What Was Said? A Discourse Analysis of a Famous Finnish Radio Journalist's Virtuous Monologues

Seppo Alajoutsijärvi

Vocational College, Kemijärvi

Lepistötie 1, 98120 Kemijärvi, Finland

Tel: 358-400-417-342   E-mail:seppo.alajoutsijarvi@upp.inet.fi

Kaarina Määttä (Corresponding author)

Faculty of Education, University of Lapland

P. O. Box 122, 96101 Rovaniemi, Finland

Tel: 358-400-696-480   E-mail: kaarina.maatta@ulapland.fi

Abstract

The aim of this article is to study a well-known radio journalist and media-educator Hannu Taanila's radio programs in a state-owned Finnish Broadcasting Company. Hannu Taanila is an influential media person whose radio programs were famous and popular. This article concentrates on Hannu Taanila's radio monologues. The research data includes 16 radio programs broadcast in 2005. Each program lasted for 45 minutes and all of them were recorded, transcribed, and analysed by discourse analysis. This article focuses on describing and discussing this famous radio speaker's image, his language and editorial practice: What kinds of interpretative discourses did Hannu Taanila construct in his radio speeches and which were his positions of media education in his radio program? The results of this research show, that the radio as a public media still has the possibility to fulfil the basic educational purposes of national broadcasting.

Keywords: Radio, Radio monologues, Discourses, Discourse analysis, Media education

1. Introduction

In the modern world, the radio as media still goes strong (e.g. Fairclough, 1997; Fleming, 2009; Hendy, 2008; Tolson, 2005): indeed, it is worth noticing that one does not have to own a radio (machine) any longer in order to listen to the radio but most radio channels have their broadcast available in the internet as well. From educators' point of view, this presents interesting possibilities and viewpoints to education. In this article, we will review the possibilities that the public media have from the point of view of educational purposes and media education. We have chosen as an example one famous Finnish radio journalist, Hannu Taanila. Through analyzing the discourse in his radio programs we will show how the public media can influence on the listeners.

1.1 The starting point of this research

Finnish broadcasting was born in 1926 imitating the English system, BBC, that images civilization and culture. This kind of broadcasting could be compared with sowing grain everywhere evenly, and thus, touching with a spirit of cultivation. In addition, both culture and civilization refer to knowledge and civilization, distribution, and spreading. On the other hand, when activities were organized as a mass communication here in Finland, also broadcasting had to be included – as a part of democracy (Hietala, 1996; Oinonen, 2004). Its public and basic task was to produce, provide, and transmit radio and television programs equally for all citizens.

At first, Finnish broadcasting had to offer one main product: programs. In practice, it meant that independent programs with their own titles were broadcast at certain times. Besides information and civilization, Finnish broadcasting was planned to offer amusement. Nowadays, it is called *"mixing of information and amusement"*. One type of radio products is media reality which is born when somebody uses language to produce or receive the reality (Gross and Finka, 2005; Kotilainen and Kivikuru, 1999). As a consequence, the radio as a media and

radio broadcasts have become a remarkable institution in a society (Fairclough, 1997; Geller, 2007; Nieminen and Pantti, 2004; Smith, Wright, and Ostroff, 1998).

The Finnish broadcasting had to change its channels to get more listeners in 2003. It profiled the channels by the same way as the commercial radio did. They were divided by age and consumption. The program studied in this article was produced by Hannu Taanila in YLE Radio 1 which concentrates on culture and classical music as well as on the current affairs programs (Hujanen, 2003). This well-known journalist got a prize for the popularization of science in Finland in 2003 and some Finns consider him as one of the best journalists of Finland (Torkki, 2007).

Taanila's career as a journalist started in 1965 as a freelancer in Finnish TV1. His programs concerned with social policy and culture when he worked in media. In 1975, he started his actual radio work as a chief of culture staff in Finnish Radio 2. Among other things, Hannu Taanila's one remarkable idea was Latin news, *Nunti latini*, that Finnish Broadcasting begun to broadcast all over the world in 1989. Nowadays, *Nunti latini* is greatly appreciated and popular everywhere in the world. After working a long period as a journalist, Taanila retired and, at the end of the year 2005, the program was cut off by Finnish Broadcasting; ever since, many Finnish people have been yearning after his critical and colourful programs.

1.2 Main concept: the radio

Radio is an electrical media and its presentations rest solely on hearing. In addition, broadcasts are straightforward and personal, and its audience is not exactly in the offing. Audiences are seen as consumers and electronic media forms publicity (Habermas, 1989). That makes radio a special medium which is, in spite of national broadcasting, bound to international changes and development. Radio has an invisible role (Cantril and Allport, 1986). We are not able to see its message as it consists of noise and silence only, and because of its invisibility, radio's other distinctive qualities – the nature of its language, jokes, the way the audience uses it - ultimately determine (Cohen, 1976; Cricel, 1986): that is why depictions in broadcasts have to be clear, easy, and argumentative, but not ponderous.

