Exploring patriotism in journalistic practices during war

A qualitative study on Ukrainian journalists' working challenges in wartime.

By: Anastasiia Galchenko

Supervisor: Kristina Riegert
Södertörn University | School of Journalism
Master's dissertation 15 credits
Journalism | Spring semester 2024
International Master's Programme in Journalism

Acknowledgment

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor, Prof. Kristina Riegert, whose insights and feedback were crucial to the finalization of this work. I am also sincerely thankful to Senior Lecturer Malin Picha Edwardsson for her valuable feedback during the examination process. I want to extend my appreciation to my classmates for their constructive feedback throughout our examinations. I am grateful to all the professors at Södertörn University who have contributed to my growth during this master's program.

A special thanks goes to each participant in this study, whose willingness to share their personal experiences and insights has been invaluable. Your openness and contributions have provided a more profound understanding of the complexities surrounding Ukrainian journalism, and without your participation, this research would not have been possible. Your voices have truly shaped the direction and depth of this study, and I am deeply grateful for the time and effort you dedicated to make this work a reality.

Finally, I am profoundly thankful to my family for their unwavering support and patience throughout this journey. Your belief in me and constant inspiration have been invaluable.

Висловлення подяки

Висловлюю особливу подяку кожному учаснику цього дослідження, чия готовність поділитися особистим досвідом та думками стала безцінною. Ваша відкритість та внесок в дослідження допомогли глибше зрозуміти складнощі, що існують в українській журналістиці. Хочу наголосити що без вашої участі це дослідження не стало б можливим. Ваші голоси справді визначили напрямок і глибину цієї праці і я глибоко вдячна вам за час та зусилля, які ви присвятили, за для втілення цієї роботи.

Abstract

The purpose of this research is to study how Ukrainian journalists perceive professional and patriotic journalism since the full-scale invasion in 2022. A mixed method was used, combining thematic and narrative analysis. To gather data for the study, six Ukrainian journalists were interviewed through semi-structured interviews. Transcribed interviews were coded and analyzed through deductive and inductive coding approaches. The results indicated that Ukrainian journalists perceive professionalism according to the theoretical framework on professionalism, with truthfulness and objectivity being important values for all the participants. The results could show that, as in earlier research, journalists do not have a consensus on which professional norms they should follow. Patriotism was not perceived as negative and according to the interviewed journalists, patriotism, and censorship are necessary in wartime. The results also indicate that participants present patriotism as ethically defensible due to safety concerns and the endeavor for Ukrainians to survive.

Анотація

Мета цього дослідження - дослідити, як українські журналісти осмислюють професійну та патріотичну журналістику після повномасштабного вторгнення у 2022 році. Було використано змішаний метод, що поєднує тематичний та наративний аналіз. Для збору даних для аналізу було опитано шістьох українських журналістів за допомогою напівструктурованих інтерв'ю. Транскрибовані інтерв'ю були закодовані та проаналізовані за допомогою дедуктивного та індуктивного підходів до кодування. Результати показали, що українські журналісти сприймають професіоналізм так, відповідно до теоретичних засад професіоналізму, де правдивість та об'єктивність є важливими цінностями для всіх журналістів. Як і в попередніх дослідженнях, виявилося, що журналісти не мають консенсусу щодо того, яких професійних норм вони повинні дотримуватися. Патріотизм не сприймається як негативне явище, і, на думку опитаних журналістів, патріотизм і цензура є необхідними у воєнний час. Результати також вказують на те, що учасники ідентифікують патріотизм як етично виправданий через міркування безпеки та прагнення українців вижити.

Keywords: professionalism, patriotism, objectivity, Ukrainians, security, journalists

Table of content

1. Introduction *5*

2. Background *6*

2.1 From Euromaidan to the full-scale invasion **6**

2.2 Journalistic landscape in Ukraine **8**

3. Research aim and research questions *10*

4. Previous research *11*

5. Theoretical framework *15*

5.1 Professional journalism **15**

5.2 Patriotic journalism **16**

5.4 Combining theories **19**

6. Method *20*

6.2 Interviewing **22**

6.3 Ethical considerations & researchers' role **23**

6.4 Coding and analysis **24**

6.5 General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) **25**

6.6 Limitations **25**

7. Results and analysis *26*

7.1 Professionalism in war conditions **27**

7.2 Patriotism in journalism **30**

7.2.1 Censorship 33

7.2.2 Balanced reporting 38

7.2.3 Ukrainian identity 39

8. Discussion and analysis *41*

9. Conclusion *47*

10. References *49*

Appendix 1 - List of participants *51*

Appendix 2 - Interview guide *51*

List of tables *52*

Table 1 ..... **52**

Table 2 ..... **53**

1. Introduction

Ukraine's history is complex and characterized by periods of struggle for independence, for cultural identity, and cultural and national sovereignty. The history of Ukraine dates back to Kyiv Rus in the late 9th century, but the battle for modern Ukraine started in 1917 with the Ukrainian People's Republic declaring its independence from Russia (Plokhy, 2016). With Ukraine's fall under the Soviet Union, years of dark history began, including the Holodomor, mass executions and repressions, World War 2 and Nazi occupation (Snyder, 2010). As the Soviet collapsed, Ukraine renewed its independence in 1991 (Plokhy, 2016). The modern history of Ukraine reveals the many challenges for the Ukrainian society. Ukrainian journalists have played an important role as narrators of history and a driving force for societal change. They have participated and reported on significant events, such as the Orange revolution and the Euromaidan protests, providing crucial information and shaping public opinion (Orlova, 2016). However, through earlier research, the patriotic influence on the media landscape has been debated, concerning objectivity, bias, and journalistic roles.

Patriotism within journalism has long been discussed and is an important subject when looking at nations undergoing big political or social changes. Ukraine is dealing with both internal and external pressure, making the concept of patriotism in journalism even more complex. Earlier research has shown that Ukrainian journalists have since 2014 been divided into: journalists who adapt to universal standards and those who use the "patriotic approach"; which has been explained as a result of a different approach by media professionals (Budivska & Orlova, 2017; Orlova, 2016). Studying patriotic journalism is crucial for understanding how the media can influence national identity, public opinion and geopolitical landscape. Ukraine's struggle for national sovereignty makes Ukraine a good case study in order to understand the dynamics of patriotic journalism. This will also provide an insight in how patriotic journalism works in different context, comparing it to earlier studies on patriotism. Ukraine as a case study can also be compared to other countries with similar experiences and struggles, such as Georgia.

Although there is quite a lot of research on patriotism in Ukraine and its impact on news reporting, one can argue that the Ukrainian journalists' own understanding of patriotism and professionalism is missing since the full-scale invasion. Nygren et al (2018, p. 1061) point out that there is a tradition of activism in central and Eastern Europe, which raises a question of

whether patriotism in journalism means the same for Ukrainian journalists as it does in the Anglo-American model. This thesis will explore if journalists themselves think it's possible to adapt to universal standards of objectivity and impartiality since 2022. This work will further explain how Ukrainian journalists relate to patriotism and if or how patriotism has an impact on their professional work.

2. Background

2.1 From Euromaidan to the full-scale invasion

Ukraine has had a turbulent history with Russia for many decades and although Ukraine declared its independence in 1991, Russia has been trying to influence Ukraine's development direction ever since (Plokhy, 2016; Szeptycki, 2007). This has had an impact on the whole Ukrainian society, including the journalists. This chapter will provide an overview of the main events that impacted Ukraine and the Ukrainian media landscape since 2013.

In 2013, Ukrainian authorities were supposed to sign an Association Agreement with the European Union. The agreement was set to be signed at the Vilnius Summit, when suddenly, the then President Viktor Yanukovych, announced that the agreement would not be signed and Ukraine would instead proceed with cooperation with Russia (Diuk, 2014, pp. 10–11). Already before the announcement, a gathering of students and journalists had assembled at Independence Square in Kyiv, urging Yanukovych to sign the deal with the EU. Following his withdrawal, the protests escalated into a full-fledged movement. Although this was not the first mass protest in Ukraine's history, it soon showed to be something new. In the early hours of November 30th, the authorities sent in the Berkut special forces to clear the square (Plokhy, 2018, p. 114). The ensuing brutality, with Berkut beating students bloody, stoked widespread outrage. Anger over such brutality and the regime led to a mass rally on December 1st with people nationwide going out onto the streets against the regime and violence, demanding the authorities to sign the Association Agreement with the EU immediately (Diuk, 2014, pp. 13–14). For the next two months, protests were ongoing in several regions of Ukraine, with the biggest movement in Kyiv. The authorities used brutal violence to stop the protests, which resulted in the death of over 100 people, some shot, and some beaten to death by the special police forces. Several public organizations and initiatives worked on gathering documentation on what happened during the three months of the revolution, making a particularly

informative report, “The Price of Freedom”. On February 22, it is alleged that Yanukovych escaped Ukraine, which led to a shift of power in Ukraine and the ending of the Revolution of Dignity, also called the Euromaidan (Pavlichenko & Matviychuk, 2013, p. 81).

Less than two weeks after the killings at the Independence Square in Kyiv, Russia occupied Crimea. Armed men in unmarked uniforms, called the “green men” in the media, took the control over governmental buildings in Crimea on February 27 (Plokhy, 2018, p. 116). Russia organized a referendum on March 16 with a purpose to give an appearance of legitimization of the annexation, but the results were rejected internationally (Plokhy, 2018, pp. 116–117). Despite this, Russia officially annexed Crimea on March 18; thus, violating the international law. This act was the first military incursion into Ukrainian territory since its renewed independence in 1991. At the same time as Russia occupied Crimea, they launched a hybrid war which included spreading the narrative that the government in Kyiv was nationalistic and fascist, and that government’s desire to ban the Russian language (Plokhy, 2018, p. 118). The Russian narrative that was spreading across Ukraine and even most of the world pictured that majority of Ukrainians in Donbas wanted to be “independent” or join Russia (Kazdobina et al., 2024; Voytyuk, 2023). In reality, this was not the case, and somehow the opinion polls that were pulled in eastern Ukraine, the pro-Ukraine demonstrations, and other evidence that refutes that narrative, were lost by many foreign observers (Kazdobina et al., 2024, pp. 4–5). This shows the impact that the media and journalists have on societal opinion and how much propaganda can affect our perception of a situation and later the consequences of it. Today, evidence indicates that there were local collaborators at the beginning of the conflict in eastern Ukraine, but they were still supported by Moscow and the war began when administrative buildings were seized under the leadership of irregular Russian troops (Kazdobina et al., 2024, pp. 5–6). The Russian involvement in the war in Donbas started already during the first separatist movement and at the beginning of March 2014 Russia assembled military equipment on its border with Ukraine to later in July 2014 launch several attacks from Russian territory (Kazdobina et al., 2024, pp. 9–10). In August 2014 Russian military invaded mainland Ukraine (Plokhy, 2018, p. 120). This was the beginning of what later turned into a full-scale war.

Although this background may seem detailed and not really about journalism, it is needed to understand why Ukrainian journalists reason as they do. The historical context is quite complex between Russia and Ukraine, and many contradictions arise depending on which

research you read or which newspaper you open. A more profound understanding of Ukraine's history will make it more clear on why patriotism is present in the Ukrainian media as it is.

2.2 Journalistic landscape in Ukraine

The reason behind explaining the events happening in Ukraine since 2013 is that everything that has happened had a big influence on Ukrainian journalists and the media sphere in the country. These events have shaped journalistic roles and practices that Ukrainian journalists use today to navigate a country at war. This chapter will give an overview of how Ukrainian journalism has been affected by the different events since Ukraine's independence, with a focus on the events that happened since 2013.

