Democratization of Communication as an Utopia

Experiences from the Finnish Radio Reform in the 1980s

TAISTO HUJANEN

The history of mass communication media is full of social and political utopias and, in particular, of technological utopias. The questions of access and participation are, in fact, a crucial element of a utopia which is below labeled as democratization of communication. Today, the democratic utopia of communication is again actualized by the recent development of technology like interactive television and computerized communication networks. In the European context, the dramatic political changes especially in the former socialist countries have also created ground for renewed democratic utopies.

For the study of contemporary utopias like democratization of communication, a useful point of reference is Mannheim's (1976) classic sociology of knowledge. His methodological emphasis on the "concreteness" of utopias means that utopian thinking is considered as an active social force affecting the transformation of societies in time and space. In fact, for him, utopian thinking is a necessary precondition of social change and of the historical transformation of societies.

The key element in Mannheim's turn towards the sociology of knowledge was the conclusion that the history of ideas should be seen as the history of their uses. For instance, utopian thinking does not affect history as an abstract set of ideas but through the use of those ideas by their "bearers", individuals, social classes, political movements etc.

The idea of the concreteness of utopias as formulated by Mannheim is in contrast with everyday understanding of utopic thinking. Utopias are most typically considered as something unreachable, mere wishful thinking. As Mannheim puts it, the contemporary connotation of the term "utopian" is predominantly that of an idea which is in principle unrealizable (op.cit., 177). The important point of Mannheim's own definition of utopian thinking is that he reverses such an everyday notion of utopias and makes them situational and socially conditional. According to Mannheim, the representives of a given order will label as utopian all conceptions of existence which *from their point of view* can in principle never be realized (op.cit., 176-177; italics original). Naturally, the individuals and groups of people who are labeled as utopians have a totally different view of what is realizable or not.

Mannheim offers also a few formal criteria for the identification of utopian think-

ing. A utopia refers, as he says, to a state of mind incongruous with the state of reality within which it occurs (op.cit., 173). Such an incongruence is evident in the fact that a state of mind in experience, in thought, in practice, is oriented towards objects which do not exist in the actual situation (ibid.). These formal characteristics do not alone reveal the sociological essence of utopian thinking and, therefore, Mannheim proposes a further elaboration of the concept:

Only those orientations trenscending reality will be referred to by us as utopian which, when they pass over into conduct, tend to shatter, either partially or wholly, the order of things prevailing at the time. (ibid.; italics added by TH)

For Mannheim, the above elaboration sets up a distinction between utopia and ideology, the latter referring to knowledge which is used to maintain the existing social order. The history of ideas, then, is characterized by a continuous struggle between utopians, the bearers of utopian thinking, and those who act in the name of status quo, the representatives of a given order.

The particular nature of utopias, the way they challenge the existing social order, makes them an interesting and relevant object in the study of hegemonic processes of power. What the utopias and utopians challenge is the taken for granted character of a given social order, maintained and reproduced, for instance, by the practices of everyday knowledge. Such a contestation over the naturalized forms of thinking, what is realizable and what is not, tells a lot about the premises of a given social order and the characteristics of dominant ideologies. This potential of utopias to question and make visible the practices of dominant ideologies is the reason why

the notion of utopia is below used as a central methodological tool in the analysis of the Finnish radio reform.

The approach selected below does not, as such, follow Mannheim's sociology of knowledge. From the point of view of the contemporary sociological analysis, a central aspect of his approach seems hard to apply. That is the realistic epistemology of his sociology of knowledge, the emphasis to consider utopian thinking in relation to the "true" course of history. That is demonstrated by the following citation from Mannheim:

It is only as long as we find ourselves in the very midst of mutually conflicting ideas that it is extremely difficult to determine what is to be regarded as truly utopian (i.e. realizable in the future) in the outlook of a rising class, and what is to be regarded as merely the ideology of dominant as well as ascendant classes. But, if we look into the past, it seems possible to find a fairly adequate criterion of what is to be regarded as ideological and what as utopian. This criterion is their realization. Ideas which later turned out to have been only distorted representations of a past or potential social order were ideological, while those which were adequately realized in the succeeding social order were relative utopias. (op.cit., 184)

As Mannheim points out in the beginning of the above citation, in the contemporary sociological analysis, "in the very midst of mutually conflicting ideas", it seems hard to determine what is to be regarded as truly utopian (i.e. realizable, in terms of realistic epistemology). Consequently, in the analysis of contemporary utopias below, the key question is not their congruence or incongruence with reality, but rather the way they contribute to the construction of present realities. What is the reality the utopians challenge, what sort of realities are constructed as alternatives to that?