In encyclopaedia, radio is defined as a technical tool without taking into consideration its processes and actors (John, 1968; Nachman, 2000). According to Åbrink (1998, p. 15), radio means *sending messages without technical control over them who receives the messages.* A sender is ignorant of listeners but acts in public. When talking about today's radio, we refer to the modern way to beam a program – as a type of discussion, monologue, and dialog (Gross and Fink, 2005; Åbring, 1998). Listening to the radio inspires imagination and listeners are riveted by it; furthermore, active listeners shape their own fantasies based on what they have heard and what kind of experiences they pursue (Fleming, 2009).

Nowadays, it is popular to use colloquial language on radio. It appears as a talkative dialog that also includes mistakes and indefinite sentences. Radio epitomizes social communication and does not necessitate perfect purity: this medium wants to differ from the traditional way and repeated talking (Keith, 2009). Thompson (1995) has stated about the phenomenon the following way: *"Fundamentally the usage of communication media transforms the spatial and temporal organization of social lives creates new forms of action and interaction and new models of exercising power, which are no longer linked to the sharing of a common location".* Finally, people think that radio is a social institution where people meet each other like a journalist meet listeners - this thought describes the illusion of radio (Fairclough, 1997).

Radio is an elastic medium by its nature and has received new duties: Radio wakes us up in the morning, sends us to the work, provides us with a variety of moods in the evening, and gives us late-night activities. Blackwell and Seabrook (1993) point out that mass media operate within the social system. To do all the above mentioned, a journalist has to be an expert of using language and conscious of what is happening in his/her environment. Therefore, the language that a journalist uses has many functions (Halliday, 1978).

People often think that language is an extensive phenomenon and has a variety of different forms. It consists of numerous phonemes, words, sentences, and texts as well as their structural rules and usage.Relation between language and the world is not symmetrical: that is why language describes the world but not vice versa. Halliday (1978, p. 27) considers language as a social skill because *"children grow up, and their language grows up with them".* This shows how necessary social togetherness is for the development of language. Furthermore, he claims that *"learning language is learning how to mean".* Halliday (1978) considers parlance as a process. Thus, for example, when a journalist describes the reality he/she regards it as a field of many systems competing against each other. The described reality is a remarkable world and its processes and relations are shaped many different ways (Parker, 1992; Potter and Wetherell, 1989).

Usually, radio speech and language, as in media in general, consist of much more than just information (Fairclough, 1997; Seehafer and Laemmer, 1959). They are based on the observations of reality without a natural meaning that could be interpreted through words or another signs. At first, when radio began to operate, a journalist's voice played an important role, unlike nowadays (Hilmes, 1997; Pease and Dennis, 1995). Now, the tendency is different: a mundane speaking style is used – it is called the ethos of communication. This kind of language is understood as more democratic. In addition, chatting has become a significant type of discussion that combines the elements of discussion and amusement (Fairclough, 1997; Scannel 1992). Every journalist's work includes more and more entertaining and therefore, journalists are on a par with listeners. Entertainment, personal expression and common sense are emphasized in the new practices of media and programs are more talkative than before, which can be heard in the language that is used (Perez-Sabater et al., 1992; Yanguas, 2010). At the same time, all these tendencies symbolize individualism (Fairclough, 1997; Tolson, 1991).

2. The Aim of the Research and Research Questions

Nowadays, the most important elements in media seem to be to please the audience and the multitude of the audience; and these elements have become an automatic part of its presentations. This tendency has changed the traditional media, including national broadcasting. In Finland, it has been claimed that the national broadcasting is harmful, or downright a hindrance, to the business media.

Hannu Taanila has worked as a journalist in Finnish Broadcasting Company since 1965. He has been granted for his lifework as a journalist and has practiced as an individual and critical editor who has special speaker's talents.

The aim of this research is to find out what kind of media talk Hannu Taanila's radio programs represent and to identify Journalist Hannu Taanila as a radio journalist. As the purpose was to understand what factors in his discourse appealed to the audience – what was the secret of his virtuous speech – this research was set the following questions:

1) What kinds of interpretative discourses did Hannu Taanila construct in his radio speeches?

2) What kind of position did his radio program have in media education?

3. The Research Method, Data and Analysis

In the present study, the editorial practices of Hannu Taanila's radio programs were studied as well as his image as a radio journalist and as an influential media person. The approach was constructive. The programs were broadcast in the Finnish Radio, officially known as Finnish Broadcasting Company, which is a state-owned company in Finland.

Hannu Taanila is known of his linguistic skills and his critical opinions in Finland. He had his own radio program from 2003 to 2005. The data of this research consisted of 16 45-minute-long monologues broadcast on the radio every second Monday in 2005. Every program was listened to, recorded, and then, immediately after listening, written up. As texts, the data comprised 164 written pages.

The aim was to outline the main discourses of the speech and positions from which Taanila spoke. Linguistic characteristics are constructed when the aim is to express something; and the use of language has its consequences, as well (Wetherell and Potter, 1988). During a discursive action, we constantly situate people into a certain position and produce different subjectivities for them (Davies and Harre, 2001). Discussions express positions, locations, and places where a subject could take a certain position (Foucault, 1969). Those subject positions define individuals' perspectives and offer relevant images and concepts for them. In discourses, subject positions vary temporarily and are never static. They are also defined over and over again in new situations (Davies and Harre, 2001; Jokinen and Juhila, 1999).