Shortly after Ukraine declared its independence in 1991, the new leadership in Ukraine created new legislation, which allowed private ownership of media, proclaimed freedom of expression, banned censorship, and established regulatory bodies to improve media development (Orlova, 2016, p. 443). But at the same time earlier researchers could see that Ukraine inherited a couple of features from the Soviet Union which have been influencing Ukrainian media since its independence, these being: tradition of state ownership, loyalty to censorship, and lack of business management (Orlova, 2016, p. 443).

Already at the beginning of the 21st century, the Ukrainian government made attempts to practice control over news content, leading to editors receiving instructions on how to report (Budivska & Orlova, 2017, p. 138). The implementation of these instructions was controlled by the presidential administration (Orlova, 2016, p. 445). Following the legalization of private media ownership, several media outlets came under the control of Ukrainian oligarchs with close connections to political elites. This gave them the ability to manipulate the media for their interests.

With the Orange Revolution in 2004, the media gained more freedom from the state, but still failed to reclaim editorial freedom from media outlet owners. When the Yanukovych regime came to power in 2010, journalists had again to adapt to the new realities; press freedom declined, and journalists were exposed to threats, attacks, and censorship of different kinds

(Orlova, 2016, p. 447). According to earlier research, it is said that the reason the media sphere was so vulnerable is that the achievements during the Orange Revolution were not institutionalized (Budivska & Orlova, 2017, p. 139). As a result of these different challenges, Ukrainian journalists have become more active in their resistance against censorship and other forms of pressure, being active forces during the Orange Revolution and then Euromaidan (Orlova, 2016, p. 447).

During Euromaidan (see 2.1), there were restrictions on freedom of speech, for example, limitations on information about the events on TV channels that were state-controlled (Pavlichenko & Matviychuk, 2013, p. 30). During Euromaidan, several media outlets supported the protests and when tensions and violence grew bigger at these protests boundaries between journalism and activism started to blur (Budivska & Orlova, 2017, p. 140). At the same time, officials used different kinds of pressure on the media, leading to journalists disagreeing with editorial policy (Pavlichenko & Matviychuk, 2013, p. 32). Journalists were also one of the highest-risk groups during Euromaidan. January 19 – 22 2014, more than 40 journalists sustained injuries at the protests when law enforcement began firing at people in orange vests and helmets marked with the word “Press” (Pavlichenko & Matviychuk, 2013, p. 66). Even outside the square, violence was not uncommon against journalists, several cases of journalists being severely beaten were noted (Pavlichenko & Matviychuk, 2013, p. 32). Telekrytyka, a Ukrainian media watchdog, reported that 2014 was the most challenging year for journalists in Ukraine with 7 fatalities, 33 kidnapped, and 47 journalists arrested (Orlova, 2016, p. 449). Despite the harsh reality of Euromaidan, it did bring some positive changes for the Ukrainian media. Freedom of speech increased and pressure from the state declined. One significant achievement was the adoption of new media laws aiming at reforming the media landscape. These reforms include establishment of public broadcasting, privatization of media and more transparency in media ownership (Orlova, 2016, p. 450). In 2015, a reform on the privatization of state-owned media was passed. This reform aimed to give priority to editorial teams to take ownership of the outlets (Orlova, 2016, p. 451).

Even though Euromaidan brought several positive changes to the Ukrainian media landscape, the unexpected turn of the following events brought new challenges. As Russia occupied Crimea and the armed conflict in eastern Ukraine started, Ukraine’s sovereignty was violated. Ukrainian journalists were not prepared for such a situation and had first to deal with the issue

of personal security. Media outlets and journalists lacked experience and editorial practices in conflict reporting and had to find a way of reporting on a conflict in their country (Orlova, 2016, p. 449). Apart from the security and editorial issues, there have been other issues in the media sphere. Firstly, much of the mainstream media is still under the control of oligarchs, which remains their instrument to achieve business or political goals and, in such a way, hinders editorial autonomy (Orlova, 2016, p. 454). The discussion on the blurred lines between journalism and activism in Ukraine arose when Ukrainian journalists were put in front of the challenge of how to balance professionalism and patriotism with an ongoing armed conflict. Following this, debates among Ukrainian journalists about professional standards during wartime arose, revealing a lack of consensus among media professionals which led to the fact that journalists' experiences outweighed editorial practices (Orlova, 2016, p. 456).

Today, ten years since the occupation of Crimea and the start of the armed conflict in eastern Ukraine, Ukrainian journalists still stand in front of the challenge of reporting about the war in their country and trying to provide balanced coverage at the same time as being a part of the society that is under attack. Ukrainian journalists are exposed to threats and are targeted during hostilities. According to the Ukrainian Institute of Mass Information (IMI), 75 media workers were killed in Ukraine from 2014 to November 2023, including working journalists and those who went to defend Ukraine (IMI, 2023). The Committee to protect journalists confirms 17 journalists' deaths when performing their professional work between year 2022 and 2023 (CPJ, 2024).

3. Research aim and research questions

Even though Ukrainian journalists had to deal with the challenges of security, censorship, and a patriotism before 2022, the full-scale invasion made every one of these challenges more severe. Journalism as a profession became more dangerous, many journalists became volunteers in the Armed Forces of Ukraine, and all were affected by the war in their private lives.

As mentioned in the introduction, patriotic behavior has been recognized in Ukrainian media through earlier research. Patriotism has been researched earlier, but there are still differences in how different journalists understand patriotism and how to cope with it.

This study seeks to investigate how Ukrainian journalists themselves define the core values of professional journalism and patriotic journalism, including how challenges during wartime shape their work practices and professional identities. By exploring journalists' own perspectives and experiences, this research aims to provide insights into journalistic ethics during war, the complexities in journalistic practices in Ukraine since 2022, and explain how journalists mediate professional journalism with patriotism.

To be able to conduct this study, two research questions will guide this paper:

RQ1: How do Ukrainian journalists define professional and patriotic journalism in the background of an ongoing war?
RQ2: How do Ukrainian journalists combine patriotism and professionalism?

By exploring the connection between professional journalistic values and patriotic journalism in the Ukrainian context, this research aims to contribute to a broader understanding of journalistic ethics, media professionalism and the dynamics of media in war conditions. The findings may contribute to professional development initiatives for transitional democracies and explore more on how to perceive patriotism in journalism.

4. Previous research

The subject of patriotism and its influence on the quality of journalistic professionalism is not new and has been studied before. In this chapter, the earlier research on journalism in conflict situations will be explained. This will be followed by a case study about the situation in Ukraine post Euromaidan.

The history of reporting on wars or other conflicts goes several centuries back. Before the 19th century, the only way to get information from the frontline was through soldier's letters home and military dispatches (Tumber, 2019, p. 372). The research on reporting of the

Falklands War and Gulf War 2 has shown that because of journalists' dependency on the military (human basic needs such as safety or a need to belong to a group), journalists started to embrace military language and got emotionally engaged with their military troops as journalists couldn't get any physical distance to the conflict (Allan & Zelizer, 2004, pp. 192, 199).

The research on how journalism has changed in the US since September 11 in 2001, shows a slightly different angle of patriotism, when journalists do not stick to the values of impartiality and objectivity. After the terrorist attack, the media started to make statements such as "an attack against America" or "an attack against our nation" which broke the invulnerability that many US citizens felt on American soil (Zelizer & Allan, 2011, p. 274). Such statements and ideas were seen in patriotic intensity all over the country after the attacks, both in language but also with everyday reminders of the nation such as flags or American colors (Zelizer & Allan, 2011, p. 277).

This indicated that a journalist can work and follow normative values, such as objectivity and impartiality, in peacetime or if it concerns another country's war, but such values are not necessarily fitting when working amidst own country's war or conflict (Allan & Zelizer, 2004, p. 193). In earlier research, it has been shown that many journalists tend to make a distinction between "we" and "them" (Tumber, 2019, p. 373; Zelizer & Allan, 2011, p. 277). This is a position leaning towards the patriotic identity. The concern from this is that patriotism can interfere with the ability of reporters to do their job properly (Zelizer & Allan, 2011, p. 12).

Moving toward the digital age, the dynamics of reporting has changed, giving room to live coverage straight from the frontline, and the information flow is no longer limited to journalists. Although the whole population is not mobilized, development in technology makes it possible for everyone to witness the war (Tumber, 2019, pp. 373–375). Information management is one of the primary concerns of the military (Tumber, 2019, p. 376). Earlier research distinguishes two ways of reporting during conflict: one is the sphere of consensus, which means that all content in the reports has close ties with the political elite, and the second one is the sphere of legitimate controversy, which happens when the war opposition and critic content moves into the mainstream (Tumber, 2019, p. 377).

During the conflict, the journalist becomes a witness to different atrocities and injustices and many journalists say that truth-seeking and being a witness is essential in their work (Tumber, 2019, p. 380). This leads to the reality of journalists prioritize taking a moral stance to condemn the atrocities they witness over maintaining a strictly objective view (Tumber, 2019, p. 381). With that said, earlier research has shown that the most important professional values for journalists are neutrality, objectivity and avoiding bias, but they do not always comply with the reality of covering a conflict (Tumber, 2019, p. 382).

Euromaidan, the occupation of Crimea and war in eastern Ukraine raised an important question on what the role of journalists in Ukraine is and which are the boundaries between professionalism and activism (Budivska & Orlova, 2017, p. 146). Budivska (2017) researched on the relationship and boundaries between professionalism and activism in Ukraine through in-depth interviews with Ukrainian journalists. She found the three mayor approaches of journalist's work: 1) consistency in integrating professional identity in activism, 2) recognizing the contradiction between the two but lacking resolution, and 3) criticizing activist journalism and its compatibility with professionalism (Budivska & Orlova, 2017, p. 149). This brings it to the ethical dilemma of how to balance impartiality and patriotism when journalists living in Ukraine engage in activist projects such as donating money to the army or protesting at Euromaidan. The result from (Budivska & Orlova, 2017, pp. 150–152) research proves that journalists are aware of the normative principles from the Anglo-American model, but these guidelines are relatively abstract.

When the war erupted in eastern Ukraine, debates that focused on the language used to describe the conflict, the representation of all sides, and the possibility of dialogue with "the other side" arose (Orlova, 2016, p. 456). These debates have revealed disagreement among media professionals. Earlier research has explained this as different approaches by the media professionals; ban everything Russian and support interests of the state or to maintain a dialogue with Russian professionals and comply to universal journalistic standards and ideals (Budivska & Orlova, 2017). This shows a polarization among journalists about their role in the conflict, some advocating for neutrality and others prioritizing national interests.

Although Euromaidan brought more freedom for Ukrainian journalists and media, several problems left unsolved that have challenged the Ukrainian media sphere. The Ukrainian media got freedom from the government through a law that granted independence from the

state following Euromaidan, but many oligarchs managed to hold control over their media (Orlova, 2016). It has been shown that there is a great editorial dependence on the owners which allows these oligarchs to use media as instruments for their own goals (Orlova, 2016, pp. 453–454). This indicates that the professional journalistic feature of neutrality or objectivity is questioned. Earlier research suggests that within the society in Ukraine, there are struggles that affect objectivity such as influence from the oligarchs, government, and military (Springer et al., 2022, p. 198). The same research has also shown that Ukrainian journalists do commit to objectivity norms, but the coverage can be one-sided and only use Ukrainian sources (Springer et al., 2022, pp. 187, 190). Nygren et al. (2018) have researched how the mainstream media report on the conflict in eastern Ukraine. Here the fact of "our side" was brought up as the audience can expect journalists to support their "own side" and in that way contribute to a patriotic way of reporting (Nygren et al., 2018, p. 1061). The results strongly suggested that Ukrainian media focused most on the conflict and the military, mainly soldiers and others who help assist the "own side", putting the political sphere aside (Nygren et al., 2018, p. 1063). The interviews with the journalists gave the same picture as other earlier research, journalists try to follow the standards, but the majority could not be impartial (Nygren et al., 2018, p. 1068). At the same time, earlier research has indicated that there has not been a consensus among media professionals on which are the "right" standards, which showed itself in various approaches where journalists' experiences were more important than editorial practices (Orlova, 2016, p. 457).