What is the socio-cultural and political composition of utopians and, on the other hand, of those who represent the existing order? Who and in what way are labeled as utopians by themselves or by the others?

In comparison with Mannheim's emphasis on cognition, i.e. thinking and knowledge, the above questions point to a more language-oriented approach, known today as discourse analysis. This is not to say that Mannheim's consideration of utopian thinking and mentality has no use in the present-day analysis of utopian discourse. As highlighted above, it can very well be used to demonstrate the social conditions of language as discourse and, in particular, to illuminate the relationship between the uses of language and power. The latter aspect, the connection between language and power, is a central one in an approach which is recently termed as critical discourse analysis.[1] In addition, Mannheim's conception of utopia is useful as an analytical tool when trying to identify the contours of utopian thinking. In terms of cognition, following Mannheim, democratization of communication as an utopia can be defined as a set of future oriented beliefs which challenge the existing order of communication and media.

The concept of discourse is a useful point of departure because it pays attention to different uses of language. As a discourse utopias are contextual and situational and, therefore, they are expressed and used in a number of different articulations.[2] In the struggle between utopians and representatives of the existing order those articulations are contested, and interpretations which are different and even contradictory are produced.

In the contemporary analysis of utopias, history is studied in a process, in its making. Therefore, any objectivation of history in terms of its real course or meaning cannot be used as a test of those utopias. In this way discourse analysis means a break with the classic sociology of knowledge.

Object of the Study

This article will discuss the utopia of democratization of communication in relation to the process which in the late 1970s and the early 1980s was termed as deregulation of broadcasting. Later on, many analysts preferred to characterize the process as re-regulation, which refers to its consequences; regulation did not disappear but new forms of regulation emerged.[3] Be it deregulation or re-regulation, as concepts both of them are only formal and descriptive. The nature of the change is better highlighted by concepts like commercialization and privatization (cf. Murdock 1990). In Finland this moment of change is often characterized as the emergence of the new situation of competition.

In the following, the Finnish radio reform in the middle of the 1980s is considered as a case study in order to demonstrate what sort of role the idea of democratization of communication played in the process of deregulation (and re-regulation). In this reform the public service broadcasting represented the existing order, status quo, challenged by the reformists. Since 1934 the Finnish Broadcasting Company (YLE) had a monopoly of radio broadcasting which lasted until 1985, when the government granted franchises to a number of commercial local radio stations.[4] In the struggle over the reform the democratization of communication was actively referred to by numerous parties, in particular, in the early phase of the discussion.

As a discursive formation, the Finnish radio reform of 1985 is of particular inte-

rest, because it shows that the language used by the parties involved changed rapidly after the government's decision to implement the reform. In general, one can say that the relevance of democratic utopias essentially diminished after the implementation of the reform. The contextualization of such a change of discourse will be the focal point of the following analysis.

The Democratic Utopia of Communication – A General Review

Historically the idea of democratization of communication can be linked with classic political liberalism, its conception of individual freedoms and the idea of public sphere. In this sense the democratization of communication represents the re-interpretation of liberalism in the context of the information society, and later, media society.

The democratic utopia of communication constructed a vision of a society in which the new media, the new forms of communication technology would open up a way towards "polis", the democratic community of equal individuals. The new technology would facilitate the direct participation of people in the political debate and decision making, without the control and patronizing of the bureaucratic state and the corporations linked with it.[5]

Socially and culturally an interesting element of the democratization discourse was a sort of postmodern nostalgia which is expressed in the concept of community. The traditional values of community, close social ties and cultural self-expression, would be transferred over time to a new social situation.

