as well as misconduct concerning German history and political culture are typical types of scandals (ESSER/HARTUNG 2004). However, scandal cultures are mutable – although by a long process. In 2016 we witnessed the rise of Donald Trump to become the 45th President of the United States, which could be seen as a turning point as regards our concept of scandalization: His racist and misogynist comments and his insults against minorities in general have not weakened him.

Maybe Trump is the result of a general tendency in popular culture to emphasize the role of »the outsider who speaks it as it is«. But this begs the question if public discourse as a whole in civil society has not irrevocably changed: Are we witnessing a transformation of scandal culture in the US

(and other Western societies)? If so, what are the reasons for this and what are the consequences for dealing with future scandals and affairs? Trump's actions on the campaign trail cannot only be explained by intentional self-scandalization, as the leaked audio footage of the notorious ›Access Hollywood‹ tape illustrates.

Trump's scandals have shown that traditional reporting on scandals has deficits: Deliberate provocations by Trump produced enormous publicity but do not appear to be explainable as strategic patterns of communication (HALLER 2015). Often, journalists are limited to describing and criticizing scandals instead of thematizing a lack of reaction by the public. Thus, one may argue that academic research and journalism should be more sensitive to characteristics of specific scandal cultures. In this sense our book attempts to contribute to a better understanding of scandals.

To acknowledge such wide-ranging changes within our media and political systems, the 1st International Conference in Scandalogy pursued two main targets: First, to present and discuss recent findings on the social phenomenon of scandals. Second, to strengthen the networking of scandal research beyond the boundaries of certain scientific fields. The conference took place on April 7th and 8th at the University of Bamberg and was organized by the Institute for Communication Science and the Institute of German Studies. The cooperation of both departments shows that scandals are not exclusively a topic for social sciences. The scope of papers presented at the conference proves this claim:

The collected volume opens with an unusual but at the same time fitting contribution to a pressing issue by our first keynote speaker ROBERT M. ENTMAN. In the light of Entman's longstanding research on political scandals and the media he offers insightful remarks on the campaign and presidency of Donald Trump. In this brief statement Entman proposes a first explanation why the established logic of political scandalization does not appear to apply anymore with Trump.

Our second keynote speaker STEFFEN BURKHARDT provides a concise overview over scandal research and scandal theory in the network society. His argument addresses the increasing interconnectedness of scandalized actants, the media as agents of scandalization and the public as passive spectators as well as active participants in the act of scandal production. Burkhardt draws on concepts from literature studies when he relates the dynamics of the mediated scandals to the narrative structures of classical drama. To illustrate this, Burkhardt proposes the ›scandal clock‹ not only

as a metaphor for the stages of scandalization but also as a foil for conducting systematic research on scandals in Western societies.

Our third keynote speaker MARTINA WAGNER-EGELHAAF elaborates further the concept of scandals as narratives. She presents an alternative approach to scandal research by looking at the rich history of Western literary thought and poetics and what it can contribute to the interdisciplinary field of scandalogy. For a few decades, literature scholars – as well as critics, authors, and publishers etc. – have tended to emphasize the ability of (modern) literature to be scandalous. The scandal potential of literature has become an often-praised quality feature of literature itself. But, in order to arouse really relevant scandals, more than just non-conformist aesthetics are necessary. Wagner-Egelhaaf takes a closer look at prominent scandals in literature history and identifies the factors that attributed to the significance of these cases. Furthermore, she contributes to the understanding of scandals as dramatic plays and narratives.

The work of MONIKA VERBALYTE on the other hand shows the underlying principles of public outrage based on emotional responses to scandals. Her theoretical assumptions connect the research fields of communication and sociology with psychological emotion research. The author draws on emotion theory to contribute to a better understanding of the political scandals. This combination of approaches can lead to remarkable benefits in emotional theory as well as in scandal theory. Verbalyte compares and contrasts two theoretical perspectives on scandal, functionalistic and communicative-discursive. She concludes that the communicative-discursive perspective appears to be more suitable for the analysis of political scandals in current pluralistic societies. Her contribution is primarily of theoretical nature, but, in order to illustrate her statements, she provides certain empirical examples; in particular, two German political scandals: the Plagiarism scandal around minister of defense, Karl-Theodor zu Guttenberg, in 2011 and the Mortgage-Media scandal centered around President Christian Wulff in 2011-2012.