This study belongs to the field of qualitative research. The methodological approach, namely discourse analysis, responds to theoretical questions such as how and from which point of view one should research these kinds of radio programs that this research focuses on. Those presentations are fundamentally human actions and, therefore, produce cultural and social reality. According to the approach used in this research, cultural and social realism exist but knowledge about them is merely a subjective interpretation. Edmund Husserl (1995) thinks that we perceive the only realistic world through our subjective experiences and attention. Hence, it calls for attention to people's experience and the interpretation of their experiences. Wetherell (2001) defines language as a human meaning-making-activity. He understands that the task of the language is not to describe reality but to understand it. In this study, discourse analysis appeared as a suitable and workable method to observe language and to use it as a tool for constructing and interpreting.

The word *"discourse"* is based on Latin word *"discursus"* and means *"to run around"*. On the other hand, the French word *"discourse"* means *"speech, lecture, chat, or rambling"*. In addition to its etymologic perspective, discourse also means a process and its result, simultaneously. This means that the meanings of languages are not ready or absolutely true and are produced in discourses formulated in social, historical, and institutional contexts (Lehtonen, 2000).

In literature, discourse has many different definitions referring to discourse analysis. Language science is a discourse of writing or/and speech (Luukka, 2000). Searching discourses can also be paralleled with researching language usage (Wetherell, Taylor, and Yates, 2001).

Foucault (1969) has defined discourse as the wholeness of utterances from a similar form system. The science of language sees a discourse as writing or speech (Luukka, 2000). The study of discourse can also be understood as the research of language usage Wetherell, Taylor, and Yates, 2001).

In the present research, the discourse analysis was based on a model of discourse with the functions, socio-cultural contexts, and subject positions launched by Norman Fairclough. He describes his model as quite a repeating way of speaking about the events of social life, happenings, situations, and the relations of a certain position. In this model, Fairclough (1992/1995) separates oral text into three parts. The first level of text addresses the relations of language. The level that consists of social circumstances in discussion, namely the way the language is used, is located between the first and the lowest levels. According to Fairclough (2005), analysis of texts includes 'interdiscursive' analysis of how genres, discourses and styles are articulated together. These are categories which are distinguished and related at the level of social practices (as elements of orders of discourse). These features were systematically interpreted from the data in this research and four different interpretative discourses were found. The aim was to reveal the functions and context of the journalist's radio monologues.

The question of reliability in discourse analysis concerns whether different researchers would interpret the text in similar ways – although such reliability is not necessarily possible as researchers are likely to differ for example in their motivational factors, expectations, and familiarity. Therefore, discourse analysis always remains a matter of interpretation and ultimately, the reliability and the validity of the researcher's findings depends on the force and logic of the arguments. Thus, it also depends on the quality of the rhetoric. (Booth 1978; Kobayashi, and Rinnert, 1996; Madill, Jordan, and Shirley, 2000). In this research, the logic of the analysis is founded on the theoretical and methodological framework presented earlier and the analyzing procedures are described carefully. In addition, we have presented quotations from the data to support our findings and interpretations.

4. Results

We first identified four different interpretative discourses used by Hannu Taanila in his radio program: 1) Celebrity discourse, 2) Influential persons and the power in politics, 3) The national autonomy, and 4) Modern practices in media. The final naming of these discourses aims at revealing the functions and context of Hannu Taanila's radio speeches. In the following sub-sections, these discourses are illustrated by showing the particular features of Hannu Taanila's radio speeches. Furthermore, four kind of subject positions produced by Taanila's role as a media educator in his radio speeches will be set to Hannu Taanila.

4.1 Celebrity discourse

Celebrity discourse represented the most common and central way – almost as a hegemonic way – of Hannu Taanila's speech. He constructed the illustrations of well-known and influential persons and their ways of acting by using colourful speech and metaphors. *"They are the nation's torches and lofty statues."* This phenomenon represents the emphasized ethos and particularly the popular media where talking about politicians has started to resemble celebrity culture (Corner and Pels, 2003). Turner (2004) differentiates celebrity and public figures from each other and thinks that a celebrity is in media because of his/her work role but after becoming an interesting person in general, he/she has turned into a celebrity. It is known that today's media are only interested in celebrities and their private life because the stories about them sell well. *"Yes, I admit that I have a severe need for publicity and I, as a celebrity, have not been able to ascend from the farm or quilt level."*

This way, Hannu Taanila represented politicians and other well-known people and what they have done. The perspective was social and he categorized them either as useless or praised as the builders of common good. Taanila lifted up this phenomenon of celebrity idolatry and attacked celebrities because people tended to see only those well-known people behind the things, positions, and happenings but not the neutral and common concepts or immaterial institutions. This phenomenon exemplifies the individualization in media and outlines societal life through famous politicians, leaders and those who appear in public all the time. These kinds of people want to parade themselves. Taanila understood that they are only for the sake of themselves in media and he called them

as stand-up comics. *"These post-modern partygoers and other critics typify those who prefer acting behind everybody else."*

One of the most interesting features of Hannu Taanila's way of speech was that when describing people he usually referred to them with their whole name: *"Paavo Lipponen"*, *"Max Jacobson"*. This was how he let the audience know of whom he was talking about and describing an illustration of. For example, Taanila did not use titles as *"the prime minister"* or *"the president"* because these titles would have referred to an institution, not a particular person. According to Norman Fairclough (1997), throwing away the title that describes neighbourhood and democracy is an example of the selections that a journalist does concerning his object. Similarly, a journalist turns an official discourse into more talkative in order to make the audience understand his message easier. It is commonly known that people with a certain social status know and try to show for others with their behaviour (Weber, 2004).