In general, one can say that the existing order to be challenged by the democratic utopia of communication was the institutionalization of liberal freedoms of speech and expression in bourgeois society. Such an institutionalization was grounded historically in two kinds of representation: in politics the representation was constituted by political parties and parliament, in mass communication by the owners of the media and the professional journalists.

In relation to the mass media the old democratic slogan "power to the people" changed into the form "media to the people". In this way, the democratic utopia of communication can be seen as a critique of the institutionalized forms of mass media professionalism. Of the two central concepts used by the utopians, participation and public access, especially the latter resulted in the radical criticism of institutionalized professionalism. The radical interpretation of access considered the media as a resource of communication, used by people themselves, in their own interest; accordingly, the role of journalists was reduced into the role of communication facilitators.[6]

Despite its many protagonists the democratic utopia of communication was and is a marginal phenomenon. But as the following example of the Finnish radio reform shows, it has a potential to exceed its marginality. This is based on its nature as a re-interpretation of liberalism. Especially for politicians, it demonstrated that measures can be found to re-vitalize the public sphere; bureaucratization and corporatism are not the final end of the bourgeois public sphere.[7]

The Finnish Radio Reform as a Discursive Formation – Identifying some Basic Contradictions

Among the promoters of the Finnish radio reform, a sort of an unholy alliance was created in the early 1980s between those who favoured pure American-style com-

mercial radio and those who were enthusiastic about radio's potential for the democratization of communication. This alliance was made possible by a common enemy, the fifty-years' monopoly of public service radio.

Another important prerequisite for the alliance was the positive attitude towards advertising in radio, although the rationalizations for the attitude differed from each other. For most partners of the alliance, i.e. for those who promoted the American-style commercial radio, advertising was the true nature of the business; for the utopians, enthusiastic about the ideas of democratization, it was a necessary evil. The utopians stressed that the advertising would be used instrumentally only, as a source of financing, and they argued that it would not affect the contents of the new radio.[8]

The utopians did not join the main lobbying organization of the reformists, the Union of Local Radio Stations, set up in 1983. This demonstrates that their instrumental attitude to advertising marked an important difference in relation to other partners of the unholy alliance. In fact, the debate just prior to the governments's decision on franchises shows that the utopians were suspicious of the interests of commercial actors in the alliance. They wanted to stress the importance of content, and pointed out that the government should grant licences only for those applicants who clearly indicate the qualitative aspects of their intentions (Hemaánus & Turkki 1985). In relation to the then-hot discussion on deregulation, one can say that this represented a clearly re-regulative attitude.

The utopians were marginal in number and only a few of them participated actively in the public debate. However, they had an important symbolic value because they identified themselves with youth sub-cultures and alternative social movements. In particular, the youth sub-cultures adopted an important role in the legitimation of the radio reform. In the critique of the existing order, the public service monopoly radio, just the youth was singled out as the segment of the audience most badly served by the radio.

All the utopians were not young; some of them even belonged to the establishment, the cultural and political elite of the country. Among them, the most active and influential debator was Mr. Jaakko Numminen who unlike other utopians joined the Union of Local Radio Stations. He was even elected as the first chairman of the Union and remained in that position until 1987, the year the government decided that commercial radio were to stay permanent. For Mr. Numminen, the position as the representative of the interests of commercial local radio stations was only one of his multiple roles. In his person he expressed, in fact, one of the curious contradictions of the radio reform. Mr. Numminen's most known role was in the position of a high state official, the head of the governmental department of education and, in addition, he was an outstanding cultural expert in the Center Party, then the other major party in the government.

As a utopian Mr. Numminen was enthusiastic about the new radio's potential in the re-vitalization of the public sphere. This would take place trough the decentralization of the national broadcasting system. "Local community" and "local culture" were the key slogans of his numerous speeches as the chairman of the Union of the Local Radio Stations.[9]

For the advocates of commercial radio, Mr. Numminen's multiple roles were politically functional. Within the state authorities he demonstrated the actual division of opinions among the regulators of broad-

casting. Already in 1979 an expert committee was set up by the government to study the status and organization of broadcasting, and it was this committee which later, in 1984, made the formal proposal of the radio reform (see Radio and Television Committee 1984). An important factor symbolically was also Mr. Numminen's party affiliation. His party, the Center, traditionally favoured the national monopoly of broadcasting, because it was seen as a guarantee of a regional balance of broadcasting. This demonstrates why Mr. Numminen in his speeches so often referred to the mobilization of local communities as a result from the new radio system.