How media systems affect the dynamics of media scandalization in two Western European nations is discussed in two content analytical studies. First, MARCO MAZZONI, ROBERTO MINCIGRUCCI, and ANNA STANZIANO take a closer look at the mechanisms of scandalization in Italy. Their empirical analysis of investigative reporting on an alleged corruption scandal reveals a tendency for spectacularization and instrumentalization of scandals in journalism. These narrative patterns are used as means of Italian journal-

ists to cover political scandals and must be understood with respect to differences of the Italian media system compared to other Western nations. In another empirical study, MARIA KARIDI, DANIELA MAHL, and MICHAEL MEYEN provide evidence that media coverage of scandals in the German press has considerably changed over the past three decades. Relating to Snow and Altheide's concept of media logic, the authors interpret their findings of increased personalization and narrativization as a changing of dominant agent-structure dynamics in the journalistic field. This is exemplified by analyzing the coverage of tax-evasion and environmental scandals in two prominent cases from the 1990s and 2010s.

The reasons for increased media coverage of political scandals are discussed by CHRISTIAN VON SIKORSKI. He also offers a broad empirical overview over effects of media coverage and presents possible macro level impacts of political scandals. For instance, scandals of the political elite may reinforce the strategy of populist politicians who claim to fight against a corrupt system.

An empirical case study about effects of political scandals on public preferences is presented by DOMINIC NYHUIS and SUSUMU SHIKANO. The authors used longitudinal data on public preferences during the donation scandal of the German party CDU and modified a model of Shikano and Käppner which is used to decompose ideological and non-ideological components of sympathy ratings of politicians. The findings indicate that the valence component of political preferences can be influenced by coverage on political scandals.

Another perspective is taken by TIMOTHY COOMBS, SHERRY HOLLADAY, and ELINA R. TACHKOVA. The authors focus not only on the United States but also on the research field of strategic communication and the relationship between scandals and crises. The authors point out that organizational scandal research is mostly dominated by case studies and lacks theoretical foundations. Thus, their paper closes the gap between scandal and crisis research. The authors define an intersection of both states as a ›scansis‹. This concept takes into account that a crisis can merge to a scansis when media coverage reveals violations of expectations by stakeholders.

That even our most basic common sense understanding of scandals is culturally mediated and historically bound to the development of Western political and media systems is illustrated in LAEED ZAGHLAMI's commentary on scandals with respect to religion, media, and politics in Algeria. From a totally different standpoint, Zaghlami explains the, at times, conflicting

dynamics of scandalization in an islamic country and a former authoritarian and current semi-presidential system.

Overall, the selection of studies provides profound theoretical perspectives backed by empirical evidence. However, adding further to the relevance of scandals in the 21st century, a practical contribution to this collected volume is important to us. We think, generally, it is problematic to deal with scandals as far-reaching media and society phenomena from an exclusively theoretical standpoint that, too often, offers abstract explanations for concrete problems. Thus, we are happy that FREDERIK OBERMAIER, one of the leading journalists behind the publication of the Panama Papers, provides insights into the challenges of investigative journalism and the reach of global scandals. With this interview we hope to trace an arc between the research field of Scandalogy and journalistic practice at the International Consortium of Investigative Journalists (ICIJ).

We would like to thank our keynote speakers Robert M. Entman (George Washington University), Martina Wagner-Egelhaaf (University of Münster), and Steffen Burkhardt (University of Applied Sciences Hamburg). They enriched the conference with their presentations and their expertise in scandal research. Furthermore, their work proves that scandals are topics in various disciplines: Martina Wagner-Egelhaaf is professor of German studies, Steffen Burkhardt is a scholar of communication studies and Robert M. Entman works as a political scientist. Special thanks go to the Ludwig Delp Foundation in Munich which funded the conference as well as the production of this book. We also thank our reviewer team who selected the best papers out of a large number of excellent paper submissions. Furthermore we would like to thank the publishing house Herbert von Halem for guiding us through the process of making this book. Last but not least we thank our student assistants Theresa Briselat and Lisa Feller who helped us in the organization and during the conference, and Andreas Böhler who translated the interview with Frederik Obermaier and Steffen Burkhardt's contribution.

This book aims particularly at scandalogists of all scientific subjects. However, it is also interesting for a broader public. Especially practitioners in the media, public relations, politics, economy, and other areas can find useful information on the process of scandalization.

We hope you enjoy reading and especially that you gain new insights.