All earlier research on patriotism and activism in Ukrainian media brings us to the same conclusion, there is an ethical dilemma on how to balance professionalism with patriotism when being attacked as a nation. Journalists bring out similar arguments as to why some values are not present in reports, for example, fear of causing harm to the Ukrainian side (self-censorship) or differences in editorial guidelines (Budivska & Orlova, 2017; Nygren et al., 2018; Orlova, 2016).

All the mentioned earlier research has been done before the full-scale invasion of Ukraine in 2022. Before the year 2022, the war was restricted to eastern Ukraine, leaving space for dialogues and negotiations. It is interesting to see if the challenges for Ukrainian journalists have changed and what their stake on patriotism in journalism is since 2022. As earlier research has shown that Ukrainian journalists have been polarized, the questions of whether that's still the case arise. This research will contribute to a broader picture of what "patriotic

journalism" means for Ukrainian journalists and test if the normative understanding of patriotism is the same. In the broader picture, it will help to put Ukraine in perspective of how journalists are dealing with patriotism to maintain their professionalism.

5. Theoretical framework

5.1 Professional journalism

The concept of professional journalism has sparked several debates about whether it contributes to better journalism. Many researchers have defined professionalism in slightly different ways, and it is difficult to make a clear definition as professionalism consists of several elements and is dependent on various factors that will be discussed next.

All professional groups have some criteria to be called professionals. According to Wilensky (1964, p. 138), there are two criteria to be professional: first, the technical criteria which are based on systematic knowledge (for example, a degree in the subject), and second, that professionals adhere to some professional norms (for example, codes of ethics). Professional journalism should follow high standards and be able to provide news and information that is reliable, truthful, and impartial, which also means that journalists should have expert knowledge and serve the society (Waisbord, 2013, pp. 95–96).

Hallin and Mancini (2004, pp. 34–36) consider three key factors that should be present in any media system: autonomy, professional norms, and public service orientation. Autonomy is explained as the degree of independence that journalists have in their work, with external influences such as political, commercial, or ideological (Hallin & Mancini, 2004, p. 35). Professional norms are the existence of shared norms between peers that are specific to a profession, in the case of journalism, it's ethical principles (Hallin & Mancini, 2004, p. 35). Lastly, an important part of professionalism is that the work is serving the public society. According to Hanitzsch, some elements should be considered universal (not dependent on culture); journalists should offer a public service, be impartial and credible, work autonomously, prioritize actuality, and uphold ethical standards (Hanitzsch, 2007, pp. 367–368). Ethical standards are important to have in place to prevent doing any harm as a journalist. Some of the principles that are included into journalistic ethical standards are

objectivity, truthfulness, accuracy, reliability, to not do any harm, to verify information and serve the public (Ward, 2019, p. 309).

Hanitzsch and Örnebring together define professionalism as having a system of shared institutional norms, rules, and practices that journalists work by (Wahl-Jorgensen & Hanitzsch, 2020, p. 107). Professional journalists are expected to perform their duties independently, maintaining a dispassionate approach and consistently delivering high-quality work, irrespective of their employer.

From earlier definitions of professional journalism, an ideal picture of a professional journalist can be defined: a professional is an individual who produces news aligned with social expectations, has autonomy, and adheres to ethical and practical standards shared with their peers. Together, they shape their professional performance through routines, orientation, autonomy, and training, regardless of their media system (González & Echeverría, 2022). But in everyday work, journalists constantly must find a balance between normative standards and everyday practice (González & Echeverría, 2022, p. 5). Therefore, there are several critics of professional journalism and challenges, most relevant for this paper, the challenge to preserve professionalism during war conditions.

Waisbord (2013, p. 97) suggests that professionalism in journalism may find itself challenged by the evolving, intricate, and often conflicting nature of events by restricting the wideness of coverage and hindering different explorations of complex issues and perspectives. This can defy conventional expectations of objectivity, even handedness, and fairness, ultimately highlighting how reality often surpasses the limitations imposed by the rules of professional journalism (Waisbord, 2013, p. 97).

Hanitzsch and Örnebring are bringing to our attention that there still is a need for more studies of causality and contextual influences (organizational, institutional, cultural, etc.) on journalists' perception of professionalism, roles, and identities (Wahl-Jorgensen & Hanitzsch, 2020, p. 117).

5.2 Patriotic journalism

Patriotic journalism is common in coverage of war, terrorist attacks, or other crises. Patriotism has an impact on professionalism in the sense that during a crisis, audience expectations change, objectivity may not be as important, and journalists take on a more active role in a society. The social environment affects journalists' behavior. In earlier research, this was detected in the aftermath of September 11, 2001, after the terrorist attack in the US (Zelizer & Allan, 2011). Although the definition of "patriotic journalism" can vary, it differs from the traditional objective model of journalism, at the same time as others can see it as a natural part of journalism (Ginosar & Cohen, 2019, p. 4).

According to Ginosar there are two types of patriotism, tribal and global patriotism. The latter is shown to be more professional where journalists behave in a more ethical, professional manner (Ginosar, 2015, p. 293). Tribal patriotism is more about journalists abandoning their professionalism and don't see neutrality as a journalistic standard. Schudson points out that the reason for this is solidarity with society during national tragedies (Ginosar, 2015, p. 291). At the same time, Zelizer and Allan explain that journalists feel forced to become part of the nation in such situations and cannot act as neutral observers (Zelizer & Allan, 2011). Ginosar (2015, p. 292) points out four main indicators of patriotic journalism: (1) journalists align with the governmental framing of the crisis, (2) journalists refrain from criticizing the government, (3) journalists show solidarity with the community in crisis and (4) journalists overlook the perspective of the opposing side.

Cohen and Ginosar summarize five approaches from the literature on how to explain patriotic journalism: 1) journalists adapt their behavior depending on the prevailing consensus or legitimate controversy surrounding an issue; 2) journalists serve the elites of society, no matter whether it's peace or war; 3) journalists are always in between the two identities of professional and national and in times of war journalists tend to act more patriotic; 4) journalists living in the conflict get personally affected by such events; 5) journalistic behavior is dependent on technology and technological developments, which for example leads to performance journalism or journalists being closer to the military (Ginosar & Cohen, 2019, p. 6).

Another important thing to consider when discussing patriotism is journalistic ethics. Ward (2010, p. 213) has developed a theory that shows how journalists can be patriotic without violating all the principles of democratic journalism. There is a distinction between different

degrees of patriotism, it can be extreme but also moderate and fit in with democratic values. According to Wards' research, two types of patriotism can be distinguished, communal patriotism and political patriotism. Communal patriotism is emotional and rooted in personal ties to specific people and places, focusing on non-political aspects of life such as language and traditions (Ward, 2010, p. 216). Political patriotism, on the other hand, is loyalty to a country's political values, rule of law, constitutions, and structure while celebrating its ideals, rights, and traditions (Ward, 2010, p. 216). However, the pure patriotism of either communal or political patriotism is rare, based on the history of patriotism and distinctions of patriotism, Ward could form a continuum from extreme patriotism to a more moderate one. Extreme patriotism is distinguished by: 1) a belief in a country's superiority, 2) prioritizing a country's interests with few restrictions, and 3) offering uncritical support for the country's actions (Ward, 2010, p. 223). Moderate patriotism is connected to democratic values and is distinguished by: 1) affection for a country, 2) a desire for a country's prosperity, 3) concern for a country's well-being (not exclusive), 4) support for a country to pursue its national goals within moral limits, and 5) conditional, critical support for a country's actions (Ward, 2010, pp. 223–224). The conclusion by Ward is that a journalist can be patriotic and adhere to ethical journalism, but this patriotism needs to be under strict conditions and follow democratic values.

When journalists turn to patriotic journalism, the aspect of censorship needs to be lifted. Censorship per se is some action from the government or others that represses freedom of speech and press, for example through threats. Self-censorship is a bit different and often depends on the journalists themselves. Several definitions can explain self-censorship: 1) choosing not to express a thought or belief that can be found objectionable and 2) choosing voluntarily to control speech or behavior to prevent causing annoyance or offense to others without being officially required to do so (Fadnes et al., 2020, p. 3). Self-censorship can be distinguished into two types, public and private self-censorship (Fadnes et al., 2020, p. 4). Public self-censorship involves individuals internalizing aspects of public censorship and censoring themselves, often avoiding stories out of fear of harassment or for safety reasons (Fadnes et al., 2020, p. 4). Private self-censorship is restraining one's attitude, balancing between what can be considered acceptable and what one wants to express, meaning that journalists self-censor based on professional and ethical values (Fadnes et al., 2020, p. 4). The question is whether self-censorship is always problematic or can be considered legitimate. This can be looked at through the motivation behind the self-censorship.

Patriotic journalism can be approached through cultural and professional ideology. As journalistic values can differ across cultures, nations, and times one can argue that there is no "right" journalistic professional ideology. So, to investigate patriotic journalism, Ginosar (2015, p. 296) proposes to look at journalism identity as a lens through which journalists define their values and professionalism. At the same time as looking at journalism's social function which shows the role of the journalists in their society and how they behave to fulfill these roles.

5.4 Combining theories

Integrating the theories of professional journalism and patriotic journalism provides a framework to use to be able to understand how journalists navigate their roles and responsibilities amidst national and societal interests and professional standards.

From earlier research, we can define professional journalism's most common key values: objectivity, truthfulness, reliability, and a degree of professional norms. These values will serve as a foundation for defining professional journalism in this study.

Patriotic journalism is considered as something that influences professionalism and thus is negative for journalism. Patriotism has an impact on objectivity, which is one of the most important values in journalistic professionalism. Often, when reporting in a patriotic way, the journalist loses the sense of neutrality. The question arises on whether this happens deliberately or if the journalist somehow is forced to report in this way during wartime.

By combining these theories, it's possible to explore how journalists balance their professional responsibilities with patriotic duties and how journalists uphold their journalistic integrity while considering the consequences what their reporting has on national identities. As Ginosar (2015) tells us, to be able to research patriotic journalism you must look at the journalistic identity first. Knowing how journalists in Ukraine understand professionalism and which values are important for them, it will be possible to understand if / how patriotism is influencing their work. To understand if patriotism is compatible with professional journalism, the type of patriotism needs to be defined (extreme or moderate). From that it will be possible to evaluate the ethical weight of patriotism on journalism through three criteria: 1)

patriotism is inclusive and respects all citizens' rights and freedom, 2) patriotism is restrained, avoids aggressiveness, and aligns with international law and human rights, 3) patriotism must endure public scrutiny which requires an open public sphere and a free press (Ward, 2010, p. 227).

Combining these two theories will indicate if professionalism and patriotism indeed contradict each other or if it is possible to be both professional and patriotic, based on the journalists' own experience. Research that combines these theories is important to shed light on the complexity of journalists' decision-making when national interest may intersect with their professionalism. Such a study will provide insights into the role of journalists in shaping public and national narratives.