Only a few utopians came from the political left. Socialists and communists as well as social democrats were until the 1980's strong supporters of the public service monopoly. However, in the education organizations of the labour movement there were people who got interested in the ideas of democratization from the radical access point of view (Gronow 1985, 1987). They were critical towards introducing advertising in radio and favoured a sort of citizens' radio (cf. the Swedish 'närradio', neighbourhood radio), financed by membership fees, sponsorship and public subsidies. Such a model had considerable support also within the central regulating authority, the Ministry of Transport and Communication. As a result, in the second phase of the radio reform in 1987, a number of so called non-commercial stations were granted franchises for local radio broadcasting.

The Social Democratic Party finally changed its traditionally suspicious attitude toward commercial radio into one that favoured reform. Besides the Center, it was the other major party in the government to decide on the implementation of the re-

form. The main reason for the change of attitude was not the democratic ethos of utopians but the crisis of the labour press. Through the reform, the social democrats struggled against their weakening power in the ownership of the mass communication media.

The relationship between the labour press and the Social Democratic Party is symptomatic of the structural contradictions of the radio reform. The newspaper press and, in particular, regional newspapers were in the beginning suspicious of increased competition in the field of advertising but then changed their strategy in favour of the deregulation of radio broadcasting; they were also to be the biggest group of franchise owners after the implementation of the reform. In other words: the reform was not only a struggle between utopians and the existing national monopoly of radio broadcasting, but even more an internal struggle for power within the established mass media system. The latter dimension of struggle concerned, first of all, the right to advertising. If radio was to be transformed to a medium of advertising, the newspapers wanted to have their fair share of the cake.[10]

As to the role of the Finnish Broadcasting Company (YLE), the national broadcasting company, it should be said that it did not remain a silent object of protest. For example, already in 1975 it introduced a gradual decentralization of its radio transmissions which essentially changed the role of regional programme production (Muttonen 1980, Hartikainen 1981). Regional production did not only serve as a source of materials for the national transmissions but were allowed to develop distinct identities in relation to their particular audiences.

Private Enterprise vs. Social Movement – The Development of Radio City

Among the receivers of the first 22 franchises there were two radio stations which most clearly used the ideas of democratization of communication to motivate their intentions. These were Radio City in Helsinki and Radio 957 in Tampere. Both of them have been commercially succesful: Radio City is now the biggest commercial station in the country, and Radio 957 is the market leader in the Tampere region. However, the critics say, today hardly anything is left of their original spirit.

The change in democratic utopias is reflected by an article which the fortnightly magazine of *Helsingin Sanomat* (the biggest newspaper in Finland) published in celebration of the 5 year anniversary of Radio. The lead of the story goes:

> *"The youth's own radio station" has grown from a romantic movement to a commercial enterprise which strives towards a stream-lined music radio.* (Aronen 1990; all translations by TH)

The lead summarizes the point of view expressed by Mr. Juha Tynkkynen, the executive producer of Radio City, who was interviewed in the article. Mr. Tynkkynen did not accept the identification of Radio City as a movement; if it ever was a movement, it was similar to big newspapers like *Helsingin Sanomat* or *Ilta-Sanomat*. Another point of view was represented by Mr. Teppo Turkki who was one of the key people in the introduction of the radio station. As his comment on Mr. Tynkkynen the following citation is presented:

> *Tynkkynen's ideal is a stream-lined rock station, as for me, from the beginning the main task was to give a channel for all those small groups which lacked access to traditional chan-*

nels. In the beginning 'city' meant sub-cultures, marginal cultures, modern 'dialects', not hedonism and consumer culture. A year after Radio City came City Magazine, as the herald of the new middle class culture. Then, in the second capture of the city concept, city-culture became the culture for Lotto people; soon it was adopted by MTV (refers to the commercial television in Finland) and Ilta-Sanomat (means: the biggest popular newspaper in Finland). (ibid.)

