

Singapore Management University

Institutional Knowledge at Singapore Management University

Research Collection College of Integrative
Studies

College of Integrative Studies

1-2014

Changing views on media ethics and societal functions among students in Singapore

Benjamin Hill DETENBER

Sonny ROSENTHAL

Singapore Management University, srosenthal@smu.edu.sg

Follow this and additional works at: https://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/cis_research



Part of the [Asian Studies Commons](#), [Communication Technology and New Media Commons](#), and the [Instructional Media Design Commons](#)

Citation

DETENBER, Benjamin Hill and ROSENTHAL, Sonny. Changing views on media ethics and societal functions among students in Singapore. (2014). *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*. 29, (2), 108-125.
Available at: https://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/cis_research/185

This Journal Article is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Integrative Studies at Institutional Knowledge at Singapore Management University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Research Collection College of Integrative Studies by an authorized administrator of Institutional Knowledge at Singapore Management University. For more information, please email cherylds@smu.edu.sg.



Changing Views on Media Ethics and Societal Functions among Students in Singapore

Benjamin Hill Detenber & Sonny Rosenthal

To cite this article: Benjamin Hill Detenber & Sonny Rosenthal (2014) Changing Views on Media Ethics and Societal Functions among Students in Singapore, *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, 29:2, 108-125, DOI: [10.1080/08900523.2014.893776](https://doi.org/10.1080/08900523.2014.893776)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/08900523.2014.893776>



Published online: 17 Apr 2014.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 429



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Citing articles: 2 View citing articles [↗](#)

Changing Views on Media Ethics and Societal Functions among Students in Singapore

Benjamin Hill Detenber and Sonny Rosenthal
Wee Kim Wee School of Communication and Information
Nanyang Technological University

This panel study assessed changes in ethical ideology and beliefs about the societal function of media over the course of undergraduate communication education in Singapore. First, students' agreement with the ethical principles of truth telling, independence, and accountability increased. Second, change in agreement with the ethical principle of minimizing harm was negatively related to change in justification of contentious newsgathering methods. Third, belief that the media should function as a watchdog increased and that it should serve national development decreased. Change in these variables was inversely correlated. We relate these findings to global contexts and make recommendations for curriculum development.

Journalists sometimes face the ethical dilemma of choosing between “doing their job” and “doing what’s right” (e.g., Kay, Reilly, Amend, & Kyle, 2011; McAdams, 1986; Paterno, 1998). Of course, this dichotomy occludes the subjective nature of ethical behavior: Journalists who face such a dilemma may lack a clear point of reference for making an ethical choice along a continuum of relatively good or bad options. There are countless case studies of ethical dilemmas in journalism that can help inform journalists' approaches to news reporting (e.g., Shedden, 2011). Such studies are at the core of media ethics curricula in journalism and public relations training programs, and communication scholars have pushed for the expansion of such curricula (Hunt & Tirpok, 1993; Lambeth, Christians, & Cole, 1994; Navas, 2009). Perhaps one of the more valuable skills that young communication practitioners can learn is being able to make sound, ethical decisions given multiple competing interests and contextual factors. Recent research efforts have examined the influence of education, work experience, and culture on journalism students' sense of ethics (Ball, Hanna, & Sanders, 2006; Sanders,

Manuscript submitted July 23, 2013; revision accepted January 21, 2014.

Correspondence should be sent to Sonny Rosenthal, Assistant Professor, Wee Kim Wee School of Communication and Information, Nanyang Technological University, 31 Nanyang Link #04-39, Singapore 637718. E-mail: sonny.rosenthal@ntu.edu.sg

Hanna, Berganza, & Aranda, 2008). Most of these studies have examined communication education in Western societies; however, communication practitioners can play an important role in whatever society they operate. Notably, while droves of readers are abandoning printed news in Europe and North America, readership of Asian newspapers grew 15% between 2006 and 2010 (WAN-IFRA, 2011).

The present study continues an ongoing research project in Singapore that examines the impact of undergraduate studies on communication students' sense of ethics. A recent trend analysis summarized the findings as of August 2011, with responses from more than 800 first- and final-year communication students over a period of five years (Detenber, Cenite, Malik, & Neo, 2012). Results showed differences between the two groups of students on several ethics-related variables. Methodological advancements in the study design now allow for individual changes to be assessed (as opposed to cohort trends). The current panel study tracks 166 students from initiation to completion of their undergraduate studies of communication. We analyze new data from April 2012 in order to replicate and extend portions of the trend analysis. The small sample size limits our ability to generalize to other communication students. Thus, the current analyses are largely exploratory.

In the present study, we replicate analyses of students' agreement with four ethical principles in the Society of Professional Journalists' (SPJ) Code of Ethics: seek truth and report it, minimize harm, act independently, and be accountable. We also replicate an analysis of students' tendency over time to justify contentious modes of newsgathering. Finally, we examine students' perceptions of the role of media as a government watchdog, as a partner in national development, and as a commercial entity. Detenber et al. (2012) did not include these three constructs in their analyses.