An interesting phenomenon that also appeared in Taanila's programs was that he wanted to show and inform the audience of the fact that everybody does not have the freedom of speech. People are divided into those who do not always get themselves heard and to those who are the overwhelming majority, such as *"those so-called representatives of the so-called economic life"*. Thus, people are divided into those who have the positions due which they to get listened and to those who are not listened to. The result of this division is that people are presented badly in the electric media (Fairclough, 1997). For that reason, Taanila addressed citizens and brought out repeatedly their voice. *"How much do we worship these so-called business managers every day?"* His way of thinking produced a theory according to which becoming civilized is not passive learning and knowledge but, instead, it is how we behave and exist in the world during people's entire life-span (Ojanen, 2008; Snellman, 1863/1982). Ordinary people's diligence and modesty were emphasized in Taanila's speeches: *"Erkki Väisänen is not any silly stinking rich businessman who visits Florida for skiing"* or *"No, Erkki Väisänen is a civilized man."* These quotes revealed Taanila's sympathetic attitude to a conventional life style and his resistance to an elitist culture

4.2 Influential people and power

Politicians and participation in politics were central themes in Hannu Taanila's radio speeches in 2005. In this discourse, Taanila described how the power is present in everywhere where we produce social reality and how politicians try to use power for their own interests and lead public discussion in a direction they want to. He also argued that as a journalist his task was to seize on if he found something superficial and useless in the society. Frequently, he stated in his speeches that: *"it is worth noticing that"*. People cannot own the power but they can use it and make others function a certain way (Kusch, 1993): *"let us, citizens, notice how they treat us"*. By this critical and common way Hannu Taanila expressed the unrealistic relations between citizens, politics, and political leaders (Fairclough, 1997). This indicated Taanila's attempt to change it and reminded the audience of the fact that citizens should have the real power in a democratic society. His criticism showed that everybody has a right to express one's opinions by oneself.

When defending citizens, Taanila used a sort of manipulation in order to get in harmony and unity with the audience – whereupon it was easy to introduce his own opinion. *"The political discussion in this summer makes you merely yarn except the NATO debate that makes you almost want to neglect reading the newspapers and watching television"*. At the same time, he used a type of discourse, a mix of information and irony, and illustrated how leaders would present themselves unselfish and worshiping each other. In this discourse, Taanila used plenty of transformation of words as a linguistic method and transformed nouns into verbs. His another method was the use of metaphors. He was talking about *"liturgying"* instead of using the word *"to speak"* when referring to the *"must-listen"* speeches of a politician or the elite. When using the pronoun "we", he wanted to show how he was one of the citizens. *"These Their Graces do not even tolerate to talk with us citizens and we useless fools allow them to do this."* Hannu Taanila spoke about civilization and democracy and gave examples about them. *"... civilization, civilization. Only by that a man turns into a human being and enters the real world and the joys of life, into the real-world paradise and garden of all kinds of desires"*. Like Aristotle (2000), Taanila gave examples through which he showed that there must be a relation between people and the world and the values of civilized persons.

Taanila showed how people use power by exaggerating and shaking meanings in order to attract people's attention: *"we should not resign to be dictated"* or *"we should now think of ourselves."* This manner of speech represents society-related criticism and defends the civil rights (Fairclough, 1992). In this discourse, Taanila used the word *"capitalism"* instead of *"economic competition"*. For instance, when reflecting the economic power of the ambition to maximize profits, his discussion style is a creative mix of entertainment, information, and

everyday talk yet including criticism and analysis: *"The question is about harsh barbarism and terror committed by today's capitalism, and which are executed by the ideologies of the snowmobile drivers and slalom skier of all sort... these are the little commandants of the today's capitalists' labour camps, these 'rudolfhösses' who do not want to hurt even a fly."*

4.3 The national autonomy

The third interpretative discourse was identified as the one in which the question of the autonomy in society was central. Autonomy means that a modern nation operates like an autonomous subject determining its actions by its own circumstances (Brubaker, 1992; Hegel, 1821/1961; Kant, 1784/1995). Taanila taught that citizens should decide what should be done and a state is merely an institution governed by them. *"Reaching for our own interests means basically two things: Firstly, that we will not insult any outsiders but we reconcile. Secondly, we are not dying for or applying for to be under some outsider's stooge or government."* According to Taanila, it is not allowed to observe a nation as a geographical but as an institutional form and random event. When Taanila warned about the threat of losing autonomy, he used the bound-up stories of everyday life which seemed close to people and were easy to understand.

In those stories, Taanila was concerned about citizens' freedom and induced the neighbourhood and ordinary citizens to raise their national spirit. At the same time, he was an informant and demanded autonomy and the freedom of opinion. Through simplifying things and metaphors, he wanted to be amusing and shake oppositionists. *"How is crawling this Finland, this Finland of all kinds of genteel; how is it crawling willingly like a slave at the command of European Union"*. This kind of language would be natural for today's journalists who supplant the traditional manner (Fairclough, 1997).