Bamberg January 23rd, 2018

André Haller, Martin Kraus and Hendrik Michael

References

BARTL, ANDREA; MARTIN KRAUS: *Skandalautoren. Zu repräsentativen Mustern literarischer Provokation und Aufsehen erregender Autorinszenierung*. Würzburg [Königshausen & Neumann] 2014

BURKHARDT, STEFFEN: *Medienskandale. Zur moralischen Sprengkraft öffentlicher Diskurse*. Köln [Herbert von Halem] 2006

EKSTRÖM, MATS; BENGT JOHANSSON: Talk Scandals. In: *Media, Culture & Society*, 30(1), 2008, S. 61 - 79

ENTMAN, ROBERT M.: *Scandal and Silence. Media Responses to Presidential Misconduct*. Cambridge [Polity Press] 2012

ESSER, FRANK; UWE HARTUNG: Nazis, Pollution, and no Sex. Political Scandals as a Reflection of Political Culture in Germany. In: *American Behavioral Scientist*, 47(8), 2004, S. 1040 - 1071

HALLER, ANDRÉ: *Dissens als kommunikatives Instrument. Theorie der intendierten Selbstskandalisierung in der politischen Kommunikation*. 2nd, revised edition. Bamberg [University of Bamberg Press] 2014

HALLER, ANDRÉ: How to deal with the Black Sheep? An evaluation of journalists' reactions towards intentional self-scandalization by politicians. In: *Journal of Applied Journalism and Media Studies*, 4(3), 2015, S. 435 - 451

HONDRICH, KARL OTTO: *Enthüllung und Entrüstung. Eine Phänomenologie des politischen Skandals*. Frankfurt/M. [Suhrkamp Verlag] 2002

KEPPLINGER, HANS MATHIAS: *Die Mechanismen der Skandalisierung. Zu Guttenberg, Kachelmann, Sarrazin & Co.: Warum einige öffentlich untergehen – und andere nicht*. München [Olzog] 2012

KEPPLINGER, HANS MATHIAS; SIMONE CHRISTINE EHMIG; UWE HARTUNG: *Alltägliche Skandale: Eine repräsentative Analyse regionaler Fälle*. Konstanz [UVK] 2002

LUDWIG, MARK; THOMAS SCHIERL; CHRISTIAN VON SIKORSKI (eds.): *Mediated Scandals. Gründe, Genese und Folgeeffekte von medialer Skandalberichterstattung*. Köln [Herbert von Halem] 2016

THOMPSON, JOHN B.: *Political Scandal: Power and Visability in the Media Age*. Cambrige [Polity Press] 2000

ROBERT M. ENTMAN / HENDRIK MICHAEL

Preliminary Observations on Scandals and the Press in the Age of Trump

Certainly, Trump's presidential campaign was a hot topic at our conference. But when work began on this book in the summer of 2016, one could not seriously have foreseen the changing of America's political landscape. The editors of this book were taken by surprise to say the least. We, as many others, did not know what to make of this development. Luckily, we had an expert at hand. When we contacted Robert Entman to hear his opinion on Trump, he prompted an analysis that we found a fitting contribution to our book. Our correspondence is printed below.

Subject: Statement on President Trump
From: hendrik.michael@uni-bamberg.de
Date: 3/15/2017
To: entman@gwu.edu

Dear Mr. Entman,

as a presidential candidate Mr. Trump has publicly stated that he »could stand in the middle of 5th Avenue and shoot somebody, and wouldn't lose any votes.« This statement seems to illustrate a striking aspect of Mr. Trump's presidency which has seen countless scandals in just a short period of time. Yet the Access Hollywood Tape, the strong evidence of Russia meddling with Trump's campaign, the president's twitter feed claiming the election was rigged, poorly executed policies, etc., appear to roll off the president's shoulders with little effect. Professional journalists and political experts are starting to wonder whether the mechanics of scandal-

ization, or the traditional framing of scandals in public discourse, do not apply under President Trump, especially if compared to past presidents' political scandals and their public consequences.

Do you think this is actually the case? Are there more scandals surrounding President Trump, compared to his predecessors, or are some of those actually non-scandals in your opinion? What has changed about the general conditions in the United States that affect the scandalization of Mr. Trump? Is it him being a political outsider and a media celebrity, the consolidation of political factions, or the polarization of public discourse in a rapidly changing media environment that ›cushion the blow‹?