In this comment an important question is set up in relation to the transformation of utopias. Who stole my utopia? – that is what Mr. Turkki seemed to ask. What happens to utopias when they are removed from one context to another? 'The capture' of the 'city' concept is an example of such a transformation. In the introduction of Radio City it conceptualized the emancipation of sub-cultures and marginal groups; then it turned to a business idea and lost its authenticity. In the new context, the concept of 'city' became, first of all, a sort of post-modern marketing strategy, based on the homology between audience segments and the marketing ideology.

The above examples of the exchange of opinions show that among the utopians themselves a clear division of perspectives developed. After the two years' test period of commercial radio from 1985 to 1987, the 'city' as a business idea took over, and the 'old' idealists like Mr. Turkki left and even went back to YLE, the former enemy. The contradiction between different interpretations of the 'city' concept marked a radically distinct view of the radio as a medium. In the beginning, the utopians considered radio as a medium of cultural self-expression; to a lesser extent also as a medium of social and political emancipation and protest. From the point of view of the later development, this looked amateurish and like pure idealism.

In fact, in the internal contesting over the meaning of 'city', the 'old' idealists became stigmatized as utopians, an interesting contradiction in terms. 'The utopian' was used as a label of negative identification, a symbol of lacking realism and of pure wishful thinking. As documented above in relation to Mannheim, such a strategy of reasoning is typical of the representatives of the status quo when they contradict the challenging utopians.

The business-minded realists stressed the importance of a new professionalism which would follow the American tradition of commercial radio. They were critical toward the bureaucratic culture of production of the public service broadcasting and contrasted that with a more business and market oriented professionalism. In the spirit of American commercial radio, they emphasized the importance of formats, the stream-lining of programme services in relation to carefully defined segments of audiences, their musical taste, life-style and consumer orientation.[11] Whatever identities the new radio stations would adopt, they should be feasible in terms of a successful business. Accordingly, the meaning of the 'city' concept should be tested against its effectiveness in audience segmentation, i.e. whether or not it was successful in attracting enough listeners to the station.

The Political Legitimation of the Radio Reform

The above discussion surrounding Radio City and city culture demonstrates an important general feature in the discursive construction of the radio reform. The earlier enthusiasm towards the utopia of democratic communication died out quickly. A year after the launching of the first 22 stations Mr. Numminen, a former utopian and the chairman of the Union of Local Radio Stations, actively defended the advertising-based financing of the new stations. He was critical of an expert plan in the Ministry of Transport and Communication which was in favour of the Swedish 'närradio' model for the future granting of franchises. It would not be fair to listeners nor to entrepreneurs seeking access to the business, concluded Mr. Numminen.

Mr. Numminen had also become sceptical of citizens' radio, the public-access element in the franchises of the new local radio stations. The local people and organizations did not queue for access to the radio, although some stations offered free air time, said Mr. Numminen. His change of language illuminates the general development. The interest turned towards radio as a business and radio as an advertising medium. When the new government in 1987 decided on the continuation of the reform, the business language already dominated the scene. The social democrats were still in the government but their main partner was a new one, the conservatives, who traditionally supported the private-enterprise-based model for the institutionalization of the freedom of speech.

At a rapid pace, radio as business became a taken for-granted cultural fact. A straight-forward summary of this development is given by an expert committee of audio-visual culture which was set up by the Ministry of Education in 1987. In its report on radio and recordings (1991, 202) it concluded:

Commercial local radio stations have received franchises to pursue business in the air waves so there is no need for control over their activity. In practice this means, among other things, that the stations can freely choose their editorial line. Consequently, there is no justification to make the stations responsible for giving air

time to interested organizations, if the station is not willing to do it. The freedom of speech of public interest and other similar organizations must be guaranteed with other measures.

Conclusion

The introduction of commercial radio took place in Finland clearly earlier than in other Nordic countries.[12] A contributing factor to that may have been that Finland had commercial television since the early years of television. So the equation of broadcasting and advertising was well known among politicians and administrators as well as broadcasters and their audiences. However, in terms of values and norms of radio and television culture, the dominant attitude was strongly in favour of public service broadcasting. That was expressed by a dichotomic form of thinking which characterized public broadcasting with a number of positive attributes and commercial broadcasting with almost exclusively negative ones. Table 1 demonstrates, at first, a few key dimensions of the traditional dichotomy and, further on, the way it was re-articulated in the course of the radio reform.