In this discourse, Taanila's strategy was to convince people with the Aristotelian theory of pathos, which aimed at calling the audience's attention on a theme and led it to a favourable state of mind. In this ethos, trustworthiness was Taanila's other strategy. In addition, Taanila's speech stood for the middle class when speaking about rationalism and society. He thought that it is unnecessary to have a monarch in order to be an independent nation but to have a nation governed by itself (Hegel, 1821/1961). He requested citizens to work for harmony and solidarity. *"Let us feather our own nest without any ukases or other directives as independent and conscious subjects but without bullying in any direction."*

To achieve citizens' trust on their autonomy, Taanila gave examples and represented a contrast between a dependent state and an independent one (Snellman, 1863/1982). Betweenwhiles, he was also provocative and founded all on the Germanic Bildung tradition and Immanuel Kant's utterance *"Sapere aude"* which advises to be speculative and to use one's own mind (Kant, 1784/1995).

4.4 Modern practices in media

Entertainment was a characteristic feature of Hannu Taanila's speeches. It was included not only in his program but it can be recognized generally in the modern media as well (Fairclough, 1997). Entertainment has replaced information (Nieminen and Pantti, 2004) and, sometimes, it is difficult to determine whether there is entertainment or not because everyone does not experience these kind of matters the same way. Instead, it is defined by the genre and the influence it has on receivers (Fairclough, 1997). *"...so the second best option would be a stove that has both a gas stove and an electric oven. This combines all the gas stove's effectiveness, even quicker than the brain of Mauri Pekkarinen [prime minister], with more versatile uses of an electric oven."*

In this discourse, Taanila used the expressions temporarily as a means of entertainment to persuade people to listen. All in all, information and entertainment are mixed together which is, indeed, a general practice of discourse (Titscher, Meyer, Wodak, and Vetter, 2000). Besides Taanila's colourful language, the phenomenon of attraction is evident in this discourse. It stimulates powerful emotions and makes people laugh and amuse. Ekström (2000) thinks that we do not know the difference between information and entertainment because they are not contrasts. Entertainment and chatting have commonly occupied discussion in media during the last twenty years being a remarkable phenomenon in the society, too (Karvonen, 2008). *"Why is it so that the Finnish rabble is moping because it is practicing only a passive resistance against this front of the intelligence?"*

We understand that all above-mentioned presents popular culture. It means not only popular but also a nation as an opposition to elitism (Dahlgren and Sparks, 1992). In addition, according to Johan Fornäs (1998), popular refers to that what belongs to people. Economy is another thing that controls subjects' and journalists' discursive style: texts are produced by a cultural industry and a citizen has been given only the role of a consumer (Street, 2000). The movements of discussion indicate a larger movement in culture and along the theory of function, the media as an established institution have a very important task (Fairclough, 1997; Kunelius, 2003). The

movements in the society, such as socio-culture, cultivating the editorial practice of journalist, the manners of language, and the perspectives of media are opposite to the cultural industry (Featherstone, 1991; Giddens, 1991; Kellner, 1998).

4.5 Hannu taanila's positions in media education

Generally, we define positions for everybody in discourses and we produce certain subjectivities for things and people all the time. In this way, the pre-shaped identities for the individuals determine different rights, duties, and features to different people. Identity means the same as a functional category and a piece of the system of meanings, a subject position (Jokinen and Juhila, 1999). It is also described as a position through which a person defines his/her perspective and in which a discourse offers relevant images and concepts to use (Davies and Harre, 2001).

4.5.1 Citizens' defender

A journalist's speech is important because he/she contacts the audience this way. The number of these words, discursive, and delivery rose very high (Fairclough, 1997). Hannu Taanila's audience consisted of typical middle-class citizens; which can be interpreted from the language he used continuously. When talking about current happenings, he was a defender of the citizens who understood them. Based on this, he did not undervalue them but, instead, demanded for humanism and democracy.

In his defence, Taanila showed how he also belonged to the same world with citizens who were against politicians. To support this argument, he also used a workers' voice and said, for example: *"even we here by the workers' side…"* Additionally, he got irritated when he had found a professor's undermining words about citizens and defended them like it was directed in him.

4.5.2 A critic, an attacker and a questioner

Nowadays, it is normal to enhance personality in media and to bring out a journalist's features; that is in harmony with individualism (Fairclough, 1997). Critical educators have long believed in the possibilities of education to affect the society. According to Taanila, the first thing that we should do would be to change undemocratic practices. This kind of criticism is aimed at the existing constructions and the relations of power and practice.

In his speeches, Taanila constructed a position of a critic and attacked European Union and NATO. Those cases took place besides the material target, namely, the union (Turner, 2004), and he described it colourfully and creatively with irony. Monologues reveal the journalist's perspective and construct his subjectivity.

4.5.3 A civilizer and an educator

Civilization, culture, and education are the expressions of communal life and, at the same time, they are results of a better communal existence. One of these words, civilization, is comprised of culture and education. Their common baseline is an idea that a man could become a human being (Siljander, 2000). Hannu Taanila shared Immanuel Kant's (1784/1995) view in his theory about civilizing process which was defined as an attempt to enhance emancipation and freedom in order to turn *homo barbarus* into *homo humanus*.

