

1

Why Ethics Matters in Journalism

Our society needs news professionals who do the right thing

Learning Goals

This chapter will help you understand:

- the importance of ethics in a journalist's everyday work;
- two reasons that journalists should be ethical – one moral, one practical;
- why journalists should adhere voluntarily to high standards of conduct;
- how the journalism profession has matured in recent decades;
- that the purpose of this book, and your college course, is to help you make ethically sound decisions;
- that discussing the case studies in class is crucial to learning the decision-making process;
- that the historical ethics standards of the journalism profession apply across all media platforms; and
- that ethical journalism and vigorous journalism are compatible.

Lovelle Svart, a 62-year-old woman with short, sandy hair, faced the video camera and calmly talked about dying. “This is my medication,” she said, holding an orange bottle of clear liquid. “Everyone has told me ... I look better than I did ten years ago, but inside, I hurt like nobody's business.” On that afternoon of September 28, 2007, after she had danced the polka one last time and said her goodbyes to family and close friends, the contents of the orange bottle quietly killed her.¹

Svart's death came three months after her doctor informed her she would die of lung cancer within six months. The former research librarian disclosed the grim

Figure 1.1

Lovelle Svart faces the camera during one of her “Living to the End” video diaries on *The Oregonian’s* website

PHOTO BY ROB FINCH.

REPRINTED BY PERMISSION OF THE OREGONIAN



prognosis to a reporter friend at *The Oregonian* in Portland, the newspaper where she had worked. She said she had decided to avail herself of Oregon’s assisted-suicide law. Svart also said she wanted to talk to people frankly about death and dying, hoping she could help them come to grips with the subject themselves. Out of that conversation grew an

extraordinary mutual decision: On its website and in print, *The Oregonian* would chronicle Lovelle Svart’s final months on earth.

In her series of tasteful “video diaries” (see Figure 1.1), she talked about living with a fatal disease and about her dwindling reservoir of time. In response, hundreds of people messaged her on the website, addressing her as if they were old friends.

But before Svart taped her diaries, journalists at *The Oregonian* talked earnestly about what they were considering. Most of all, they asked themselves questions about ethics.

The threshold question was whether their actions might influence what Svart did. Would she feel free to change her mind? After all the attention, would she feel obligated to go ahead and take the lethal dose? On this topic, they were comforted by their relationship to this story subject. Familiarity was reassuring, although in the abstract they would prefer to be reporting on someone who had never been involved with the paper. In 20 years of working with her, they knew Svart was strong-willed; nobody would tell her what to do. Even so, the journalists constantly reminded her that whatever she decided would be fine with them. Michael Arrieta-Walden, a project leader, personally sat down with her and made that clear. The story would be about death and dying, not about Svart’s assisted suicide.

Would the video diaries make a statement in favor of the controversial state law? No, they decided. The debate was over; the law had been enacted and it had passed court tests. Irrespective of how they and members of the audience felt about assisted suicide, they would just be showing how the law actually worked – a journalistic purpose. They posted links to stories that they had done earlier reflecting different points of view about the law itself. Other links guided readers to organizations that supported people in time of grief.

In debates among themselves and in teleconferences with an ethicist, they raised countless other questions and tried to arrive at answers that met the test of their collective conscience. For example, a question that caused much soul-searching was what to do if Svart collapsed while they were alone with her. It was a fact that she had posted “do not resuscitate” signs in her bedroom and always carried a document stating her wishes. Still, this possibility made them very uncomfortable – they were journalists, not doctors. Finally they resolved that if they were alone with her in her bedroom and she lost consciousness, they would pull the emergency cord and let medical personnel handle the situation. As Svart’s health

declined, they made another decision: They would not go alone with her outside the assisted-living center where she lived. From then on, if they accompanied her outside, there would also be another person along, someone who clearly had the duty of looking out for Svart's interests.²

The self-questioning in the *Oregonian* newsroom illustrates ethics awareness in contemporary journalism. "Twenty years ago, an ethical question might come up when someone walked into the editor's office at the last minute," said Sandra Rowe, editor of *The Oregonian*. "We've gone through a culture change. Now an ethical question comes up once or twice a week at our daily news meeting, where everyone can join the discussion. We are confident we can reach a sound decision if everyone has a say."³

Although lapses surely occur – and this book will detail numerous examples, as well as some disturbing trends – journalism has matured ethically in recent decades. Most journalists see theirs as a noble profession serving the public interest. They *want* to behave ethically.