Table 2 can be used to demonstrate that anyone who wanted to introduce commercial radio in Finland was faced by major socio-cultural and political obstacles. In a

historical perspective, the main task was to be how to re-articulate the traditionally suspicious attitude to commercial broadcasting in terms of positive connotations. A lesson from the Finnish radio reform is that the particular socio-cultural and political mixture of reformists, the unholy alliance between democratic utopians, advertisers and business-minded broadcasters contributed to the success of the re-articulation. As to the role of utopian discourse, one can conclude that its ideological importance exceeded the number of utopians themselves, the few people who actively pursued the ideas of the democratization of communication.

For all partners in the struggle over radio reform it was clear from the beginning that the basic choice of alternatives was between whether or not to introduce commercial radio in Finland. However, in the public debate over the reform the commercial nature of the new radio stations played only a minor role. In the discursive construction of the reform the choice was more between democratic and undemocratic or democratic and authoritarian models of radio, not between commercial radio and public service.

Such an emphasis was necessary for the political legitimation of the reform. The key parties in the government traditionally favoured a strong national monopoly of public service radio; the Finnish Broadcas-

Table 1.   The Traditional Articulation of Public/Commercial Dichotomy

Public (+)	*Commercial (-)*
Serious	Light
High culture	Low culture
Information	Entertainment
Public service	Private profit/business
Balanced	Biased (in terms of corporate interests)

Table 2.   The Re-articulation of Public/Commercial in the 1980s

Public (-)	Commercial (+)
Monopoly	Competition
Political	Market oriented
Paternalistic	Responsive
Bureaucratic	Effective
Conservative	Open to new ideas
Institutional	Personal, informal
Elitist	Popular
Distant	Close

ting Company lobbied actively for public service inside the regulating authorities. For many influential actors in the establishment commercialism was and still is a monster.

Knowing this context and the rapid implementation of the radio reform the following conclusion seems reasonable: In the discursive construction of the reform, the democratic utopia of communication was used to break the historical dichotomy between commercialism and public service. Only the re-articulation of this dichotomy made it possible for the advocates of deregulation to gain wide popular and political support for their intentions. In the early 1980's, a straight-forward 'radio as business' thinking was not politically feasible in Finland, as it was to be towards the end of the decade.

Notes

1. For principles of critical discourse analysis see, for example, van Dijk 1993 and Kress 1993; cf. Fairclough 1995.
2. This is, in fact, similar to Mannheim's methodological emphasis in the study of the history of ideas, thinking and knowledge (op.cit., 87-96).
3. For examples of this discusssion, see McQuail & Siune 1986, Dyson & Humphreys 1988, Porter 1989, Palmer & Tunstall 1990, Siune and Truetzschler 1992; for radio, in particular, see Wedell & Crookes 1991.
4. For publications in English on description and analysis of the radio reform, see Hujanen & Jyrkiäinen 1991, Heiskanen 1988, Moring 1988; cf. Slade & Barchak 1989. Lowe 1992 analyzes the impact of the reform on the corporate culture of the National Broadcasting Company YLE.
5. In the early 1980s, parallel to the Finnish radio reform, an intensive international debate was taking place on the issue of democratization of communication. International organizations like UNESCO and Council of Europe actively sponsored the debate (see, for example, Berrigan 1977, Beaud 1980, Fisher & Harms 1983). International Association for Mass Communication Research (IAMCR) selected communication and democracy as the topic of its 25th anniversary meeting in Paris in 1982. In the report of the conference it is documented that an extensive round-table discussion was held under the rubric of Community Radio and Cable TV: Research on New Experiments (Sreberny-Mohammadi 1982, 24). This at-

tracted broad international participation, the report concludes, and a number of papers were given on the structure, organization and content of community-based projects (ibid.). White (1983) connects the idea of democratization of communication with a paradigmatic change in mass communication research. More recent discussion in relation to democratization of communication are offered by Raboy & Bruck 1989 and Splichal & Wasko 1990.