6. Method

This research is a case study of the Ukrainian journalistic landscape amid full-scale war. The research is done through a thematic and narrative analysis. The two methods will complement each other, as both the theoretical aspects and people's own experiences will be explored. The data for this study will be collected through interviews with different Ukrainian journalists, see 6.1 Sampling.

Thematic analysis is a qualitative method used to identify and analyze patterns or themes within the research data. A theme can be defined as a category identified through data that aligns with the research focus, builds on transcript codes, and forms the foundation for a theoretical understanding of a subject (Bryman, 2016, p. 584). This kind of analysis will help to explore Ukrainian journalists' experiences and perceptions. Bryman (2016, p. 585) explains that to build a framework for thematic analysis, you can use a strategy where the researcher needs to outline central themes and sub-themes. With such an analysis, it is possible to find patterns, similarities, and differences when journalists explain the concepts of professionalism and patriotism. Although such an analysis is rich in flexibility and in-depth insights, it does have its limitations. As Bryman (2016, p. 587) writes, it can be complicated for a researcher to explain how themes were identified or why they matter. To make a good thematic analysis, it's important to present the process of how the themes emerged, which will be done in the 6.3 coding section.

A narrative analysis is used to analyze stories about people or events and how these affected participants (Bryman, 2016, p. 589). The importance is how people make sense of an event. In this research, the narrative approach fits as it aims to understand how Ukrainian journalists cope with the journalistic challenges during the war and the effect it has on their professional work. The aim of a narrative analysis is to extract the interviewee's reconstructed descriptions of links between events and between events and their context (Bryman, 2016, p. 589). In this case, to find links between journalistic professionalism and an armed conflict. One of the limitations of such a method is the risk of researcher's uncritical recognition of the stories that are told.

6.1 Sampling

When starting the research project, it's important to explain the reasons behind the sampling of the collected data. The war in Ukraine brought many challenges, among them violence and censorship. It's a complex conflict from the perspective of political and territorial issues. Choosing Ukraine as a context sample raises important questions about press freedom, journalistic integrity, and professionalism. Such a study will contribute to the discussion on how democratic values can be upheld during times of conflict, when looking into how Ukrainian journalists deal with such challenges and how these challenges shape reporting practices and professional ethics.

The chosen sampling method of participants for this study was purposive sampling, which involves strategically selecting participants to ensure their relevance to the research questions (Bryman, 408). Within purposive sampling, there are various approaches. In this paper, two kinds of sampling were used. Firstly, generic purposive sampling was employed, meaning that participants were selected purposefully without necessarily considering theory generation or theoretical categories (Bryman, 412). Nevertheless, the criteria for appropriate cases were established, guided by the research questions, ensuring that the sampling aligned with the study's objectives. For this thesis, four criteria were defined for selecting participants: (1) journalists from diverse geographical areas, (2) a roughly equal representation of men and women, (3) journalists from both local and national media outlets, and (4) journalists involved in different types of report genres. Although purposive sampling does not allow for the generalization of results to a larger population, it is not a weakness in this thesis, as the results

are not seeking to be generalized. The snowball sampling technique was used after sampling a small group of participants with the generic approach. The participants who were going to be interviewed were asked to recommend someone else in the journalistic field. The reasoning behind this approach was to get in contact with more journalists. Although this gave the possibility to get in touch with more journalists, only one of the participants came from the snowball sampling technique in the end. Meaning that there should not be any risks with potential similarity in opinions because of the sampling technique.

For this study, six interviews were made, three women and three men (see Appendix 1). Three interviewees were working for national media outlets, two of them were working for local media (eastern and central Ukraine) and one was working with national, local, and international media. The interviewees working at local newspapers worked with all kinds of reports, two people worked with specific genres that often did not include working with the military, and two were working almost exclusively with military reporting.

6.2 Interviewing

As the study has a specific topic that needs to be covered, at the same time as it needs to give the interviewees the possibility to have freedom in how they reply, the best method is to use semi-structured interviews (Bryman, 2016, p. 468). The interview process was flexible, and the interview questions were structured to understand journalists' perceptions of professionalism, patriotism, the experience of censorship, and the governmental or society's expectations of them. When preparing an interview guide seven themes were identified, (1) personal background, (2) professional values, (3) understanding patriotism, (4) balance between professionalism and patriotism, (5) challenges of war reporting, (6) censorship, (7) Ukrainian identity and professional balance. Based on these themes, nine questions were formed (see Appendix 2). Everyone was asked all the questions written in the interview guide; however, some people got extra questions, to get deeper into some problem or discussion.

With initial contact, journalists were given the possibility to choose between doing the interview through Zoom or face-to-face. Everyone chose to do the interview through Zoom, and the length varied from 20 to 45 minutes. All interviews were done in Ukrainian and recorded to be transcribed. There are both advantages and limitations to online interviewing. Interviewing through Zoom gives more flexibility to both parties as it saves costs and time,

this could also encourage more people to participate than would possibly have said no due to limits in time (Bryman, 2016, p. 492). A big limitation is the risk of technological problems, for example, poor internet or problems with recording (Bryman, 2016, p. 492). During almost all interviews, the problem with connection appeared due to internet problems in Ukraine. One interview was interrupted due to a shelling of the interviewees city and when the interviewee came back, there was a recording issue. Neither of these problems influenced the results of the study.

6.3 Ethical considerations & researchers' role

There are several ethnical aspects to consider when doing this kind of study. As this study contains interviews, it is important to meticulously inform the participants about the aim of the study, what is expected from the participants and to get a signed consent from those who want to participate. It is also highly important to make sure that every participant's anonymity is ensured throughout the whole study. This was done with the help of university's guidelines, see more in Chapter 6.4. Another ethical aspect is respecting the sensitivity of the context. Given that the war is ongoing in Ukraine, the researcher must be mindful of the emotional and psychological impact of discussions about patriotism and professionalism. Some participants got emotional (angry or/and sad) during the interviews. Here the researcher plays an important role when handling these situations, when to pause the interview and how to be respectful of the participants' feelings, making them comfortable in the interview.

This study seeks to highlight the voices of Ukrainian journalists, providing them with a platform to share their experiences and perspectives. It is therefore essential that the researchers' bias is minimized to ensure that the true narratives and insights of these journalists are accurately represented. The role of the researcher in this kind of study is to be a facilitator and let the participants express their views freely without asking any leading questions or inserting opinions during the interview. The researcher's Ukrainian background presented both a challenge and an advantage. Because of the personal connection, a potential bias could influence the interpretation of the data. It was therefore highly important to stay reflective over own interpretations, constantly reflecting over own role in the study and how it might affect the research outcome. It's especially important to be clear on what are the interviewees' opinions and where the researcher's own reflections are when writing the

analysis. Being a Ukrainian offers a significant advantage in understanding the nuances of the language and societal lifestyle. The researcher has a comprehensive understanding of Ukraine's cultural and historical context, which allows for accurate and respectful interpretation of the interviews. By focusing on the authentic stories and viewpoints of those directly affected, the study seeks to highlight the realities on the ground, free from external interpretation. The goal is to let journalists' voice lead the discussion of professionalism and patriotism.

6.4 Coding and analysis

The transcription was an important part of this study, as the researcher needs to be accurate and precise with the transcript so as not to lose any essential expressions or hints from the participant. After the interviews were transcribed, they were translated into English. There are several limitations with translation, examples of these are sayings that cannot be translated directly into English or not accurately transmitting the participants' points. This was addressed through a thorough reading of the Ukrainian transcript and comparing it to the English version during the whole study. The overall translation was done to keep the wordings and expressions as similar as possible. There were parts of the interviews that were not transcribed. Some parts were not transcribed due to anonymity concerns of the participant, and some parts were not transcribed because of their irrelevance to the study (stories about war in itself). The parts that were not transcribed are highlighted in the transcript to ensure transparency.

The first step before analyzing was to create a coding system. This study is done with an inductive and deductive approach. Codes are needed to give meaning and to categorize data collected during the study (Miles et al., 2014, p. 63). Thematic phrases, which are extended phrases or sentences, can be used to define the content and meaning of data units in addition to codes (Miles et al., 2014, p. 73). In this study, there are two main themes to focus on: professionalism and patriotism. These themes describe different parts of data. During the first cycle of coding, the codes were defined beforehand, using a deductive approach. The codes were separated into the themes of professionalism and patriotism. Professionalism was coded with the following codes: education, reliability, truthfulness, objectivity, and ethical principles. Patriotism was coded with governmental censorship, military censorship, self-

censorship, neutrality, security, and balanced reporting. Every code was given a color, see Table 1, and these different colors made it easier to find relevant codes in the data. When the first part of the coding was done, the method, in vivo, was used to further code the data. The "in vivo" method uses the participant's phrases or words as codes in the data (Miles et al., 2014, p. 65). It is a good coding method for a study that prioritizes the participant's voice. This method was able to give a more profound review of the data. The coding process was as follows: 1) review the whole text several times, 2) find relevant data in the transcript, 3) quote the participant in an Excel document, divided into themes professionalism and patriotism, and 4) write down new codes that emerged from the participants' expressions. This process resulted in more codes being discovered in relation to researcher-generated codes, see Table 2. Then the second cycle of coding took place. This is important to shorten data and to start searching for patterns between different interviewees (Miles et al., 2014, p. 79). This was done through the following codes: 1) themes, 2) sub-themes, and 2) explanations. The results from the analysis are presented in chapter 7.

6.5 General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR)

As the study has been done through interviews and potentially sensitive information has been brought up during interviews, it is highly important to protect participants' personal data. The process has therefore followed Södertörn University's guidelines on how to process personal data. The first step was a consideration of which personal data is necessary to collect. This study collected minimal personal data (name, working place, and e-mail). Before collecting this data, a supervisor was informed about it. All personal data is stored on the storage services provided by Södertörn University and the interviews took place and were recorded via Zoom. The consent to take part in the study was collected from every interviewee before collecting any data or starting the interview. The consent form is a standard form provided by Södertörn University. To ensure participants' anonymity no names were written down in transcriptions, these were changed to aliases. The participants' names were changed to aliases in the material and in the results. When the study is finished, all the material with personal data will be deleted.

6.6 Limitations

This study does have several limitations. One of the biggest concerns is the number of people who were interviewed. As only 6 people participated in this study, the study cannot be

generalized to all Ukrainian journalists. Even though there are few participants, they do represent different media holders, different regions, and different ages. The results could not show any significant differences between their answers, which makes the study to some extent representative of journalists' situation in Ukraine. Another limitation is due to journalists' own safety concerns. Participants may have been hesitant to speak freely due to concerns about personal safety or potential pressure, leading to self-censorship or incomplete disclosures. The study's insights may be highly context-dependent, reflecting the unique circumstances of Ukraine. This might limit the applicability of the findings to other contexts or times.

Given these limitations, the study could have been more representative of Ukrainian journalism during wartime if more journalists took part in the study. However, this study does not aim for any generalizations. The aim of the study is to be one of the introducing studies to explain patriotism in Ukraine through the ethical aspect. The ethical aspect of patriotism cannot be explained with only one study because of its many angles, which encourages more studies on the topic. The mentioned limitations did not come in the way of answering the research questions of this study.

There may be limitations in the researcher's interpretation of the collected data. Emotions and expressions can be understood differently based on the researcher's background and personal impressions. Even though the study was done with an unbiased approach, these factors could unconsciously influence the study. The researcher's role and how the limitation of bias was dealt with is explained more in-depth in Chapter 6.3. There is also a limitation that applies to language. As previously mentioned, the translation can slightly distort the participants' points, as certain nuances cannot be translated directly. This risk was eliminated by going through the material several times in both Ukrainian and English, which in turn is a strength.