The main advantage of the panel study over the trend study is that we can evaluate change within individuals over time, thereby providing a more rigorous assessment of the influence of work experience and education. We are also able to correlate the within-person change in one variable with the change in another variable to examine how the development of one ethical principle or concept is positively or negatively related to the development of another principle or concept. In an ideal learning environment, multiple learning outcomes are concomitant, and there is value in studying the nature of their interdependence.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Singapore provides a unique context to study journalism education. Scholars have described the city-state as an "illiberal democracy," in which the media play a limited and often supportive role in reporting on government activity (Chua, 2002; Mutalib, 2000; Thompson, 2004). Other scholars have described the Singapore media as employing a "development model," in which the media emphasize national development in their coverage of news and exercise less independence than do Western media (Cenite, Yee, Juan, Qin, & Lin, 2008). Furthermore, the Singapore government actively promotes a singular political ideology—an agenda that the media may facilitate. Chang (1999) analyzed Singapore news media coverage of public opinion polls. The results portray the news media as a publicly trusted source of information and an advocate of government initiatives. Ultimately, "a self-fulfilling proph-

esy through manufacturing consent in the news, forced consensus in opinion formation, and uncontested policy debates is likely to breed government complacency [and weaken] the foundation and process for any public policy discussion to emerge openly” (p. 26). Nonetheless, journalism education and journalism workplaces in Singapore have many professional standards and characteristics in common with their Western counterparts (Hao, George, & Shi, 2011).

The site of the current study is a communication program at a large public university in Singapore. Members of the school’s faculty received their training in Western education systems and have built a curriculum similar to those found in Western schools of communication. The curriculum includes specific coursework on media and culture; critical research methods; and, as a core requirement, media law, ethics, and policy. These topics receive some additional attention in several other courses, and students graduate with a well-rounded and comprehensive communication education. By its design, the program should instill in its students a deeper understanding of media ethics and the role of media in society (George, 2009). The current study tests this assertion.

Ethical Principles in Journalism

The SPJ Code of Ethics gives four directives: seek truth and report it, minimize harm, act independently, and be accountable (SPJ, 1996). Although the membership of SPJ is primarily journalists working in the United States, the Code of Ethics has global relevance and applicability. For example, the core postulates of Ward’s (2005) *global journalism ethic* relate to claims of credibility, justifiability of consequences, and attention to the human condition. These postulates run parallel to the SPJ directives. For example, seeking and reporting truth and acting independently affect claims of credibility; being accountable relates to justification of consequences (e.g., journalists must be accountable when they justify an invasion of privacy); and minimizing harm shows humanity. This brief comparison suggests some universal aspects of the SPJ Code of Ethics.

We suggest that acceptance of the SPJ Code of Ethics is related to factors that underlie ethical decision making in general. For individuals, the development and expression of an ethical ideology can hinge on many factors. The most basic building blocks involve intellectual development and social conventions (Wilkins & Coleman, 2005). Researchers have found consistently that age and education strongly predict moral development (Rest, Narvaez, Thoma, & Bebeau, 1999; Wilkins & Coleman, 2005), and several studies have examined these factors specifically among university students. University students are ripe for such examination as, according to Kohlberg (1973), it is in early adulthood that people begin to understand the relativism of morality, as well as the distinction between principles and rules. Borkowski and Ugras (1998) meta-analyzed 56 studies of ethical attitudes and behaviors among undergraduate business students and found that older students and women were more likely to demonstrate ethical attitudes and behaviors than were younger students and men, respectively. A recent study found that undergraduate students who had taken a business ethics course had better ethical awareness and moral reasoning skills than did demographically comparable students who had not taken the course (Lau, 2010). Furthermore, there is some evidence that moral development plateaus as formal education stops (Rest, 1979). In the context of

communication and journalism studies, Groshek and Conway (2012) found that concern over ethical lapses increased through the course of undergraduate study, as did the willingness to impose stiff penalties for transgressions of journalistic ethics. Consistent with these findings and the predictions of Detenber et al. (2012), we propose that students' agreement with the tenets of the SPJ Code of Ethics will be positively related to education and, concomitantly, age:

- H1: Students in their first year will express less agreement with journalists' ethical principles of a) truth telling, b) minimizing harm, c) independence, and d) accountability than they will in their final year.

In addition to replicating prior findings, we are curious to what extent agreement with any one ethical principle is related to agreement with the other three principles. Intuitively, we might expect positive relationships among agreement with all four principles, as they all reflect on a common ethical ideology. However, we are unaware of prior research that has examined such relationships in this context, and have insufficient theoretical basis for articulating a hypothesis. Thus, we propose the following research question:

- RQ1: How is change in agreement with each of the journalists' ethical principles related to change in agreement with each other principle (a total of six relationships)?

Contentious Newsgathering Methods

The information journalists need to complete their stories may not always be readily accessible. Sometimes, they must employ tactics that would, in certain contexts, appear unethical. Such tactics might include the unauthorized use of classified documents, revealing the identity of a protected source, concealing press affiliation, and using hidden recording devices (Ball et al., 2006; *The New York Times*, 2005; Reinardy & Moore, 2007). However, in the right context, the social value of reporting news can justify contentious methods of getting information. Existing codes of ethics do inadequately address such issues as deception and invasion of privacy (Whitehouse, 2010); the decision to use such methods largely falls in the hands of reporters and their editors.