The word *"enlightenment"* became common in Europe in the 18th century and means to light or clarify things. Of the same concept group, the German word *"Bildsamkeit"* refers to that a human being is in principle educative (Siljander, 2000). When Taanila was telling about freedom and emancipation, he alluded to the Finnish people being obliged to change their attitudes towards other countries regardless of our limited possibilities. It means that a nation has to trust only in itself and be autonomous (Kant, 1784/1995; Snellman, 1863/1982). Still, at the same time, Taanila warned and educated of the risks and unwanted consequences that may occur. For example, he exhorted us to remember that Finland is quite a small country and the only power that small countries of this kind have is civilization.

One of the stories Taanila told was about how civilized a common shopkeeper or a forest foreman can be. Being civilized does not necessarily need higher education but merely inner humanism that belongs to everybody and not only for the affluent. Hannu Taanila told stories about reality but also constructed new reality and stayed in an educator's position with leaders in the opposite one.

5. Discussion

When studying radio and media, this study concerns with the construction of social life. The idea is that a journalist produces meanings concerning reality by his experiences and usage of language. The fact is that communication researchers usually lean on the theory of speech act and ethno methodology and consider a variety of meanings as important.

Public service is powerful in Finland; for example, the Finnish Broadcasting has been long the only actor in this field. It has also served everybody regardless of the place of residence or wealth but now the world has changed. Furthermore, there are more entertainment and amusement included. Similarly, the media culture tends to broadcast the same programs from medium to another in order to attain more audience at the expense of documentaries. A certain tradition exists: Culture has started to resemble marketing more and more – and vice versa (Wall, 2000). Nowadays, spectacles are very popular because they go beyond people's experiences and their everyday life (Fairclough, 1997; Nieminen and Pantti, 2004; Kellner, 1998).

Along with a postmodern vision, we live in a reality of media that govern us (Kellner, 1998). This idea was born at the end of last millennium and is based on the modern theory. According to a concept of reality, it has been compensated by the reality of media that shows its presentations elsewhere, superficially, and amusingly. At the same time, media arrange our free time, shape political opinions, social communication, and give the model how to behave and speak (Ferrell Lowe, 1998; Squires, 2000; Tsakona, 2009). It is an arrangement of culture and a place of events (Fairclough, 1997).

Hannu Taanila launched a different operational model compared with the traditional one in the radio. His speech represents a critical perspective as he addressed the problems of a society and individuals and the causes for these problems. His actions were based on the idea of social responsibility and self-determination. Consequently, he understood the task of media as not just to earn economic profit for owners but merely to serve citizens with the issues of a great importance to them and to have larger responsibility in society in order to offer common good, stability, and support democracy (Nieminen and Pantti, 2004; Kellner, 1998). His criticism was in line with Immanuel Kant's idea about freedom and how to take care of it as well as civil rights (Kant, 1784/1995). Similar radio personalities have been researched in other countries too as their strong influence on people has been recognized (Hendershot, 2007).

The analysis of Hannu Taanila's radio programs shows that the radio as media produces criticism, reasoning thinking, and arouses people's own opinions of the reality. Radio still can carry out its basic task of civilizing given by a society. The informative quality of journalism does not necessarily have to become lighter although competing for the audience and the trend of entertaining do pose some pressure. Radio programs should not or do not have to address their audiences only as consumers but also as citizens and participants. However, it seems clear that new researches are needed to enhance high-quality content production of media.

References

Åbrink, H. (1988). *Gomorron, Stockholm. Radioprat som stil, genre och samtal med lyssnare [Good morning Stockholm. Radio speech as a style, genre and cooperation with audience]*. (Acta Universitatis Tamperensis No. 632.) Tampere: University of Tampere.

Aristotle. (2000). *Retoriikka. Runousoppi. Osa IX [Rhetorica Poetica, Part IX]*. (Translated by the editors of Aristotelic Books). Tampere: Gaudeamus.

Blackwell, T, and Seabrook, J. (1993). *The revolt against change: towards a conserving radicalism.* London: Vintage.

Booth, W. C. (1978). Metaphor as Rhetoric: The Problem of Evaluation. *Critical Inquiry,* 5 (1), 49-72.

Brubaker, R. (1992). *Citizenship and nationalhood in France and Germany.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/447972

Cantril, H. C. and Allport, G. W. (1986). *The psychology of radio*. New Hampshire: Harper & Row.

Cohen, A. A. (1976). Radio vs. TV: The effect of the medium. *Journal of Communication*, 26(2), 29-35. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1976.tb01376.x

Corner, J. and Pels, D. (2003). *Media and the restyling of politics, consumerism, celebrity and cynicism.* London, Thousand Oaks & New Delhi: Sage.

Cricel, A. (1986). *Understanding radio.* London: Methuen. http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9780203300343

Dahlgren, P. and Sparks, C. (1992). *Journalism and popular culture.* London: Sage.

Davies, B., and Harre, R. (2001). Positioning: The discursive production of selves. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, and S. J. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse theory and practice* (pp. 261-271). London: Sage.

Ekström, M. (2000). Information, Storytelling and Attractions: TV journalism in three modes of communication. *Media, Culture and Society,* 22(4), 465-492. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/016344300022004006

Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis. The critical study of language*. London: Longman.