Two Powerful Incentives for Ethical Behavior

Why should journalists practice sound ethics? If you ask that question in a crowd of journalists, you would probably get as many answers as there are people in the room. But while the answers may vary, their essence can be distilled into two broad categories. One, logically enough, is moral; the other could be called practical.

- *The moral incentive:* Journalists should be ethical because they, like most other human beings, want to see themselves as decent and honest. It is natural to crave self-esteem, not to mention the respect of others. There is a psychic reward in knowing that you have tried to do the right thing. As much as they like getting a good story, journalists don't want to be known for having exploited someone in the process.
- *The practical incentive:* In the long term, ethical journalism promotes the news organization's credibility and thus its acceptance by the public. This translates into commercial success. What journalists have to sell is the news – and if the public does not believe their reporting, they have nothing to sell. Consumers of the news are more likely to believe journalists' reporting if they see the journalists as ethical in the way they treat the public and the subjects of news coverage. Just as a wise consumer would choose a product with a trusted brand name over a no-name alternative when seeking quality, journalists hope that consumers will choose their news organization because it behaves responsibly. Thus ethical journalism can also be a profitable journalism that provides a livelihood for the journalists and their families, along with a financial return

for the investors in the newspaper, broadcast station, or online news organization.

The Case for Voluntary Ethics Standards

There are also practical arguments for ethical behavior that flow from journalism's special role in American life.

The First Amendment guarantee of a free press means that unlike other professionals, such as those in medicine and the law, journalists are not regulated by the state and are not subject to an enforceable ethics code. And that is a good thing, of course. The First Amendment insulates journalists from retribution from office holders who want to control the flow of information to the public and who often resent the way they are covered in the media. If a state board licensed journalists, it is a safe bet that some members of the board would abuse their power to rid themselves of journalists who offend them. The public would be the loser if journalists could be expelled from the profession by adversaries in government.

But there is a downside to press freedom: Anybody, no matter how unqualified or unscrupulous, can become a journalist. It is a tolerable downside, given the immense benefit of an independent news media, but bad journalists taint the reputation of everyone in the profession. Because they are not subject to an enforceable code, honest journalists have an individual obligation to be responsible and to adhere voluntarily to high standards of professional conduct. Ethical journalists do not use the Constitution's protection to be socially destructive.

Yet another argument for sound ethics is the dual nature of a news organization. Journalism serves the public by providing reliable information that people need to make governing decisions about their community, state and nation. This is a news organization's *quasi-civic* function. But the news organization has another responsibility, too – and that is to make a profit. Like any other business, the newspaper, broadcast station, or online news site must survive in the marketplace.

The seeming conflict of those two functions – serving the public, yet making money – is often regarded cynically by the public. Decisions about news coverage tend to be portrayed by critics as calculated to sell newspapers or raise broadcast ratings rather than to give the citizens the information they need. The truth is that good journalism is expensive, and the best news organizations invest significant sums in deeply reported projects that could never be justified in an accountant's profit-and-loss ledger. If there is a pragmatic return in such projects, it is in the hope that they build the organization's reputation as a source of reliable information.

Journalists cannot expect their work to be universally acclaimed. But they have an obligation to themselves and their colleagues to never deliberately conduct themselves in a way that would justify the criticism. They have an obligation to practice sound ethics.

A Half-Century of Rising Professionalism

Journalism in the mid-twentieth century had its tawdry aspects. Accepting gifts from newsmakers was condoned; at Christmas, it was typical to see cases of liquor being carted into the newsroom. A reporter might earn money on the side by writing news releases and speeches for a politician he covered. Or, if he needed to buy a car, the automobile manufacturer would be pleased to provide a discount. Journalists would brush aside questions about these practices by insisting that they could still be objective – and, besides, it was just compensation because newsroom salaries were so low.

For reasons that are explored in Chapter 3, journalism matured in the second half of the century. The following are some examples of that trend.

Ethics standards have been articulated in comprehensive codes

Not only professional organizations of journalists, but individual newspapers, broadcast stations and online news sites typically have comprehensive ethics codes. Professional organizations' codes date to the first half of the twentieth century. The American Society of Newspaper Editors (ASNE) established its Canons of Journalism, outlining commonly accepted ethical principles, in 1923. However, it was not until the late 1970s that the practice of adopting ethics codes by individual newspapers became common. There is a distinct difference in the effect of these two different kinds of ethics codes. Although the codes of professional organizations like ASNE fulfill an important purpose of establishing profession-wide standards, they are voluntary and without enforcement provisions. But when a newsroom adopts a code, violations can be enforced by suspension or dismissal of the violators. Of course, codes are valuable only to the extent that they are practiced, and newsroom leaders have a responsibility both to enforce their codes and to set the example of propriety.