6. On this debate, see Jakubowicz 1988, Jankowski et al. 1988, Lewis & Booth 1989. For the description and analysis of the new community-based media, Jankowski et al. 1988, Kleinsteuber & Sonnenberg 1990, Jankowski et al. 1992.

7. These are the central themes discussed in relation to Habermas' notion of the bourgeois public sphere. For a recent example of this debate, see Dahlgren 1995.

8. This argument was supported by two most active young debators, Juha Hemaánus and Teppo Turkki, who both represented the movement behind Radio City in Helsinki (Hemánus & Turkki 1985).

9. Numminen's speeches can be traced in total in the organ of the Union of Local Radio Stations which was then called 'Paikallisradio' (in English, Local Radio); for key examples, see Numminen 1985 and 1986.

10. On the economy of media advertising in Finland, see Hujanen & Jyrkiäinen 1991; more on other aspects of media trends, see Jyrkiäinen 1993.

11. A basic American textbook on radio programming (including formats) is MacFarland 1990; see also MacFarland 1995-1996.

12. For a comparative data on the media trends in the Nordic countries, see Nordicom 1995; on the analysis of the earlier trends, see a special issue of the Nordicom Review (Nordicom 1991).

Literature

Aronen, Eeva-Kaarina (1990) "Rock, raha, rehellisyys". (Rock, Money, Fairness) *Helsingin Sanomat, Kuukausiliite* 8 (21.4.1990): 16-19.

Beaud, Paul (1980) *Community Media? Local Radio and Television and Audio-Visual Animation Experiments in Europe*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Berrigan, Frances J. (1977)(ed.) *Access: Some Western Models of Community Media*. Paris: UNESCO.

Carlsson, Ulla (ed.)(1995) Media Trends 1995 in Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden: a Statistical Compendium. *Nordic Media Trends 1* Nordicom Sverige.

Dahlgren, Peter (1995) *Television and the Public Sphere*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage.

van Dijk, Teun A. (1993) "Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis". *Discourse & Society* 4(2): 249-283.

Dyson, Kenneth & Humphreys, Peter (1988) *Broadcasting and New Media Policies in Western Europe*. Guildford and King's Lynn: Routledge.

Fairclough, Norman (1995) *Critical discourse analysis: the critical study of language*. London, New York: Longman.

Fisher, Desmond & Harms, Leroy S. (1983) (ed.) *The Right to Communicate: A New Human Right*. Dublin: Boole Press.

Gronow, Pekka (1985) *Viestinnän tulevaisuus* (Future of Communication) Helsinki: Työväen Sivistysliitto.

Gronow, Pekka (1987)(ed.) *Sähköinen viestintä ja paikallinen kulttuuri* (Electronic Communication and Local Culture) Helsinki: Publications of the State's Arts Administration, No 31.

Hartikainen, Riitta (1981) *Paikallisradiot meillä ja muualla* (Local Radio At Home and Abroad) Helsinki: The Finnish Broadcasting Company, Department of Planning and Research, Series B, No 1.

Heiskanen, Ilkka (1988) "Local Media, Regionalism and International Economic Integration". *Nordicom Review* (2): 1-12.

Hemaánus, Juha & Turkki, Teppo (1985) "Paikallisten radioasemien on kyettävä luomaan uutta". (Local Radio Stations Must Be Able to Create New) *Sanomalehtimies* (1):5.

Hujanen, Taisto & Jyrkiäinen, Jyrki (1991) "The Finnish Media System in Transition". *Nordicom Review* (2): 63-79.

Jakubowicz, Karol (1988) "To democratise communication, first democratise society". *Media Development* (4): 10-12.

Jankowski, Nick & Prehn, Ole & Stappers, James (1992)(eds) *The People's Voice: Local Radio and Television in Europe*. London, Paris, Rome: John Libbey.

Jankowski, Nick & Vos, Koos & Brouwer, Wim (1989) "Training Dutch citizen groups in video production techniques". *Media Development* (4): 22-26.