Best regards,
Hendrik Michael

Subject: Re: Statement on President Trump
From: entman@gwu.edu
Date: 3/15/2017
To: hendrik.michael@uni-bamberg.de

Dear Mr. Michael,

most of the many charges that Donald Trump or his top advisors engaged in illegal or unethical behavior—some well-documented, others never receiving thorough investigation—did *not* become politically significant scandals during the 2016 campaign. Among the examples are Trump's fraudulent business practices and his close relationships to organized crime figures in the US and abroad. Even with respect to his sexual depredations, multiple credible allegations would likely have continued to receive barely any attention until the Access Hollywood recordings rendered the information irresistible to the media.

No doubt an important reason for Trump's early successes was that although Trump had been unusually corrupt in his personal and professional lives, he benefited from the polarized political parties and fragmented media audiences that marked US politics by 2016. Another reason was that the continuing stream of new allegations overwhelmed the ability of interactions among elites, media and public to create a self-reinforcing cascade of scandalized framing, which takes time. A third was that, as argued in my *Scandal And Silence*, cover-ups and lying often work. By withholding his tax

returns and using Twitter to misdirect media attention to trivial controversies such as the size of his inauguration crowd, Trump demonstrated unusual mastery over the mechanics of scandal evasion.

Yet I would contest the idea that Trump's ability to avoid decisively damaging scandalization throughout the presidential campaign and at least into the early months of his presidency marks a major departure from past practice. There were numerous incidents of serious misconduct by the president and close aides during the campaigns and administrations of Ronald Reagan, George H.W. Bush and George W. Bush that pretty much »roll[ed] off the president's shoulders with little effect.« For example, here is a striking parallel to Trump aides meeting with Russians in 2016: There is strong evidence that Reagan operatives met with Iranians during the 1980 campaign, undermining President Jimmy Carter's ability to negotiate for release of the Americans held hostage in Iran. (See Gary Sick's *October Surprise*). On the other hand, most if not all of the highly publicized Clinton administration scandals became widely regarded in retrospect as exaggerated distractions that held little relevance to his performance as president—moments of poor journalistic, rather than presidential, performance. So the idea that evidence of bad behavior has reliably generated scandalization and political damage for presidents is a faulty premise. It might well have become more faulty than ever because of the polarized party and media systems, but this is a difference of degree, not kind.

Regards,
Bob

Subject: Re: Re: Statement on President Trump
From: hendrik.michael@uni-bamberg.de
Date: 3/15/2017
To: entman@gwu.edu

Dear Bob,

thank you for this quick reply and your elaboration on Donald Trump's scandals. Your observations of the scandal overload in public discourse, Trump's skillful mastery of scandal management, and historic antecedents are very interesting. But may I pose a follow-up question?

With respect to media coverage on scandals of past US presidents (e. g. Bill Clinton) you identified a »poor journalistic performance«. What is your prognosis as regards the professional journalistic media and Donald Trump? May we see the implementation of different forms of journalistic reporting, i.e. an increase of investigative methods (with all its modern ramifications: data driven journalism, whistle-blowing, etc.) rather than the spectacularization and personalization that comes as a conventional treatment of political scandals?

Yours,
Hendrik

Subject: Re: Re: Re: Statement on President Trump
From: entman@gwu.edu
Date: 3/15/2017
To: hendrik.michael@uni-bamberg.de

Dear Hendrik,

good questions. I'd add the following final paragraph to my previous response:

The unique challenges posed by Trump could spur innovations in investigative methods. His plenitude of misdeeds could embolden journalists to depart from their traditionally close reliance on government investigations to lend scandals enough momentum and persistence to force corrupt leaders from office. But at this writing, mainstream journalists seem committed to remaining within the boundaries of elite discourse. If elites, for partisan gain, fear of unleashing political instability, or other reasons, refuse to investigate thoroughly no matter how high the probe leads—a refusal that has been more the norm than exception in the U.S., Watergate notwithstanding (see *Scandal And Silence*)—scandalized media attention should remain poorly calibrated to the severity of misconduct at the upper reaches of American government.