7. Results and analysis

This study will explain how the interviewed Ukrainian journalists understand professionalism and patriotism and the struggles journalists go through when working in Ukraine right now. In the study, several patterns were found between these journalists. Almost all journalists talked about the same or similar indicators of professionalism and patriotism. However, the

interpretation of patriotism is a bit different from the normative theories on patriotic journalism.

7.1 Professionalism in war conditions

As professionalism can vary between the countries, it's important to start with presenting the results of how Ukrainian journalists interpret professionalism and if it coincides with its definition in the theoretical framework. The collected data was coded through two steps of coding, first with the help of researcher-generated codes and then with "in vivo" coding. When the coding was done, it was possible to see patterns of which professional characteristics are presented as most important. The theme professionalism was divided into two sub-themes, journalistic norms and ethics. Journalistic norms in this study are education, reliability, objectivity, truthfulness, responsibility, openness, confidentiality, having profound knowledge, making high-quality text, being a good listener, and working towards public interests. Ethics are defined as a set of rules when working with victims and their families, children, and military personnel.

The first researcher-generated code was education as one of the identifiers of professionalism. But education was not mentioned as a criterion for professional journalism by any of the participants. One journalist said:

> *"This is not about education; this is primarily about professionalism and professional ethics". – P6*

It appears that it is not essential to have an education in journalism, rather the importance lies in how you do your job out in the field. This participant does not go in-depth on what she means by professional ethics apart from confidentiality and journalistic etiquette in the form of being a good listener and not doing any harm.

When the responses from all the participants were coded, 11 characteristics of a professional journalist were found. These are reliability, truthfulness, objectivity, responsibility, profound knowledge, openness, confidentiality; for a journalist to act in public interests, be ethical, produce high-quality text and be a good listener.

Truthfulness means that the journalist is being honest and reliable in his or her work. It's essential to maintain a good relationship between journalists and the audience. Reliability is

therefore connected to truthfulness. As a result, truthfulness or "fact–checking" was mentioned by 6 out of 6 participants. Truthfulness is the only characteristic that was mentioned by all the journalists. Reliability was, however, mentioned only by three journalists. But as these two concepts are closely connected, it can be shown that every journalist mentioned truthfulness or/and reliability as one of the key values to professionalism.

"Tell about what happened as accurately as possible, as truthfully as possible, as impartially as possible." – P2

Objectivity is closely related to being unbiased and neutral. In other words, to be objective means to present facts without letting personal emotions or opinions bias the content. This needs to be ensured to give the reader a piece of accurate and balanced information. When looking at the study data, it's shown that 5 of 6 participants mentioned "objectivity/impartiality" directly when asked about professionalism in journalism. This shows objectivity to be one of the most important qualities of professional standards.

Characteristics such as confidentiality and producing high-quality text were mentioned only by one journalist. In-depth knowledge was also only mentioned once by one of the journalists. These two journalists were also the only ones who mentioned being a good listener as a quality of a professional journalist.

The characteristic, acting in public interests, in the form of holding power holders accountable for wrongdoings, was mentioned by one journalist as important professional quality. But several journalists mentioned the importance of being responsive to their audience (P2, P5, P6).

The following characteristics are responsibility and openness. Only one journalist replied that responsibility is highly important for a journalist. The same journalist connected the responsibility with being open to your reader as a journalist and the responsibility a journalist has when working with the military, because of the risk of causing harm to people if not being accountable for your words and actions.

Ethical principles are considered crucial in journalism, as they ensure that the profession serves the public interest. As journalism can shape public opinion and is the first to inform about something, the ethical principles can be a foundation for doing this work with integrity.

When asked about professionalism, four out of six journalists mentioned ethical principles. The ethical principles were discussed a bit differently depending on the journalist. One of these journalists just mentioned the code of ethics (as a phrase) and editorial policy and the importance of having these in place when working in media. One journalist mentioned ethics that concern human values. One of the journalists points out the importance of observing ethics when writing stories about heroes. One of the journalists mentions ethical principles when talking about communication:

"When you are wearing a bulletproof vest with "press" on it, you have no right to speak out and insult a person because of their pro-Russian views. /.../ This is currently one of the most relevant rules of the modern code of ethics or the code of ethics of this war." – P5

The journalist, quoted above, talks about ethics in relation to communication and to not let emotions come in the way of professionalism. Another important aspect of communication is when talking to people who have lost their relatives or to people living near the frontline. According to this journalist, they always follow a code of ethics for such cases. According to the journalist quoted above, one of the most important modern codes of ethics is to not let emotions get in the way of professionalism, as many of the topics that need to be covered, in the present day, are painful. Another aspect of ethics in journalism that the same journalist is describing is the need to be careful when presenting war pictures, especially pictures of victims. The participant tells a story about a project that he has done and stresses that the reader can be unprepared, therefore one of the features of ethics is to have blurred victims so not to shock the reader.

The professional norms that were defined in the theoretical framework were objectivity, truthfulness, reliability, and a degree of professional norms. The result indicates that the interviewed Ukrainian journalists value the same professional standards. Serving the public interest, being ethical, having in-depth knowledge of what you are writing about, and being confidential are all professional standards. The participants agreed that truthfulness is the most important norm, followed by objectivity, reliability, and ethical principles, such as communication with victims, separating emotions from facts, confidentiality, respecting your audience, respecting the interviewees, and respecting human values. The norms discussed by the journalists are the same norms that are discussed in the theoretical framework in Chapter 5.

7.2 Patriotism in journalism

The focus of this study has been on patriotism. This section will present the results concerning patriotism, challenges, and censorship in Ukrainian journalism. Patriotism was presented as a separate theme when coding the study data. Pre-generated codes included governmental censorship, military censorship, self-censorship, neutrality and security. After the "in vivo" coding was done, several new codes emerged from the material such as inspiration, victory, nationalism, promotion, and identity as Ukrainian. After the coding process, the data showed that patriotism emerged in 3 sub-themes: 1) censorship, 2) balanced reporting, and 3) Ukrainian identity.

During this study, it was revealed that Ukrainian journalists do not see patriotism as something negative and that they believe that patriotism does not contradict professionalism in journalism. When asked about patriotism, almost all journalists call it pro-Ukrainian journalism, that it's about promoting Ukraine.

"Patriotism is showing the inner beauty of your compatriots, and achievements against the background of the fact that material and people are being destroyed"- P1

"The patriotism of a journalist is when he or she does his or her job, which is aimed at popularizing Ukraine or Ukrainians." – P5

The promotion is mentioned by 5 out of 6 journalists. It shows itself in different formats, such as quoted above, in showing the beauty of your country but also in promoting Ukraine and Ukrainian goals such as the Ukrainian peace formula abroad.

"If I am abroad, I have to present a strong, confident country and if I am at home I have to make this country strong and confident." – P4

The participant quoted above seems to understand the concept of patriotism as showing your best side to "the outside" (meaning the international arena) but emphasizing that inside the country everyone should work to make a country better, including working on internal problems such as corruption. By this participant, this is explained as a different kind of

patriotism. It's not entirely clear how to understand this from a researcher perspective because it can be understood as the participant considers that it is not necessary to show all the sides of your country on the international arena but that inside the country journalists should bring out the problems of the country and work on building a better country for themselves. This can be perceived as being not totally truthful, but at the same time, the participant has not said that a journalist should hide such facts from an audience. This participant works mostly for an international arena which can explain such a statement. With that said, she does not write investigative or analyzing reports to build Ukrainian societal opinion, but rather on presenting Ukraine, Ukrainian culture and Ukrainian interest to an international audience.

Promotion goes a bit of hand in hand with inspiration and presenting the heroes of one's country. Together, 5 out of 6 participants used inspiration, societal demand, or stories about heroes as explanations for what patriotism is and its importance.

"Understand, that only through stories of people, heroes /.../ that we can show what a cool nation we are" - P1

"A clear request from the audience for pro-Ukrainian journalism" - P2

Societal demand relates to inspiration, as explained by the participants. Meaning that there is a demand from the audience for pro-Ukrainian journalism and journalists telling the story of different heroes. What is not specified here is the demand by editors and owners. None of the participants mentioned media owners or editors and their demands. Important to notice here is that the local journalists who were interviewed were also editors. The participant who works for national, local and international media is edit for one of the media outlets he works for. Looking from this perspective, with half of the participants as editors, there is a demand for a pro-Ukrainian narrative from editors. Soldiers and volunteers are considered heroes and are deeply respected by most of the society. All the collected data was shown to contain stories about different people, about brave soldiers, volunteers, and "ordinary" citizens doing what they can for their survival. Most of the stories were not focused on Ukraine as a state, but rather on the Ukrainian people, language, and the bravery of people at the frontline. The feeling of gratitude and pride filled every interview. The state of Ukraine, in the form of constitution and political values, such as political parties and the government, is almost non-existing (not mentioned) in the analyzed material. The focus is on the human values such as

integrity and survival. Although, 3 out of 6 participants mentions nationalism in varied form in their interviews. One of the participants explains patriotism as:

"For me, patriotism is love for my native land, the land where you were born and grew up. Patriotic journalism proves to our countrymen that our land is the best, that it is here we were born, where our values are." – P3

Even though the participants mention things like love for the native land or "our land is the best", it's not defined if by "land" the participant means the political values (political beliefs, constitution, state structure) of the country. This means that it can be interpreted both as nationalism in the form of ethnic and cultural belonging but also as moderate patriotism. Two other journalists said:

"/Patriotism/ is a matter of survival. We must educate our children, our society that this is not Nazism, but healthy nationalism for us to continue to exist as species, as people, and we deserve it." – P1

"Maybe it's a little bit of national air, but Ukraine should be above all." – P2

The expression "Ukraine should be above all" is often used in Ukraine related subjects. It basically means that Ukrainians should now prioritize Ukrainian interests and doing everything to bring victory closer. Even here, it's not clear that this is so-called "extreme patriotism". In the first quote, the participant refers to survival and emphasizes that patriotism in Ukraine is needed now and in the future for Ukrainians to "exist as a species", which is not focused on the state. The other quote needs to be put in context to be understood. This participant was before talking about whether keeping balance in reporting is important and the risk of Ukrainian voice not being heard if Ukrainian journalists (or journalists overall) consider voices from both sides of this war. The participant is emphasizing that pro-Russian narratives are forceful in the information space and therefore Ukrainians should defend pro-Ukrainian narratives but still be correct in their reporting. With this context, you can understand the "Ukraine above all" as more of "Ukrainian voices should be strong and present". Still, all three quotes have traits of nationalism but during most of the interview the focus is on people and survival of people. The question is whether this can be labeled as

“extreme patriotism” or “moderate patriotism”, the terms have defined in Chapter 5.2 and will be discussed further on in Chapter 8.

"We work for victory. This is our slogan. So, the topic of patriotism is very, very valuable and important to us" - P6

The quote above shows the simple underlying opinion in many interviews. The data showed that 4 out of 6 journalists mentioned “victory” in their answers. Journalists focus on not harming the approach of victory and working for the victory. One of the journalists brings the balance into discussion when mentioning victory:

”We cannot say that we are constantly winning on the frontline and that ”victory will be coming soon” because it is not true. I would like that, but it's not true. We have both victories and defeats, no matter how you put it.” – P5

The participant emphasizes that victory is of course important (by bringing it to discussion) but also the importance of balance in reporting when writing about victory. More about objectivity and balance in patriotism will be explained in 7.2.2.

