

## ☐ Summaries of the articles

Kauko Pietilä

### **The profession of journalism and the self-defence of society**

The 20th century represents a historical era when society, reinforced by social ethics, professionalism and sociology, took a stand against the market-oriented organisation of societal life. This resistance began to break down in the 1980s at the latest, resulting in de-professionalization of the formerly professionalized occupations. Also journalism was threatened to become an anachronism, and not just as a profession but also as a business. Along with the disintegration of professionalism, different occupations exhibited signs of a new hierarchization into a higher and a lower stratum. It is in the higher stratum rather than the lower one, where an interest in re-professionalization is emerging. It is argued in the article that out of these elements a new professional dogma that understands journalism as a form of *sociation* may be refined.

Elina Noppari

### **Interplay and formation of trust between Finnish journalists and decision makers**

It is often stated in both media studies literature and public discussion that the relationship between Finnish journalists and decision-makers has grown more distant and critical since 1980s. The empirical data in this article shows that despite the confrontational relation between decision-makers and journalists, there are many well-functioning working relationships between the two parties, which may even include the exchange of very sensitive and confidential information. The article examines the mechanisms that

helps to create and maintain the atmosphere of trust between journalists and the decision-makers. The examination also touches the public discussion on the mediatization of society and decision making in general. The article suggests that mediatization on the micro level of "journalist-elite" relations can be characterized as mutual professionalization. The article is based on a survey (N=419) and interviews of 60 decision-makers.

Juho Vesa

### **Online debaters' evaluations of journalistic media in light of theories of democracy**

Citizens' views on the media are often ignored in the research on the relationship between journalistic media and democracy. This article attempts to introduce tools for recognizing citizens' views on the media by analyzing them from the standpoint of ideal-typical normative theories of democracy. An outline of citizens' evaluations of journalistic media is formed by analyzing two online debates which appeared on the web page of *Ilta-Sanomat* in 2007. When assessing the performance of the Finnish journalistic media, the debaters use eight evaluation criteria, each of which has a counterpart in the academic debate on media and democracy. These criteria are independence, objectivity, criticality, proactivity and multiperspectivalness of the journalistic media, its closeness to citizens and relevance of the media agenda. Debaters' way of evaluating the media comes closer to elite democracy and deliberative democracy than participatory democracy. The results also contribute to the debate on what citizens expect of the journalistic media.