Journalists new to the profession may be surprised to find that the rank-and-file reporters, editors, and photojournalists often are more effective than their bosses in enforcing the code. John Carroll, former editor of the *Los Angeles Times*, says that among journalists “certain beliefs are very deeply held,” and that the core of these beliefs is a newspaper’s duty to the reader. “Those who transgress against the reader will pay dearly,” Carroll says, adding that this intensity usually is masked by a laid-back newsroom demeanor. “There’s informality and humor, but beneath the surface lies something deadly serious. It is a code. Sometimes the code is not even written down, but it is deeply believed in. And, when violated, it is enforced with tribal ferocity.”⁴ See John Carroll’s Point of View “A ‘Tribal Ferocity’ Enforces the Code” for more of his thoughts on the subject.

Today's journalists are better educated

A journalist without a college degree is a rarity in newsrooms today. Although possessing a diploma does not automatically make someone a better journalist, the rising education level signifies better preparation for the challenges of a complex profession. Journalism schools have become more professional in their curricula and in the qualifications of their instructors. Specifically, more journalism schools either are offering free-standing courses in applied ethics, or they are integrating this discipline into skills courses like news reporting and news editing. The best schools do both.

Newsrooms are more diverse

Just as important, the diversity in the composition of news staffs is reflected in news coverage that is more likely to examine the whole community. The journalists of the mid-twentieth century, nearly all white men, tended to write for people like themselves. The profession has been profoundly changed by the influx of women and people of color into the workforce in the second half of the century. This is a work in progress, but in that period editors and news directors moved from a policy of exclusion to one in which they universally recognized the need to diversify.

Journalists and the companies they work for are more accountable to the public

They recognize that, like any other business, they owe a social responsibility (that is, a responsibility to society, to make the community better). A news organization's social responsibility is to provide honest, impartial, reliable information about current events that their fellow citizens need to make their democratic institutions work. This responsibility also entails being responsive to questions and complaints from the audience – the readers, viewers, listeners, and online users. In years past, journalists were reluctant to correct their mistakes because they reasoned that this would lower credibility by confirming that they were fallible. Today, the opposite view prevails; journalists realize that mistakes are going to happen and that the public is served if mistakes are speedily acknowledged and the record set straight. In another change of mind, journalists are more likely today to explain their controversial decisions rather than arrogantly asserting that their decisions speak for themselves. The Internet makes accountability more important than ever, for two reasons: first, citizen bloggers form an army of fact-checkers calling attention to

journalists' mistakes, and second, the web's interactivity fosters a conversation between journalists and their audience.

Today's journalists are more compassionate

Where many journalists of the mid-century liked to project an image of toughness toward the people they covered, today's journalists generally show empathy. To use a common expression, they acknowledge that they are in the chip-falling business as well as the wood-cutting business. They are concerned not just with reporting the news but also with how their reporting will affect the people involved. The columnist and author Anna Quindlen has written that journalists' most important obligation might well be owed to the subjects of their stories. She wonders if journalism schools "should teach not just accuracy, but empathy" by training journalists to imagine themselves in the place of the people they write about.⁵ In fact, "minimizing harm" is one of the four cornerstone principles of the Society of Professional Journalists' code of ethics and is, as well, a key component of a course in journalism ethics.

There is more "watchdog" journalism

Journalists, especially through investigative reporting, have increasingly functioned as what a scholarly book has called "Custodians of Conscience."⁶ They have used their platform to expose wrongdoing and to illuminate solutions to public ills. When the government's democratic system of checks and balances breaks down, journalists have stepped in to investigate and report to the public on the system failure. In February 2007, for example, reporters Dana Priest and Anne Hull of *The Washington Post* reported neglect by Walter Reed Army Medical Center in caring for outpatients – soldiers and Marines who had been physically and psychologically damaged in the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. Congress and the White House immediately responded by promising sweeping reforms and by firing the officials who they thought should have prevented the failure. Although officials and the citizens do not always respond so forcefully when the news media alert them to dysfunction, that does not deter responsible journalists from continuing to try to raise the public conscience.