To summarize, the most important definitions of patriotism presented by the interviewed journalists are: 1) bringing inspiration to the society through stories about people as heroes, and 2) promoting what Ukraine strives for, Ukrainians, traditions and language. Both inspiration and promotion are explained to be important to uphold the fighting spirit and for survival purposes. Patriotism is also explained as important to approach victory in the war. Furthermore, some traits of ethnic and cultural belonging are present. All of these will be discussed in relationship to the ethical principles of professional journalism in Chapter 8.

7.2.1 Censorship

Censorship is a concept that is common in situations of crisis or wars, which censorship is often related to. It’s not a question of whether censorship is present in Ukrainian journalism, as this has been proven by several researchers, but rather what kind of censorship and how Ukrainian journalists question or justify it.

During the discussion of patriotism, only two participants mentioned governmental censorship. One of the participants (P4) who mentioned such censorship claimed not to have experienced it but speculated on which kind of journalists can experience governmental censorship. This participant stated that state-owned publications and journalists such as investigators are targets for censorship, especially governmental censorship. Due to this study's focus, ownership of the media has not been discussed in detail; therefore, no result can be presented about whether these speculations can be backed up with evidence. Although earlier research has shown that before 2014, governmental censorship was seen in Ukrainian media. This is also backed by another journalist (P3) who mentioned governmental censorship before the war (before 2014) and how governmental bodies could contact them if something the governmental bodies did not like was published. This is not something new, as earlier research has stated that such censorship existed at least before 2014. But none of the participants experienced pressure in their reporting (since the war began in 2014) from the government, and several mentioned that they feel free to criticize internal problems of the country and the governmental bodies. However, two participants mentioned that they choose not to report on problems that could concern governmental bodies due to the risk that it could weaken the country, this can be understood as a kind of self-censorship. One example of this is:

"During martial law, this /governmental censorship/ has not happened because we mainly filter what we write among ourselves. We write about people; we do not write something against the state, as we understand that now is not the time for that." – P3

On the other hand, every participant mentioned military censorship. All interviewed journalists mentioned strong cooperation with press officers if wanting to work on reports that somehow included military personnel or any theme that concerns the ongoing war. The things that were brought up by the participants were: 1) restrictions on what you can show if filming or taking pictures near the frontline or reporting on a missile hit, 2) rules on what you can and cannot write in your report, for example, names, something that can identify a person that the report concerns or losses, and 3) there is good cooperation with the military personnel, especially with press officers that are working with every brigade.

"According to the rules of martial law, according to the law on media, we currently submit every issue of our printed publication to the military state administration so that we do not violate any rules of work in wartime". – P6

The quote above states that the military administration does control what is written in the media, at least in this case. Although, no one else of the participants mentioned such control, even though all participants mentioned restrictions that are put on journalism during war.

"There are press officers who monitor what's going on, this is not censorship, this is self-defense, this is security." – P1

All the participants do mention a close collaboration with press officers of different brigades. This is presented in different ways by different participants, it can be to ask if you can write about something concerning the ongoing war, if you want to report from the frontline, or if you want to do fact-checking.

All kind of military censorship is excused by the journalists due to security concerns, it is understood to be for Ukraine's defense capability and Ukrainians' safety, including military personnel and journalists.

"You need to understand that where you go, it's 100% dangerous. /.../ a certain zone from the frontline is 100% dangerous, safe zones within 10km from the frontline do no longer exist. If you are ready for this, then yes you can work there, but shoot your material /carefully/ so to not harm the defense capabilities of your state." – P2

"Access can be denied because of the intensification of hostilities. It's about security" – P5

However, journalists do not just "accept" censorship. In this study 4 out of 6 journalists mentioned the rules of censorship. Two of the journalists emphasized the need for formalized rules or censorship for it to be transparent.

"Censorship should be formalized. There should be a list of information that should not be disclosed without approval of certain authorities. This applies to the military. It should be

strict, transparent, with a clear list of what you have no right to publish without approval." – P4

The quote above emphasizes the fact that censorship should be regulated. Although censorship is not transparent, the participant aims for transparency in the sense that the "same rules apply to all". All four journalists unite the need for formal censorship with safety and to avoid communication problems. The fact that journalists want it to be transparent shows that they value fairness as important. The other two journalists emphasize that such rules are in place.

"If we have accreditation, we can work in the war zone and during curfews. You must just coordinate it with the military. There are no huge, urgent problems, no key problems that directly interfere with our work because everything can be solved." – P5

"Now journalists can basically go almost anywhere they want. Recently, /new law/, improved with clear rules and criteria. I think it's great. There are no technical issues, no prohibitions, but a certain list, a certain algorithm of actions, and this simplifies the work." – P2

The quotes above concern the work with the military. It describes the division of places where journalists can and cannot work in different zones, and what journalists can and cannot film due to security issues. This indicates that at least part of the censorship is regulated and transparent. Transparent in the sense that the same rules apply to all journalists. The question is how it works in reality. Here an interesting fact was discovered, a pattern of differences between the answers. The two journalists who mentioned the need for rules are the ones who work with military reports but do not work at the frontline. The two journalists who said that there are clear criteria are the ones who often work at the frontline. It could be that the journalists who are frequently at the frontline have much more communication with the military personnel such as press officers; thus, they have a better picture of the filtration of information. Although one of these journalists was critical to the military decision to close a city after liberation. Still, there was never any doubt that military censorship is needed to protect Ukraine and Ukrainians. This same statement was used by every journalist who was interviewed. Almost every part of censorship is justified for security reasons, for security reasons of people living in Ukraine, and of course, military personnel. One of the journalists

mentioned that not being able to show the whole picture is a disadvantage for professional work but still emphasizes that in the reality that Ukrainians are living in, it is a necessity.

Another thing that can be interpreted as censorship is the necessity of pro-Ukrainian narratives. According to all journalists who were interviewed, pro-Ukrainian journalism is highly important. Firstly, to not harm Ukrainian defense capabilities. Many of them point out that the most important job right now is to not spread anti-Ukrainian narratives.

"You can't be a journalist in Ukraine /.../ without somehow emphasizing or promoting thesis that are pro-Ukrainian and patriotic" – P2

"The main thing is not to spread any anti-Ukrainian narratives." – P5

So based on the quotes above and the fact that the "pro-Ukrainian" narrative is a recurring subject of all interviews, it is shown that Ukrainian journalists are cautious about criticizing Ukraine or Ukrainian decisions. It is also clear that there is a fear that the Russian narrative can "take over" the informational sphere and thus harm the military's defense capabilities.

To summarize, all participants agreed that there is no governmental censorship present in the media at the time the interviews were conducted. On the other hand, all participants agreed that the media have a strong military censorship presence. Since the full-scale invasion, journalists need to have a close cooperation with military personnel, especially press officers. Certain restrictions on what you can show are present, and there are rules on what you can and cannot write. Although all the participants agreed that objectivity is the most important value of journalistic professionalism, they all excuse censorship due to security concerns. Not to forget, journalists still think that it is important that censorship is regulated, for the same rules to apply to all. A pattern is found that journalists who do not work at frontline are striving after a clear description of what needs to be censored, but the journalists who work at the frontline see this as already implemented. Another aspect of censorship that is seen is self-censorship, the matter of pro-Ukrainian narratives. Although, the only narrative journalists would rather not see is the pro-Russian one. This brings us to whether journalists see their work as balanced, and how this balance is perceived.

7.2.2 Balanced reporting

Neutrality and unbiased reporting tend to be compromised in patriotic journalism. This happens if journalism prioritizes the own country's interests, values, and goals. The data could show that 6 of 6 journalists lifted the aspect of neutrality, objectivity, or balance in journalism during wartime. They all agreed that it's important to be objective and try to be unbiased in their reporting, but at the same time, it's very hard as you live in war.

"If the balance is broken, if the other side is not given the floor, then this is simply not good journalism. But if we are talking about military operations /.../, it's force majeure. Living here on our land, we cannot be completely unbiased. Consider that a certain degree of bias will be present until the war is over." – P1

The quote above shows how one journalist considers objectivity as a necessity in professional journalism but at the same time stresses out that when it comes to war, it's a different situation. This participant explains that bias is inevitable. In this statement, he is supported by several of the interviewees. At the same time, participants separate "balance and objectivity" from the fact of giving a voice to both sides. All participants agree that news can be objective if they are fact-based, with other words, objectivity is a confirmation of facts. Here are several examples of what journalists themselves are saying:

"You can always be objective; you should always be objective. If an event happens, we report it. Today, two rockets were fired. Is that objective? Yes. Were they Russian missiles? Yes. Were they fired from Crimea? Yes. Did they fall on a residential area? Yes. These are facts that happened, no doubt about it. But if we start to more speculate on where these missiles were going, that will be on our responsibility because we will direct public opinion." – P2

"He told be his perspective but when you learn from other sources it can turn out that there are other nuances, he may have exaggerated" – P3

"/A story/ can be a bit of a black mark, but if it happened, it happened and it's a fact. Just make it a balanced piece." – P5

All these quotes are about being objective without giving the other side a voice. Every journalist emphasizes the importance of fact-checking before releasing the material. As many

sides have a will to manipulate the media to their interests, it's vital. The conclusion from this is that when reporting about events you can report facts without them being colored by your bias, but it's way harder when writing an analytic piece of something that happened. It's important to use several sources and do a thorough verification of what you are writing. Although all journalists seem to be objective and have balance in mind when doing their work as a journalist, one journalist is especially critical of patriotism in relation to objectivity. This journalist makes an important case for distinguishing between facts and emotions and highlights the importance of critical thinking.

"You shouldn't make patriotism through rose-colored glasses, that's what critical thinking is for. We cannot talk only about the positive aspects of Ukrainian statehood and the negative aspects of Russian statehood." – P5

"Even if it is pro-Ukrainian, it can still be fake, this is probably more about fact-checking. A piece should be patriotic, but it should be objective." – P5

"We don't want the information field to be excessive with only positive, cool news or news of the suffering of people who survived occupation. It needs to be balanced, and society will feel as they have not been misled." – P5

The participants state that according to the journalists' standards, different points of view should be present in a piece, but at the same time he states that this is not possible in war. But what a journalist can do it to confirm information, write both good and bad, and realize that critical thinking is highly important in journalism during war.

7.2.3 Ukrainian identity

One of the codes that emerged from the material is "identity – Ukrainian". This emerged as journalists many times during the interview referred to being Ukrainian, Ukraine being in survival mode and the importance of volunteering and supporting Ukrainian defense with the help of the informational sphere. Volunteering may be more fitted for its code such as "activism" but as it was not defined as a theoretical framework it will be explained as part of the Ukrainian identity.

"Ukrainian identification should be present in every material, at least through the language" - P1

Above is said by one of the participants when discussing balancing an identity as a citizen of a country with staying professional in your work. In this study, 5 out of 6 participants did not find any problems in between being Ukrainian citizen and doing professional work during war.

"It's impossible to be a journalist in Ukraine and not be a citizen of Ukraine, just as impossible to be a citizen and not be a person who defends the interests of your country. For me, it's a purely black and white story, there are no halftones between Ukraine and Russia. There is an unmotivated aggression ongoing for a decade, this is pure evil. There is no need to look for a balance here." - P2

Journalists see their identity, as Ukrainians, being targeted and strive to protect it. Two of the participants don't see a need for any balance between identity and professionalism and two of them sees a necessity in promoting Ukrainian identification, for example if the form of Ukrainian language. One of the participants explained identity with a story about a fellow Ukrainian who fled from occupation, with a hint that you cannot separate your Ukrainian identity from journalism when such atrocities happen.

