Abstract

The work deals with the phenomenon of so called watchdog organizations. The increasing number and influence of these organizations indicates a creation of new social movement. The authoress defines them as a type of public benefit nongovernmental organizations focused on the controlling of the public sphere or advocating and asserting a "public interest" in relation to the democratization of society. The authoress target is to understand this type of action, so she asks herself the question: Which frameworks are used by watchdog activists for the interpretation of their acting? At first there is briefly presented the concept of watchdog in the context of wider reflections of contemporary society, mainly in the context of reflexive modernity, monitory and participatory democracy and information society. Secondly there is introduced Goffman's framework analysis and the related conceptualization of framework of social movements by Benford and Snow. The authoress highlights a definition of frames as the principles of selection, emphasis and presentation about what happens, and what matters. In the next part of this work, there are presented the methodology and results of the qualitative research based on semi-structured interviews with watchdog activists. The research is settled in the area of interpretative sociology and comes out from framework analysis, but also from the phenomenology, symbolic interactionism and social constructivism. On the basis of the analysis of interviews the authoress concludes that watchdog activists share a framework of participatory democracy based on the largest civic engagement, and that they are building moral boundaries between themselves and other social groups, in the sense of emphasis their identification with the image of advocates, defenders or guiders. Finally she identifies two different master frames legitimizing actions of these actors. One of them understands the concept of watchdog part mainly as a tool for problems solutions. The other part sees this as an indispensable segment of democracy. In the final discussion she points out the fact, despite of a widespread definition of watchdog as a control activity, this type of acting seems to always be related to active asserting of interests.