However, in spite of the exponential improvement in journalism's standards, there continue to be lapses. In times of intense competition, journalists too often discard their ethical principles. And mainstream news media – newspapers, broadcast networks and stations, and their online news sites – have sometimes succumbed to the pressure to match the sensational disclosures of media with lower standards of factual accuracy, such as citizen blogs, talk shows, and supermarket tabloids. There is a danger that in the competitive 24/7 news arena, the lowest common denominator may prevail.

The Goal: Make Ethically Sound Decisions

In this text and in the ethics course you are studying, you will continue your preparation for a journalism career by examining how good journalists make professional decisions. The text will identify and discuss the principles of applied ethics that are a foundation for sound decision-making. As the course progresses, you will practice your decision-making skill in case studies. The goal is to encourage you to think critically and in concrete terms about the situation confronting you – to employ logic rather than responding reflexively.

You should know that there are capable, intelligent journalists who reject the idea that journalism ethics can be taught in a college course. They argue that journalists, and journalism students, are either honorable or they are not. If they are honorable, this hypothesis continues, they will automatically make the right decision and so do not need this course. If they are not honorable, no college course is going to straighten them out. As an esteemed editor remarked to a college audience, “If your mom didn’t teach you right from wrong, your college teacher is not going to be able to.”

Although there is truth to that statement, it misses the point. The author of this textbook assumes that you *did* learn honesty and propriety in your early life. In fact, this course is intended to build on your own sense of right and wrong and to show how to apply that sense to solving ethical problems in the profession.

Journalism prizes essentially the same values as the rest of society – values like honesty and compassion – but sometimes journalists have conflicts in values that their fellow citizens do not. For example, your mom would instruct you to *always* intervene to help someone in need. However, journalists might have to weigh intervention to help one person against their duty to inform the public about thousands of other people in the same sort of adversity. If they intervene, they destroy the story’s authenticity. And they fail to inform the public.

Another flaw in the critics’ argument is the presumption that honorable journalists will reflexively do the right thing. Your mom may not have taught you a decision-making procedure. As you will discover, “the right thing” is not always obvious. You will see that sound decision-making goes beyond instinct and carefully considers – in a process called critical thinking – the pros and cons of various courses of action.

Honing Decision Skills Through Case Studies

The case-study method gives you a chance to work through difficult decisions in the classroom without consequences and without deadline pressure. The experience will prepare you for making on-the-spot ethical decisions in the real world. Each of the case studies selected for class discussion is intended to teach an important nuance about news media ethics.

In addition to explaining the principles of journalism ethics and teaching a decision-making process, this course in journalism ethics gives you two valuable opportunities:

- 1 You can study the thinking of academics and experienced practitioners on recurring problems that journalists face. While you should always do your own critical thinking, you don't have to start with a blank slate. You can draw on the trial-and-error efforts of people who have gone before you in the profession. Their experiences can help you think clearly about the issues.
- 2 You can practice your decision-making technique in a classroom setting where no one is hurt if a decision proves to be flawed. Just as a musician, an actor, or an athlete improves through practice, you benefit by thinking through the courses of action you might take in the case studies. You should emerge from the course with a deeper understanding of the challenges of the profession and infinitely more confidence about your own decision-making.

An applied-ethics course prepares you for a career in which you will be dealing with people who want to influence the way you report the news. Because journalists work for the public, it would be a betrayal of the public's trust to allow themselves to be diverted from the truth. Bob Steele of the Poynter Institute describes the manipulators:

You will be stonewalled by powerful people who will deter you from getting to the truth. You will be manipulated by savvy sources who do their best to unduly influence your stories. You will be used by those with ulterior motives who demand the cover of confidentiality in exchange for their information. You will be swayed by seemingly well-intentioned people who want to show you some favor in hopes that you, in return, will show them favoritism in the way you tell their story.⁷

Ethics and the Internet

The ethics standards discussed in this text apply no matter how the news is delivered. If a journalist fails to seek truth, or exploits the news subject, or is swayed by a conflict of interest, that breach of ethics deprives the citizen of an honest news account. It is irrelevant whether the breach occurred in print, in broadcast, or on a website.