Best,
Bob

STEFFEN BURKHARDT

Scandals in the Network Society

Scandals are an equally fascinating as well as complex research area. They are dioramas made up of social breakup and turmoil that provide information about sense of ethics and power structures. Scandals are capable of destabilizing exposed individuals as well as social, religious, political and societal groups. The increase of digital forms of communication since the turn of the millennium coincided with an increase of scientific studies that deal with these forms and that acknowledge a boom of public outrage. In nearly all Western nations an increase of scandals can be observed (cf. ALLERN et al. 2012; ALLERN/POLLACK 2012; BURKHARDT 2006; IMHOF 2002; KEPPLINGER 1996; KUMLIN/ESAIASSON 2012; DOWNEY/STANYER 2013; STRÖMBÄCK 2008; UMBRICHT/ESSER 2016). Different reasons for this development are cited in literature on the subject. Hallin and Mancini (2004) view the commercialization of the media system and its decoupling from the political institutions as a central force leading to an increase of political scandals. Hondrich (2002) finds reason for that development in the increasing complexity of modern societies that coincides with conflicting functional descriptions of the social subsystems. In that functional context, political correctness as a context-dependent sense of ethics, and an expression of changing norms and values, also becomes a matter of scandal (IMHOF 2002). Tumber and Waisbord (2004a, 2004b) cite further political, cultural, technological and media-related changes as beneficial factors. A synergy of changing norms thus leads to more scandals in the media. Kalb (1998) points to scandalization as being a strategy used by journalists to achieve maximization of circulation as well as purview and, therefore, for maximization of profit. Journalists themselves use their reporting on

scandals as decision management, career strategy, and for the pursuit of other personal interests (KEPPLINGER et al. 2002; CHALABY 2004; KANTOLA 2012). At the same time, the increasing self-dramatization of societal actors facilitates new forms of visibility and the fashioning of prominence which leads to a bigger supply of possible scandals (THOMPSON 2000; BURKHARDT 2006). Explanation attempts like the ones mentioned here shed light on the complexity of scandals that – not without reason – update the social self-understanding as a grand narrative.

There is something else, though, that also becomes apparent with regard to very recent scandals: In the fragmented public spheres of the digital age, the challenges of likes, selfies, retweets and sexting, the possibilities of anonymous denouncing, the erosion of privacy and other normative spheres of protection around certain forms of communication, data aggregation and global, intercultural communication create an unprecedented potential for public anger and outrage, along with lust and an addiction to indignation.

1. The spiral of scandals

This transformation of the phenomenon of scandals cannot be dealt with without taking digital public spheres into account. The pervasiveness of interconnected information and communication technologies did not only change the way in which media is being used but also society as such (MARTIN 1978; HILTZ/TUROFF 1978; VAN DIJK 1999; CASTELLS 2000). The network society can be seen as a form of society that organizes its relations in media networks that gradually replace or complement the social networks of face-to-face communication. Digital interaction replaces personal communication. In the media networks, which shape the primary mode of organization and the most important structures of modern society, scandals can spread rapidly through the hubs of the network. The concept of public outrage, which has developed over millennia, has undergone further transformation processes. Those processes are particularly marked by a heightened visibility of the matter of the scandal at hand and the expansion of the number of persons that are involved in the media discourse. New forms of self-reflection and self-characterization in society, centered around the conflict area of professional and private participants in a discussion, form a heterogeneous field of interaction for the attention excesses of a digital

community in a self-referential frenzy of outrage (MANDELL/CHEN 2016; PÖRKSEN/DETEL 2012). The virulence of uncontrolled mediatized scandals is a conspicuous phenomenon of society at the beginning of the 21st century (BURKHARDT 2015). A momentum of communication that defies control is typical for these scandals.

This becomes particularly apparent in actual communication about a mediatized scandal due to two separate developments: Firstly, the internet is a pool of issues full of digital communication contents that instigators of a scandal are able to absorb at any time. Secondly, instigators are able to spread their outrage via digital ways of communication in an exponentiated way. Digital communication, therefore, changes mediatized scandalization both with regard to the content of scandals and with regard to how scandals spread.

Amateurs gain influence interpreting alleged violation of norms in the mass media especially through the emergence of social media interaction, even though journalism still shapes their perception. Without journalistic reporting in TV and radio news, newspapers, magazines and online news, outrage over alleged deficiencies that are named and shamed in social media would wither. What use is the outrage over Twitter and Facebook about sexual harassment by politicians (cf. GAMSON 2016) or about the documents published online by WikiLeaks (BECKETT/BALL 2012) if the discourse in society about the subject fails to materialize? Even the elucidation by whistleblowers like Edward Snowden only attracts interest in big parts of the population through journalistic framing of a mediatized scandal. Journalism is assigned the task of de-escalating the spiral of scandals of the digital media with a disperse, partially anonymous audience.