"Do not put on rose-colored glasses, check and confirm facts. When you take off your bulletproof press vest, you start to unleash your personal feelings, and thoughts on your family and friends. And when you are at work, you are at work, you should be more balanced and objective. – P5

The quote above is from the participant that also found critical thinking to be much important in journalistic work. This participant shows that you need to disconnect from your personal feelings when working as a journalist. The importance of balance and objectivity does not disappear because of your identity. Still, the participant emphasizes that in a full-scale war, everything that is Ukrainian becomes a part of you. Highlighting the difficulty in working with a balance when struggling to survive.

In Ukraine, it's difficult to find a business or people that are in one or another way engaged in helping Ukrainian defense since the full-scale invasion, this concerns even journalists. If before 2022 it was possible for some parts of Ukraine to distance themselves from the war, since 2022 it has affected every region of Ukraine and every citizen. Many Ukrainians are eager to help the Ukrainian army, and this is also promoted by the journalists. As mentioned in earlier research, Budivska (2017) researched on the relationship between professionalism and activism in Ukraine. She found three different approaches: 1) consistency in integrating professional identity in activism, 2) recognizing the contradiction between the two but lacking resolution, and 3) criticizing activist journalism and its compatibility with professionalism. The results of this study can strengthen her research on two points. Several participants were asked if they actively participate in helping the Army in their work. And all participants that were asked answered that their media holder or them themselves do help the military, through auctions, telethons or other fundraisers. Several participants told how their media helps before even being asked about it, this was in particularly local media that at the beginning of the war operated as hubs and now focus on fundraisers and telethons. All the journalists do see contradictions between some professional and patriotic characteristics, mainly to maintain objectivity during war. However, they do not see this as a big concern as long as the war is ongoing. None of the participants criticize being active in helping the military during their professional work. They do not see these facts contradicting each other. To summarize with numbers, two journalists were mostly focused on describing Ukrainian heroes and the volunteer work of their media throughout the interview; two journalists mentioned fundraisers and telethons; one journalist mentioned that they did fundraisers at the beginning of the full-scale invasion but don't do that anymore, and one journalist did not engage in this subject at all.

8. Discussion and analysis

This chapter will answer the research questions and connect the results to earlier research on professionalism and patriotism. This chapter is divided into two parts. The first part will present the definition of professionalism and patriotic journalism. The second part will present a discussion of the balance between professionalism and patriotism.

Question 1: How do Ukrainian journalists define professional and patriotic journalism in the background of an ongoing war?

According to the theoretical framework of professionalism, there are some norms that should be considered when talking about professional journalism. Depending on the research, these concepts can be defined as slightly different. Waisbord (2013) points out that a professional journalist should be reliable, truthful, impartial, have expert knowledge, and serve the society. Hanitzsch and Örnebring (2020) argue that professionalism is having a system of shared institutional norms, rules, and practices. Hanitzsch (2007) considers some elements to be universal and not dependent on culture, such as impartiality, credibility, autonomy, working to offer a public service, and upholding ethical standards. Based on earlier studies of professional journalism, in Chapter 5.3, professionalism is defined with five key values: objectivity, truthfulness, reliability, and journalists' need to follow professional norms.

During the research, 11 characteristics of a professional journalist were found: reliability, truthfulness, objectivity, responsibility, profound knowledge, openness, confidentiality, acting in public interests, being ethical, producing high-quality text, and being a good listener.

According to the results of this study, journalists' truthfulness and objectivity are considered the most important professional norms. Participants explained that they achieve this through continuous fact-checking and being critical of the sources of information. Every participant agreed on several of the professional values presented in the theory on professional journalism. But it is worth mentioning is that there is a pattern that the journalists did not have a clear consensus on which norms are the right ones for professional journalism. Apart from objectivity and truthfulness, professional norms do vary. Such differences were earlier found by Orlova (2016) in her research on the professional identity of Ukrainians. Her research also concluded that journalists value their experiences more than editorial practices. One of the participants of this study said, *"We distinguish ourselves between what is right and what is objective".* Such a statement strengthens Orlova's thesis.

With this said, the understanding of the professional journalist in Ukraine is in line with the theoretical definition, but the key values for professionalism vary between different participants, regardless of whom they work for, their gender or their geographical position. This indicates that there is still a lack of consensus among journalists concerning editorial practices. This may be explained by the lack of resources to introduce the same editorial practices nationwide due to the ongoing war. To further explore where Ukrainian professionalism is heading, the war must end.

Patriotism is found in countries that go through difficult challenges that put a threat to the nation, such as terrorism or war. As mentioned in Chapter 5.2, Ginosar (2015, p. 292) points out four main indicators of patriotic journalism: (1) journalists align with the governmental framing of the crisis, (2) journalists refrain from criticizing the government, (3) journalists show solidarity with the community in crisis and (4) journalists overlook the perspective of the opposing side.

Results of this study could present some characteristics that Ukrainian journalists used to explain patriotism. For all journalists, patriotism means, in short, loving your country and promoting the heroes of your country. The word "country" is very broad and can mean different things, depending on how you define it. For some, a country is a state with its national borders, certain political views, certain rule of law, and a constitution. For some, the expression "love for my country", can mean love for the language, fellow citizens, and traditions of that country. Most of the participants told stories about heroes of Ukraine and how they inspire the society to work toward victory when explaining patriotism. By most, patriotism is described through the promotion of Ukraine and Ukrainian narratives, together with the importance of writing about volunteers and military personnel. None of the participants sees patriotism as something negative, or as something that can affect professionalism in a bad way. On the contrary, most of them shared that patriotism influences Ukrainian journalism to be better.

If comparing the results of this study to Ginosar's (2015) main indicators of patriotic journalism, it could be stated that Ukrainian journalism can be identified through at least two of these indicators. The results could show that the governmental censorship is not mentioned as being present by any of the participants. This states that journalists do not need to follow the governmental framing of the crisis. However, together with the evidence of what is going on in Ukraine, the governmental framing and the journalistic narrative do coincide in most of the topics regarding the war. The second characteristic is that the journalists refrain from criticizing the government. Based on the results, only one participant said that her choice is not to criticize the governmental bodies because now is "not the time". However, all the journalists expressed that they do have the freedom to criticize the government and that they do it when it's necessary. Leaving us to Ginosar's (2015) point 3) journalists show solidarity with the community and 4) journalists overlook the perspective of the other side. The results strongly suggest that journalists do show solidarity with the community and overlook the

perspective of the other side. According to the participants' statements, this is explained as necessary because of the atrocities done by the Russian military and because this war is a matter of survival.

Earlier research (Budivska & Orlova, 2017), done before 2022, has divided Ukrainian journalists into "patriotic approach" journalists and journalists who adapt to journalistic standards. Their research has explained this by various approaches by different media professionals, where some see it as necessary to ban everything Russian and some see it as necessary to maintain a dialogue with Russian professionals. Looking at the results of this study, none of the journalists mentioned any communication with Russian journalists. Several journalists are highlighting the importance of not spreading any Russian narratives and are explaining this with the fact that such narratives can endanger Ukraine. All journalists share that there is a need for patriotism but emphasize the importance of maintaining fact-checking. But as mentioned before, this is not a generalizing study; thus, it cannot be said that it applies to most journalists in Ukraine.

Another aspect that is highly present in the results of the study is censorship. As governmental censorship was not experienced by any of the journalists, it will not be further discussed. Self-censorship was mentioned by several participants. Self-censorship can be distinguished into public and private. Journalists adopt public self-censorship and avoid certain stories due to fear of harassment or safety concerns, while private self-censorship is when journalists restrain their views and balance their desire to express themselves with what is acceptable (Fadnes et al., 2020, p. 4). Public self-censorship is seen in the results of the study as a safety concern for the country; thus, avoiding writing about things that in journalists' own view can potentially harm Ukraine. The private self-censorship can be seen in participants' discussions regarding the balance of their opinions versus the opinions of their interviewee. All participants discuss military censorship. Journalists see the need for military censorship due to protection. However, journalists do think that censorship should be clear and formalized so that the same rules apply to all journalists.

This study has not considered the media system presented by Hallin and Mancini, which includes factors such as ownership and journalistic autonomy. If these aspects were studied in connection to the interviewed journalists' working place, some other patterns could have been discovered. The broader research, including research on ownership and journalistic autonomy,

would also provide a bigger picture of how much media ownership and journalistic autonomy influence professionalism and patriotism in Ukraine.

Question 2: How do Ukrainian journalists combine patriotism and professionalism?

All the participants see the role of being a truth-seeker, witness and report the atrocities as an important part of their work. Tumber's research has stated that journalists are taking a moral stance to condemn atrocities rather than maintaining a strictly objective view when witnessing atrocities. The question is whether Ukrainian journalists see taking a moral stance as important, or if they try to obey to objectivity.

All the journalists recognized the importance of objectivity together with patriotism. Journalism without objectivity is considered poor-quality journalism. Although all journalists mention objectivity, only two participants explain how they maintain objectivity in the reality of their work, defining objectivity as "fact-checking". In other words, these journalists highlight that if a report is factually accurate, it is objective; thus, it is not needed to hear the "other side". One of the journalists does see a problem with objectivity in Ukrainian journalism, if objectivity is defined as "both sides should be heard". He emphasizes that it is not possible in today's reality, neither is it needed if the facts are correct. But even when trying to be as unbiased as possible and have verified the information, you cannot be sure that the results in your piece are not somehow manipulated. This is a concern not only for Ukraine, but even for a global arena.

From the results, it appears that the interviewed journalists see patriotism as ethically justified and not being in the way of professionalism. In the theoretical framework, two different types of patriotism have been defined, tribal patriotism and global patriotism. Briefly, tribal patriotism is when journalists abandon professionalism and neutrality, and in global patriotism journalists behave more ethically. As defined in Chapter 5.2, Ward divides patriotism into communal patriotism and political patriotism. Communal patriotism is focusing on personal ties to specific places and non-political aspects of life, while political patriotism presents loyalty to a country's political values such as the constitution, rule of law and state structure (Ward, 2010, p. 216). From that, a distinction between extreme patriotism and moderate patriotism is made. Extreme patriotism is distinguished by: 1) a belief in a

country's superiority, 2) prioritizing a country's interests with few restrictions, and 3) offering uncritical support for the country's actions (Ward, 2010, p. 223). Moderate patriotism is on the other hand connected to democratic values and is distinguished by: 1) affection for a country, 2) a desire for a country's prosperity, 3) concern for a country's well-being (not exclusive), 4) support for a country to pursue its national goals within moral limits, and 5) conditional, critical support for a country's actions.

From the criteria above, patriotism defined by the journalists can mostly be considered communal and moderate patriotism. Most of the participants talked about human values and the protection of Ukrainians, the protection of the Ukrainian language, and concern for Ukraine's survival. The goal of victory is to secure the survival of the Ukrainian state and Ukrainian identity. None of the participants expressed superiority over other nations or uncritical support for the country's actions. Several participants presented either criticism of some decisions made by governmental bodies or presented their freedom to do so if necessary. Although, all participants offered uncritical support for the Army. At the same time, all journalists prioritize the country's interests over anything else. This shows that, just as Ward mentions, it's difficult to find pure extreme or pure moderate patriotism. But looking at the results of the study, it seems as if the journalists do see the patriotism in journalism as moderate patriotism which is in place to inspire and document the events to show the world. Although there are some qualities of a tribal patriotism, such as abandoning neutrality, the participants' answers do lean more towards global patriotism. This is due to participants' answers on the need for a balance in the news and the need for being objective and critical in one's reports. The most common justification of patriotism is due to own security and for own survival.