The news industry is in a tumultuous period of transition as audiences sort out where they want to go for news. Eight out of ten Americans get the news every day, but the sources of that news are changing, the Pew Center for the People & the Press reported in 2008. A Pew Center survey showed that on a typical day, 57 percent of those seeking news watched television, 35 percent listened on the radio,

34 percent read newspapers, and 29 percent went online (the percentages exceed 100 because many people use more than one source of news). According to Pew, television news is remaining stable (although cable has surpassed the broadcast networks); radio and newspapers are declining rapidly; and the Internet is gaining rapidly. Among adults 35 years of age and younger who check the news daily, more than half turn to the Internet. Younger adults also dominate the audience of the cable shows that parody the news – *The Colbert Report* with Stephen Colbert and *The Daily Show* with Jon Stewart.⁸

The survey results underscore the likelihood that online journalism, which burst on the scene in the 1990s, will be the news medium of the future. The web matches radio and television’s speed; it can far exceed newspapers’ depth of content; and it adds the unique dimension of an instantaneous conversation with the audience.

With its convergence of prose, video, still images, and audio, the web offers exciting opportunities. It also presents significant ethical challenges. The standards of online journalism are being forged right now, in the web’s adolescence, sometimes without the players’ recognizing that they are creating a template for the future of the profession. Compromises are being made:

- Tempted by the new medium’s emphasis on speed, some online sites skimp on verification in order to be first to report a news development.
- Seduced by the ease with which news accounts can be corrected on the web, some online sites post the news first and correct it later.
- Struggling with restrictive financial budgets, some online sites skip editing on web logs (“blogs”) created by their staff members, and even when they are edited, some blogs do not adhere to established principles of the profession.

In 1999, Michael Oreskes, who later became Associated Press senior managing editor, observed that “pressures are great at times of change, and so it follows that times of change are when standards matter most.”⁹ Having a website, Oreskes wrote, “doesn’t change a simple editing rule: You shouldn’t run something before you know it’s true.”¹⁰

Getting the Story – Honorably

A cautionary note is in order here. You should be wary of viewing this course or a companion course in media law as a brake on aggressive journalism. Being aggressive and being ethical are not mutually exclusive. Keep in mind that your job is to inform your audience, and that means being a good, resourceful reporter who gets the story into the paper, on the air, or on the web.

	RED LIGHT ETHICS:	GREEN LIGHT ETHICS:	
	Focuses on journalists' misbehavior	Focuses on journalistic opportunities	
	Prescribes what journalists "ought not" to do	Considers "how to" rather than "ought not"	
	Emphasizes caution and restraint	Emphasizes journalism's power and duties	
	Keeps things out of print and off the air	Uses ingenuity and craft to get things in the paper and on the air	
	Sees journalists as too aggressive	Sees journalists as too timid	

Source: Roy Peter Clark, "Red Light, Green Light: A Plea for Balance in Media Ethics," *poynteronline*, May 17, 2005.

Figure 1.2 Two approaches to journalism ethics
GRAPHIC COURTESY OF BILL MARSH

Given the real-life problems you will study in this course, it may be easy to conclude that the ethical choice is simple: Decide *against* publishing, broadcasting, or posting any news story that is the least bit questionable. But such a choice would itself be unethical. It would signify a failure to fulfill the journalist's mission of informing the public.

Roy Peter Clark of the Poynter Institute argues eloquently for balance in media ethics. He asserts that Red Light Ethics – instructing journalists about what they must *not* do – is “an absolutely necessary but destructively insufficient method for achieving responsible journalism.”

What is needed, Clark writes in an essay for *poynteronline*, is Green Light Ethics to help journalists report honorably, even in delicate situations. “Red Light says: Let’s back off. Green Light says: Let’s pin it down.” Clark’s distinctions between the two approaches are depicted in Figure 1.2.

Clark writes: “These distinctions go beyond semantics although we should not underestimate the effect on students and professionals when we shift from Red Light imperatives to Green Light ones, from negative words to positive ones. Red Light language says: Don’t invade privacy; don’t sensationalize; don’t exploit; don’t lie; don’t re-victimize. Green Light language says: Tell the truth; inform the public; reveal social ills; preserve human dignity; be brave.”¹¹

You can get the story and still be a decent human being.



Point of View

A “Tribal Ferocity” Enforces the Code

John Carroll

One reason I was drawn to my chosen career is its informality, in contrast to the real professions. Unlike doctors, lawyers or even jockeys, journalists have no entrance exams, no licenses, no governing board to pass solemn judgment when they transgress. Indeed, it is the constitutional right of every citizen, no matter how ignorant or how deprived, to be a journalist. This wild liberty, this official laxity, is one of journalism’s appeals.