While the dynamics of scandalization in the interconnected society has changed, the principle of scandal has not. That principle has been around since the first documented use of the term in the fourth century before the Common Era: Scandals can be characterized as a communication process that sparks public outrage through a postulated violation of the general moral model of the social reference system (cf. LINDBLOM 1921; STÄHLIN 1930; NECKEL 1989: 56; KÄSLER 1991: 69-85; THOMPSON 2000: 11-14; BURKHARDT 2006: 60-81). The alleged transgressions oftentimes did not prompt the scandal but did more often prompt a sometimes historically relevant pretense for the ostracism of individuals and for the demarcation of big groups.

2. What is scandal resreach?

Scandal research is the systematic and comparative study of scandals as a social ritual that serve the purpose of updating normative moral models in a society and that, through communication, contribute to a collective difference and identity formation. It analyzes the narrative structures, functional phases and discursive practices of scandalization. Scandal research especially addresses the central function of scandals, namely to negotiate power structures in communities and societies. It is therefore always also the research of power of discourse and of impuissance of discourse.

Of special importance in scandal research is the analysis of professional message production in the media system since that system, with its public interpretational sovereignty, is the most important producer of scandals since the 20th century. Mass media do not simply report on scandals that exist outside of them. Instead, they produce them by framing social circumstances, events or developments in a specific, narrative way which is labelled a scandal. Without taking into account media-related message production, especially journalism, an appropriate consideration of how scandals and norm relate would not be conceivable anymore.

In Christian-theological reflexions, and already in the 20th century, scandals have always been addressed in numerous studies of social, linguistic, cultural, legal and economical research.[1] Thompson's (1997, 2000) insight that scandals only constitute themselves through forms of communication inherent to the mass media made scandals a central matter of media science and communication science. Scandals are examined as constructs of mass media communication that can be defined separately from non-mediatized scandals. When localized scandals are being mediatized, for example the Ma Yaohai scandal in China being covered in the *New York Times*, it was not the media outlet that produced the scandal. The situation is different with scandals that provoke outrage as scandalous stories in the media. Examples are the 2004 reports about crimes in Abu Ghraib or the 2005 debate about the Danish Mohammed caricatures. For the purposes of specifying the terminology, following the established definition by Thompson, two types of ›scandals‹ can be differentiated between: a scandal (with no media coverage or a scandal that is being reported on) and a mediatized scandal

1 For an extensive synopsis of research published on scandals, cf. BURKHARDT 2015: 39ff.

(a scandal that was manufactured by the media). This differentiation is of key relevance with regard to the connection between scandalization and societal upheavals.

3. Scandals as compared to mediatized scandals

Mediatized scandals are communication processes induced by mass media that trigger public outrage by means of a postulated violation of the general moral model of the social reference system. This violation can affect different areas of society from politics, economics, culture or sports. While social norms are negotiated within partial public spheres with regard to scandals, the discourse, with regard to mediatized scandals, about the matter of the scandal and the implicated updating of normative moral concepts takes place within the complex public sphere of the media and their partial spheres (cf. BURKHARDT 2006, 2008a). Mediatized scandals are a distinct category of practical communication that uses a specific journalistic narrative pattern at the interplay of information and entertainment media to qualify and upgrade the symbolic order of social systems. Social networks have not yet established themselves as central narrative story telling platforms but merely as (powerful) distribution channels for mediatized scandals. When comparing scandals and mediatized scandals (cf. BURKHARDT 2006), there are some significant differences that become apparent concerning the degree of publication, the modes of transgression, the time and space-related framing of the scandal narrative, the difference and identity management that was upgraded by that narrative and the presence of images that were orchestrated by the scandalization (cf. table 1).

All differences that arise when comparing scandals and mediatized scandals result due to the professional production mechanisms and the communication specifics of the media system and journalism as its sui generis system for self-describing and self-observing: The distinction between socially acceptable and unacceptable behavior has a very high scattering effect in the complex public sphere of the mediatized scandal, whereas that effect is less marked when making the distinction in non-mediatized scandals. This is because journalism, as the central scandalizing agent, operates with many communication instruments and many technical dispositifs. Mediatized scandals, as opposed to non-mediatized scandals that are products of everyday communication, are predominantly professionally