Fairclough, N. (1997). *Miten media puhuu [Media Discourse]*. (Translated by V. Blom and K. Hazard). Tampere: Vastapaino.

Fairclough, N. (2005). Critical discourse analysis. *Marges Linguistiques*, 9, 76-94.

Featherstone, M. (1991). *Consumer culture and postmodernism*. London: Sage.

Ferrell Lowe, G. (1998). Symposium: Radio broadcasting in Scandinavia—Part II Competition and restructuring: Value transformation in Finnish public radio. *Journal of Radio Studies*, 5(2), 99-115. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/19376529809384550

Fleming, C. (2009). *The radio handbook*. London: Taylor & Francis.

Fornäs, J. (1998). *Kulttuuriteoria [Cultural theory]*. Tampere: Vastapaino.

Foucault, M. (1969). *Tiedon arkeologia [Archaeology of knowledge]*. (Translated by T. Kilpeläinen). Tampere: Vastapaino.

Geller, V. (2007). *Creating powerful radio*. Oxford: Elsevier.

Giddens, A. (1991). *Modernity and self-identity*. London: Polity Press.

Gross, L. S. (2003). *Telecommunications: radio, television, and movies in the digital age*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Gross, L. S. and Fink, E. J. (2005). *Telecommunications: An introduction to electronic media*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Habermas, J. (1989). *The structural transformation of the public sphere*. (Translated by T. Burger and F. Lawrence). Cambridge: Polity.

Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as social semiotic*. London: Edward Arnold.

Hegel, G. W. F. (1821/1961). *Grundlinen der Philosophie des Rechts*. Frankfurt am Main, Berlin, &Wien: Suhrkamp.

Hendershot, H. (2007). God's angriest man: Carl McIntire, Cold War fundamentalism, and right-wing broadcasting. *American Quarterly*, 59(2), 373-396. http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/aq.2007.0042

Hendy, D. (2008). Radio's cultural turns. *Cinema Journal*, 48(1), 130-138. http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/cj.0.0071

Hietala, V. (1996). *Ruudun hurma. Johdatus tv-kulttuuriin [Fascination of the screen. Introduction to tv-culture]*. Jyväskylä: Gummerus.

Hilmes, M. (1997). *Radio voices: American broadcasting, 1922-1952*. Minneapolis: University Of Minnesota Press.

Hujanen, T. (2003). Ääniradio [TV]. In K. Nordenstreg & O. A. Wiio (Eds.), *Suomen mediamaisema [The medialandscape of Finland]* (pp. 93-113). Helsinki: WSOY.

Husserl, E. (1995). *Fenomenologian idea. Viisi luentoa [Die Ideee der Phänomenologie, The Idea of Phenomenology]*. (Translated by J. Himanka, J. Hämäläinen, and H. Sivenius). Helsinki: Loki-kirjat.

John, R. S. (1968). *Encyclopaedia of radio and television broadcasting: the man behind the microphone*. London: Cathedral Square Pub.

Jokinen, A. and Juhila, K. (1999). Diskurssianalyyttisen tutkimuksen kartta [The map of discourse analysis]. In A. Jokinen, K., Juhila and Suoninen E.. *Diskurssianalyysi liikkeessä [Discourse analysis in motion]* (pp. 54-97). Tampere: Vastapaino.

Kant, I. (1784/1995). Vastaus kysymykseen: mitä on valistus? [Answer to the question: What is enligthenment?]. In J. Koivisto, M. Mäki, and T. Uusitupa (Eds.), *Mitä on valistus? [What is enlightenment?]* (pp. 76-86). Jyväskylä: Vastapaino.

Karvonen, E. (2008). Viihteellistyvä politiikan julkisuus [The publicity of entertaining politics]. *Tiedotustutkimus [Research on Communication]*, 5, 30-55.

Keith, M. C. (2009). *The radio station: Broadcast, satellite and internet*. Oxford: Focal Press.

Kellner, D. (1998). *Mediakulttuuri [Media culture]*. (Translated by M, Tuominen et al.). Tampere: Vastapaino.

Kobayashi, H. and Rinnert, C. (1996). Factors Affecting Composition in an EFL Context: Cultural Rhetorical

Pattern   adn   Readers´   Background. *Language   Learning,*   46   (3),   397-433. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-1770.1996.tb01242.x

Kotilainen, S and Kivikuru, U. (1999). Mediakasvatus ihanteiden ja todellisuuden ristipaineissa. [Media education under the pressure of the reality and the ideals]. In S. Kotilainen, M. Hankala, & U. Kivikuru (Eds.), *Mediakasvatus [Media education]* (pp. 13-30). Helsinki: Edita.

Kunelius, R. (2003). *Viestinnän vallassa. Johdatus joukkoviestinnän kysymyksiin [Under the power of communication. Introduction to the questions of the mass communication].* (5th ed.) Porvoo: WSOY.

Kusch, M. (1993). *Tiedon kentät ja kerrostumat – Michael Foucault'n tieteentutkimuksen lähtökohdat. [Fields and levels of knowledge. Points of departure in Michael Foucault's science].* (Translated by H. Hakasalo). Oulu: Kustannus Pohjoinen.