I was always taken, too, by the kinds of people who practiced journalism. My father, Wallace Carroll, was editor and publisher of a regional newspaper, in Winston-Salem, North Carolina. The people he worked with seemed more vital and engaged than your normal run of adults. They talked animatedly about things they were learning – things that were important, things that were absurd. They told hilarious jokes. I understood little about the work they did, except that it entailed typing, but I felt I’d like to hang around with such people when I grew up. Much later, after I’d been a journalist for years, I became aware of an utterance by Walter Lippmann that captured something I especially liked about life in the newsroom. “Journalism,” he declared, “is the last refuge of the vaguely talented.”

Here is something else I’ve come to realize: The looseness of the journalistic life, the seeming laxity of the newsroom, is an illusion. Yes, there’s informality and humor, but

beneath the surface lies something deadly serious. It is a code. Sometimes the code is not even written down, but it is deeply believed in. And, when violated, it is enforced with tribal ferocity.

Consider, for example, the recent events at *The New York Times*.

Before it was discovered that the young reporter Jayson Blair had fabricated several dozen stories, the news staff of *The Times* was already unhappy. Many members felt aggrieved at what they considered a high-handed style of editing. I know this because some were applying to me for jobs at the *Los Angeles Times*. But until Jayson Blair came along, the rumble of discontent remained just that, a low rumble.

When the staff learned that the paper had repeatedly misled its readers, the rumble became something more formidable: an insurrection. The aggrieved party was no longer merely the staff. It was the reader, and that meant the difference between a misdemeanor and a felony. Because the reader had been betrayed, the discontent acquired a moral force so great that it could only be answered by the dismissal of the ranking editors. The Blair scandal was a terrible event, but it also said something very positive about *The Times*, for it demonstrated beyond question the staff’s commitment to the reader.

Several years ago, at the *Los Angeles Times*, we too had an insurrection. To outsiders the

Continued

issue seemed arcane, but to the staff it was starkly obvious. The paper had published a fat edition of its Sunday magazine devoted to the opening of the city's new sports and entertainment arena, called the Staples Center. Unknown to its readers – and to the newsroom staff – the paper had formed a secret partnership with Staples. The agreement was as follows: The newspaper would publish a special edition of the Sunday magazine; the developer would help the newspaper sell ads in it; and the two would split the proceeds. Thus was the independence of the newspaper compromised – and the reader betrayed.

I was not working at the newspaper at the time, but I've heard many accounts of a con-

frontation in the cafeteria between the staff and the publisher. It was not a civil discussion among respectful colleagues. Several people who told me about it invoked the image of a lynch mob. The Staples episode, too, led to the departure of the newspaper's top brass.

What does all this say about newspaper ethics? It says that certain beliefs are very deeply held. It says that a newspaper's duty to the reader is at the core of those beliefs. And it says that those who transgress against the reader will pay dearly.

Excerpted from the Ruhl Lecture on Ethics delivered at the University of Oregon, May 6, 2004. John Carroll was then the editor of the *Los Angeles Times*.

Notes

- 1 Svart video diary at <http://next.oregonianextra.com/lovelle/>, Sept. 28, 2007.
- 2 Author's telephone interviews with Michael Arrieta-Walden, Nov. 15, 2007, and Dec. 7, 2007.
- 3 Author's telephone interview with Sandra Rowe, Sept. 21, 2007.
- 4 John Carroll: Ruhl Lecture on ethics at the University of Oregon, May 6, 2004.
- 5 Anna Quindlen: "The great obligation," column in *Newsweek*, April 19, 2004.
- 6 James S. Ettema and Theodore L. Glasser, *Custodians of Conscience: Investigative Journalism and Public Virtue* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1998).
- 7 Bob Steele, "Why ethics matters," http://www.poynter.org/content/content_view.asp?id=9512, Aug. 9, 2002.
- 8 Pew Center for the People & the Press, "Key news audiences now blend online and traditional sources," <http://people-press.org/report/444/news-media>, Aug. 17, 2008. The study was based on telephone interviews between April 30 and June 1, 2008, among a nationwide sample of 3,615 adults. Interviews were conducted by both landline and cell phones. The margin of error is plus or minus 2 percentage points.
- 9 Michael Oreskes, "Navigating a minefield," *American Journalism Review*, November 1999, 23.
- 10 Ibid.
- 11 Roy Peter Clark, "Red light, green light: a plea for balance in media ethics," http://www.poynter.org/content/content_view.asp?id=82553, May 17, 2005.