The result indicates that Ukrainian journalists see patriotism as ethically defensible. Firstly, because Ukrainians fight to survive. One journalist said:

"I don't know, there is no balance between being a journalist and being Ukrainian. We talk about what is happening. For me, it's a purely black-and-white story, there are no halftones between Russia and Ukraine. There is an unmotivated aggression for a decade, aggression since February 2014. This unmotivated aggression, the occupation of parts of Donetsk and Luhansk regions, and the occupation of Crimea, turned two years ago into a full-scale invasion. This is pure evil; it is impossible to say, "let's see how it is from their perspective".

You don't have to look from the point of view of evil, you have to look from normal people's perspective." – P2

This quote describes how all the interviewed journalists feel about neutrality and the need to distance yourself from your identity to do a good job as a professional journalist. To summarize, journalists see objectivity as fact-checking and being critical to their sources in today's Ukraine. Journalists do not see censorship or patriotism as anything negative, but rather a necessity in journalism during war. All participants interpret censorship and patriotism as ethically defensible due to security and the importance of survival for the Ukrainian state, Ukrainians themselves, and the long history of the Ukrainian fight for sovereignty.

9. Conclusion

This study has shown how Ukrainian journalists interpret professionalism and patriotism. It has also shown how the interviewed journalists defend patriotism in Ukrainian journalism. This study contributes to further research on patriotism and the ethical aspects of it. To summarize, Ukrainian journalism has been exposed to many challenges, especially since 2013. Due to numerous regime changes before 2013, the Ukrainian media did not manage to organize a stable editorial policy that could have been applied to all media outlets before the Russian military intervention in 2014. With the Russian aggression, Ukrainian journalists had to adapt to new realities and challenges, having to put aside their "normal" working conditions. In 2022, the situation in Ukraine was further complicated with the full-scale invasion, making it impossible for the journalists to not be affected by the war on any level. Just like the whole society, journalists were forced to adopt the realities of war in their job, living and working under constant life threat. Given the results of this study, journalists see patriotism and censorship as necessary tools in their job for Ukrainians to survive.

Further research should be done to try to explain further why journalists do not see patriotism as something that interferes with their professionalism. One of the aspects can be the relationship with Russia in the informational arena. History has shown that Russian narratives have been strong when journalists abroad or even in Ukraine tried to explain what was going on in Crimea and eastern Ukraine (Kazdobina et al., 2024). The results indicated that Ukrainian journalists do not see any need to give the other side a voice in the media sphere. It

is clear that Ukrainian journalists fight for their survival and for the survival of the Ukrainian state. The constant threat of death and fear of losing your country contributes to the need of patriotism. This may partly explain why Ukrainian journalists today are so afraid of giving Russian narratives space in the informational arena.

The historical context is quite specific in Ukraine and may explain parts of Ukrainian patriotism. The long historical struggle for an independence could explain the relationship to patriotism in Ukrainian journalism. Given the long historical battle between Russia and Ukraine (Plokhy 2016; Snyder 2010), it would be fruitful to do a study on patriotism from a historical perspective to try to explain why Ukrainian journalists view patriotism as they do. The historical introduction of this study does show how Russia has been influencing the Ukrainian media sphere, but to really understand all the nuances, there is a need for a longer and deeper historical context.

Another interesting research to do is comparative research on the patriotic understanding of two countries that are in conflict. For example, how patriotism is perceived in Ukrainian versus in the Russian journalistic community to see which differences there are between a country being under attack and an attacking country. Given the ethical aspects of the patriotism, a study could be done to see if patriotism can be ethical defensible in any situation.

Although this study is not enough to draw many conclusions, it is a start for broader and more profound research on Ukrainian journalism during war. Patriotic journalism has had a significant role in shaping public morale and uniting the country. It is important to continue studying patriotism as it offers insight into the interplay between media, national identity, and geopolitics. It also helps understand why and how journalism shapes the narratives of a nation under threat and what influence it has on media ethics, freedom, and democracy. Given Ukraine's geopolitical significance, a study on patriotic journalism in Ukraine not only reflects the internal dynamics but also the international perceptions and policies. Analyzing Ukrainian media frames, given Ukraine's relations with the West and Russia, can provide a more profound understanding of the global information war and the role of media in shaping international narratives.

10. References

Allan, Stuart, Zelizer, Barbie, and Vlebooks. Reporting War Journalism in Wartime. London: Routledge, 2004. Print.

Bryman, Alan. *Social Research Methods*. Fifth. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016. Print.

Budivska, Halyna, and Dariya Orlova. "Between Professionalism and Activism: Ukrainian Journalism after the Euromaidan." *Kyiv-Mohyla law & politics journal*3.3 (2017): 137–156. Print.

Diuk, Nadia. "EUROMAIDAN: Ukraine's Self-Organizing Revolution." *World affairs (Washington)* 176.6 (2014): 9–16. Print.

Fadnes, Ingrid, Roy Krøvel, and Anna Grøndahl Larsen. "Introduction: Safety for Journalists and Self-Censorship." *Journalist Safety and Self-Censorship*. 1st ed. United Kingdom: Routledge, 2021. 1–12. Print.

Hanitzsch, Thomas. "Deconstructing Journalism Culture: Toward a Universal Theory." *Communication theory* 17.4 (2007): 367–385. Print.

Kazdobina, J., Hedenskog, J., & Umland, A. (2024). *Why the Donbas War Was Never "Civil" (No 6)*. Stockholm Centre for Eastern European Studies. https://www.ui.se/globalassets/ui.se-eng/publications/other-publications/why-the-donbas-war-was-never-civil-sceeus-report-no6-2024.pdf

Miles, Matthew B., Huberman, A. M, and Saldaña, Johnny. *Qualitative Data Analysis : A Methods Sourcebook*. Fourth. Los Angeles: SAGE, 2020. Print.

Nygren, Gunnar et al. "Journalism in the Crossfire: Media Coverage of the War in Ukraine in 2014." *Journalism studies (London, England)* 19.7 (2018): 1059–1078. Print.

Orlova, Dariya. "Ukrainian Media after the EuroMaidan: In Search of Independence and Professional Identity." *Publizistik* 61.4 (2016): 441–461. Print.

O. Matviychuk and O. Pavlichenko (eds.), *The Price of Freedom: Public Report by Human Rights Organisations on Crimes Against Humanity Committed During Euromaidan (November 2013–February 2014)*, International Renaissance Foundation, Kyiv, 2015. https://www.europarl.europa.eu/cmsdata/267948/Matviichuk_Ukrainian%20NGO's.EuroMaidan.November%202013-February2014.Eng..pdf

Plokhy, Serhii. *The Gates of Europe: A History of Ukraine*. London: Penguin Books, 2016. Print.

Plokhy, Serhii. "The Return of the Empire: The Ukraine Crisis in the Historical Perspective." *South Central Review* 35.1 (2018): 111–126. Print.

Snyder, Timothy. *Bloodlands: Europe between Hitler and Stalin*. New York: Basic Books, 2010. Print.

Springer, Nina et al. "Narrating "Their War" and "Our War": The Patriotic Journalism Paradigm in the Context of Swedish and Ukrainian Conflict Coverage." *Central European journal of communication* 15.31 (2022): 178–201. Print. https://doi.org/10.51480/1899-5101.15.2(31).1

Szeptycki, Andrzej. "Russian Policy towards Ukraine: Tools of Influence." *The Polish quarterly of international affairs* 16.1 (2007): 68–93. Print. https://www.ceeol.com/search/article-detail?id=152055

Tumber, H. (2019). Journalism in War and Conflict. In K. Wahl-Jorgensen & T. Hanitzsch (Eds.), *The Handbook of Journalism Studies* (2nd ed., pp. 372–386). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315167497-24

Voytyuk, O. (2023). Russian Disinformation and Propaganda Campaign Justifying the Annexing of Crimea in 2014. *Nowa Polityka Wschodnia, 37*(2), 125–145. https://doi.org/10.15804/npw20233706

Waisbord, Silvio R., and Vlebooks. *Reinventing Professionalism Journalism and News in*

Global Perspective. Cambridge: Polity, 2013.

Ward, Stephen J. A., and ProQuest. *Global Journalism Ethics*. Montreal; Ithaca [N.Y.]: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2010. Print.

Ward, S. J. A. (2019). Ethics and journalism ethics. In Wahl-Jorgensen, Karin, Hanitzsch, Thomas, editor, and ProQuest. *The Handbook of Journalism Studies*. Second. New York, New York; London: Routledge, 2020. Print. International Communication Association (ICA) Handbook Series.

Zelizer, Barbie., Allan, Stuart, and ProQuest. *Journalism after September 11*. 2nd ed. London; New York: Routledge, 2011. Print. Communication and Society. https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.till.biblextern.sh.se/lib/sodertorn/detail.action?docID=684083

Appendix 1 - List of participants

1. P1, Anton, man, works for national media (television, digital platforms, streaming platforms), based in central Ukraine, interviewed 2024-03-25.
2. P2, Alexander, man, works for national media (television and digital platforms), based in central Ukraine, interviewed 2024-03-25.
3. P3, Eva, woman, works at a local newspaper (print and digital platforms), based in eastern Ukraine, interviewed 2024-03-26.
4. P4, Yulia, woman, works at a national magazine, based in central Ukraine, interviewed 2024-03-28.
5. P5, Slava, man, works for national, local and international media, based in eastern Ukraine, interviewed 2024-03-29.
6. P6, Lesia, woman, works at a local newspaper (print and digital platforms), based in central Ukraine, interviewed 2024-04-03.

Appendix 2 - Interview guide

1. Can you describe where you work and which kind of reports you usually work with?
2. Journalistic professionalism, which kind of key values do you think define a professional journalist?

3. Can you define your understanding of the concept of “patriotic journalism”?
4. Does patriotic journalism influence your way of reporting? Especially in the war context? If yes, how?
5. What role do you think journalists have in promoting patriotic sentiments? What role do you think they should have?
6. How do you balance patriotism with the need for objectivity and impartial reporting? Do you think that objectivity and impartial reporting are possible during war times?
7. What are the main challenges you encounter when reporting on war or war-related topics, especially in terms of maintaining objectivity and ensuring that diverse perspectives are represented?
8. Have you faced any pressure from government entities, military officials, or societal influences to shape your reporting in a particular manner? (For example, to never criticize the army or politicians?) -> How do you navigate such pressures to maintain journalistic integrity and freedom?
9. How do you handle the balance between your identity as a Ukrainian and your duties as a journalist, particularly when reporting on sensitive topics like the ongoing war?

List of tables

Table 1

Themes	Deductive code	Code definition
Professionalism	Education	Used to identify professionalism
	Reliability	Used to identify professionalism
	Truthfulness	Used to identify professionalism
	Objectivity	Used to identify professionalism
	Responsibilty	Used to identify professionalism
		One of criterias to professionalism
Patriotism	Governmental censorship	Common in patriotic journalism and time of crisis.
	Military censorship	Often refered to as needed in war but puts pressure on professionalism.
	Self-censorship	Not applied by a third part, distinctive in patriotic journalism.
	Neutrality/objectivity/balance	Neutrality tends to not be prioritized in patriotic journalism thus needed to look at.
	Security/survival	Is relevant in wartime. Can be seen as nessesity and reason for patriotism.

Table 2

Themes	Deductive code	In Vivo - coding
Professionalism	Education	
	Reliability	
	Truthfulness	
	Objectivity	
	Responsibilty	
		Public interests
		Ethics
		Deep knowledge
		Openness
		Confidentiality
		High quality text
		Listener
Patriotism	Governmental censorship	
	Military censorship	
	Self-censorship	
	Neutrality/objectivity/balance	
	Security/survival	
		Inspiration (societal demand)/heroes
		Victory
		Nationalism
		Promotion
		Identity - Ukrainian