Lehtonen, M. (2000). *Merkitysten maailma [The world of meanings].* (3rd ed.) Tampere: Vastapaino.

Luukka, M. R. (2000). Näkökulma luo kohteen: diskurssitutkimuksen taustaoletukset [The perspective creates the object: The background presumptions of discourse analysis]. In K. Sajavaara & A. Piirainen-Marsh (Eds.), *Kieli, diskurssi & yhteisö [Language, Discourse & Community]* (pp. 133-160). Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.

Madill, A., Jordan, A. and Shirley, C. (2000). Objectivity and Realibility in Qualitative Analysis: Realist, contextualist and Radical Constructionist Epistemologies. *British Journal of Psychology,* 91 (1), 1-20. http://dx.doi.org/10.1348/000712600161646

Nachman, G. (2000). *Raised on radio.* London: University of California Press.

Nieminen, H. and Pantti, M. (2004). *Media markkinoilla. Johdatus joukkoviestintään ja sen tutkimukseen [Media in the market. Introduction to mass communication and its study].* Helsinki: Liki-kirjat.

Oinonen, P. (2004). *Pitkä matka on Tippavaaraan [It is a long way to Tippavaara].* Helsinki: Finnish Literature Association.

Ojanen, E. (2008). *Sivistyksen filosofia [The philosophy of civilization].* Helsinki: Kirjapaja.

Parker, I. (1992). *Discourse dynamics. Critical analysis for social and individual psychology.* London: Routledge.

Pease, E. C. and Dennis, E. E. (1995). *Radio – the forgotten medium.* New York: Transaction Publishers.

Perebinossoff, P. Gross, B., Gross, L. S. and Vane, E. T. (2005). *Programming for TV, radio, and the Internet: strategy, development, and evaluation.* Oxford: Elsevier.

Perez-Sabater, C., Pena-Martinez, G., Turney, E. and Montero-Fleta, B. (2008). A spoken genre gets written: Online football commentaries in English, French, and Spanish. *Written Communication*, 25(2), 235-261. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0741088307313174

Potter, J. and Wetherell, M. (1989). *Discourse and Social Psychology*. London: Sage.

Scannel, P. (1992). Public service broadcasting and modern public life. In P. Scannel et al. (Eds.), *Culture and power* (pp.126-148). London: Sage.

Seehafer, E. F. and Laemmar, J. W. (1959). *Successful radio and television advertising*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Siljander, P. (2000). Kasvatus kadoksissa? [Lost education?]. In P. Siljander (Ed.), *Kasvatus ja sivistys [Education and civilization]* (pp. 15-24). Helsinki: University Press.

Smith, F. L., Wright, J. W. and Ostroff, D. (1998). *Perspectives on radio and television: telecommunication in the United States.* New York: Routledge.

Snellman, J. V. (1863/1982). Sota vai rauha Suomelle [War or peace to Finland]. In *Teokset IV. Kirjoituksia Literaturblad-lehdessä 1856−1864 [In Books IV. Articles in Literaturblad-Journal 1856-1864]* (pp. 165-177). Jyväskylä: Gummerus.

Squires, C. R. (2000). Black talk radio: Defining community needs and identity. *The Harvard International Journal of Press/Politics*, 5(2), 73-95.

Street, J. (2000). *Mass media, politics and democracy.* Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Thompson, J. B. (1995). *Ideology and modern culture. Critical social theory in the era of mass communication*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Titscher, S., Meyer, M., Wodak, R. and Vetter, E. (2000). *Methods of text and discourse analysis*. London: Sage.

Tolson, A. (1991). *Speaking from experience: interview discourse and forms of subjectivity.* (PhD thesis, University of Birmingham.) Birmingham: University of Birmingham.

Tolson, A. (2005). *Media talk: Spoken discourse on TV and radio*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Torkki, J. (2007). *Puhevalta. Kuinka kuulijat vakuutetaan [Right to speech. How the audience will be convinced]*. Helsinki: Otava.

Tsakona, V. (2009). Linguistic creativity, secondary orality, and political discourse: the modern Greek myth of the "eloquent orator". *Journal of Modern Greek Studies*, 27(1), 81-106. http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/mgs.0.0053

Turner, G. (2004). *Understanding celebrity*. London: Sage.

Wall, T. (2000). Policy, pop, and the public: the discourse of regulation in British Commercial Radio. *Journal of Radio Studies*, 7(1), 180-195. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15506843jrs0701_14

Weber, M. (1980). *Protestanttinen etiikka ja kapitalismin henki [Die protestantische Ethik un der Geist de Kapitalismus, Protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism]*. (Translated by T. Kyntäjä). Helsinki: WSOY.

Wetherell, M. (2001). Editor's introduction. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, and S. J. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse theory and practice* (pp. 9-13). London: Sage

Wetherell, M., Taylor, S. and Yates, S. J. (Eds.) (2001). *Discourse as data. A guide for analysis.* London: Sage.

Wetherell, M. and Potter, J. (1988). Discourse analysis and the identification of interpretative reportoires. In C. Antaki (Ed.), *Analysing everyday explanations. A casebook of methods* (pp.169-183). London: Sage.

Yanguas, I. (2010). Oral computer-mediated interaction between L2 Learners: It's about time! *Language Learning & Technology*, 14(3), 72-93.