Jyrkiäinen, Jyrki (1993) "Recent Changes and Trends in the Media in Finland". In: Slavko Splichal and Ildiko Kovats (eds), *Media in Transition: An East-West Dialogue*. Budapest and Ljubljana: Hungarian Academy of Sciences: 111-124.

Kleinsteuber, Hans J. & Sonnenberg, Urte (1990) "Beyond Public Service and Private Profit: International Experience with Non-commercial Local Radio". *European Journal of Communication* 5(1): 87-106.

Kress, G. (1993) "Against arbitrariness: the social production of the sign as a foundational issue in critical discourse analysis". *Discourse & Society* 4(2): 69-191.

Lewis, Peter M. & Booth, Jerry (1989) *The Invisible Medium. Public, Commercial and Community Radio*. Houndmills and London: Macmillan.

Lowe, Gregory F. (1992) *Value and Meaning Transformation in Public Service Broadcasting: Competition and Legitimacy in the Finnish Radio Renaissance*. The University of Texas at Austin: Dissertation of Telecommunications.

MacFarland, David T. (1990) *Contemporary Radio Programming Strategies*. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

MacFarland, David T. (1995-1996)(ed.) "Symposium: Radio Programming". *Journal of Radio Studies* 3: 1-58.

Mannheim, Karl (1976) *Ideology and Utopia: An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

McQuail, Denis & Siune, Karen (1986)(ed.) *New Media Politics, Comparative Perspectives in Western Europe*. London, Beverly Hills, New Delhi: Sage.

Moring, Tom (1988) "Taking Cultural Values into Possession – Local Radio and Social Competence: The Case of Finland 1985-86". *Nordicom Review* (2): 13-23.

Murdock, Graham (1990) "Redrawing the Map of the Communication Industries: Concentration and Ownership in the Era of Privatization". In: Marjorie Ferguson (ed.), *Public Communication, The New Imperatives*. London, Newbury Park, New Delhi: Sage: 1-15.

Muttonen, Mauri (1980) *Paikallisradio Ylen aikainen* (YLE's Local Radio 'Ylen aikainen') Helsinki: The Finnish Broadcasting Company, Department of Planning and Research, Series B, No 2.

Numminen, Jaakko (1985) "Katsaus paikallisradiotoiminnan tulevaisuuteen". (A Review of the Future of Local Radio Stations) *Paikallisradio* (28.2.1985): 7.

Numminen, Jaakko (1986) "Ratkaisevaa on nyt toimialamme laajentaminen ja kehittäminen". (Expanding and Developing Our Branch Is Now Decisive) *Paikallisradio* (31.12.1986): 5-6.

Palmer, Michael & Tunstall, Jeremy (1990) *Liberating Communications: Policy-Making in France and Britain* (Padstow, Cornwall: Blackwell).

Porter, Vincent (1989) "The re-regulation of television: pluralism, constitutionality and the free market in the USA, West Germany, France and the UK". *Media, Culture & Society* 11(1): 5-28.

Raboy, Marc & Bruck, Peter A. (1989)(ed.) *Communication for and against democracy*. Montreal and New York: Black Rose Books.

Siune, Karen & Truetzschler, Wolfgang (1992) (eds) *Dynamics of media politics: broadcasts and electronic media in Western Europe*. London, Newbury Park: Sage.

Slade, Joseph W. & Barchak, Leonard J. (1989) "Public Broadcasting in Finland: Inventing a National Television Programming Policy". *Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media* 33 (4): 355-373.

Splichal, Slavko & Wasko, Janet (1990)(ed.) *Communications and Democracy*. Norwood, N.J.: Ablex Publishing.

Srebeny-Mohammadi, Annabelle (1982) *Communication and Democracy: Directions in Research.* Leicester: International Association for Mass Communication Research).

Wedell, George & Crookes, Philip (1991) *RADIO 2000: The Opportunities for Public and Private Radio Services in Europe.* Manchester: The European Institute for the Media.

Weibull, Lennart & Anshelm, Magnus (1991) Signs of Change. Swedish Media in Transition. *Nordicom Review* (2) Nordicom Sweden.

White, Robert A. (1983) "Mass Communication and Culture: Transition to a New Paradigm". *Journal of Communication* 33(3): 279-301.

Also published in *Gazette* 57:181-195, 1996