Consistent with research on the development of ethical attitudes and behaviors (Ball et al., 2006; Peterson, Rhoads, & Vaught, 2001), we might suspect that support for contentious newsgathering methods is inversely correlated with education. However, since the justifiability of such methods is context-specific, then we might expect the opposite relationship: As education increases, so does the propensity to evaluate behavior in context (Hood & Deopere, 2002). As communication students learn the social value of news and the often difficult task of gathering information on socially important issues, they may increasingly accept the use of contentious newsgathering methods. Such a proposition is consistent with Detenber et al. (2012). In keeping with that finding, we predict the following:

- H2: Students will be less likely in their first year than in their final year to say that contentious newsgathering methods are justifiable.

Detenber et al. (2012) were also interested in the relationships between students' acceptance of contentious newsgathering methods and their agreement with each of the four ethical principles. They found that students who expressed high agreement with the principle of doing no harm were less likely to describe contentious methods of newsgathering as justifiable. Relationships with the other three tenets were nonsignificant. The current study seeks to extend this finding by analyzing how changing perceptions of justifiability is related to change in agreement with the ethical principles. We might expect to find a pattern consistent with Detenber et al. since we are examining the same variables in the same research setting; however, the current analytic approach is sufficiently different to warrant an exploratory stance. Thus, we pose the following research question:

RQ2: How is change in belief that contentious newsgathering is justifiable related to change in agreement with journalists' ethical principles of a) truth telling, b) minimizing harm, c) independence, and d) accountability?

Media Functions

In some societies, the news media function as a "fourth estate" that exerts both social and political influence independent of the government; in other societies, media independence is minimal or nonexistent. Across this spectrum, the media may assume a variety of roles, including a watchdog of government and corporations that serves public interests, a guard dog of private interests, a lapdog that supports government initiatives, and a direct agent of the government agenda (Donohue, Tichenor, & Olien, 1995). In liberal democracies, the media generally enjoy a high degree of freedom; whereas, under authoritarian or autocratic regimes the media tend to be more restricted (VanBelle, 1997). Reporters Without Borders (2013) makes a similar distinction, and links declines in press freedom largely with increases in censorship and other forms of repressive legislation, which has occurred in Western and non-Western nations alike. However, the link between press freedom and repression does not capture all of the socio-political attributes that can influence media landscapes and how the press operates. Freedom House evaluates international press freedom based on scores in three categories: (1) laws and regulations, (2) political pressures (including repressive actions), and (3) economic conditions that influence media content. Although the sum of scores results in a trichotomous index (free, partly free, not free), it gives a more nuanced reflection of the social structures that influence press freedom. This index is particularly relevant in the Singapore context, where a combination of laws, self-censorship, and economic factors limit the kinds of media content available and yield a score indicating the press is not free.

In Singapore, the news media engage in widespread self-censorship—the result of what one scholar terms "calibrated coercion" (George, 2005). In this model, the Singapore news media must allocate management shares to a government nominee—often a bank—that will enforce a market-stabilizing, politically neutral editorial policy that serves its economic interests (Gomez, 2005). Thus, while the government does not directly influence editorial policy, it sets a framework of auto-regulation (Lee, 2002). On occasion, government officials have clarified the role of the press in Singapore. In 2005, former Singapore Prime Minister Goh Chok Tong asserted that he does not "favor a subservient press":

An unthinking press is not good for Singapore. But press freedom must be practiced with a larger sense of responsibility and the ability to understand what is in or not in our national interests. Editors need to understand what their larger responsibilities entail and to demand them of journalists . . . Our editors and journalists must [know] what works for Singapore and how to advance our society's collective interests. I do not know what our young journalists learn in their university courses but having our media play the role as the fourth estate cannot be the starting point for building a stable, secure, incorrupt and prosperous Singapore. (Goh, 2005)

Thus, the media have a mix of obligations. For one, they should serve the public good, which has subtle resemblance to a “watchdog” role, albeit in a rather limited capacity. For another, the media must not hinder national development. In this sense, the media assume a “lapdog” role, which may partly reflect the argument that the government generally makes good decisions that need not come under public scrutiny (Lee, 2002). This position also reflects management editorial stances that protect market interests, and thus the media also assume somewhat of a “guard dog” role.

The current study is interested in how communication students describe the function of the Singapore news media with respect to three roles: serving public good, serving national development, and serving business interests. Although many students likely view the media as an important instrument for promoting national development, they may balance this view with the belief that the media should also serve public interests directly. A recent study in the United States found that age is positively related to perceived importance of the watchdog role and that general education is inversely related to the belief that media should offer solutions to community problems (Heider, McCombs, & Poindexter, 2005). Although the context of that study is quite distinct from the Singapore context, we suspect that the balancing of the watchdog and lapdog roles increases with age and education. We also suspect that, as communication students come to understand the politics and economics of the news industry, they will be more tolerant of market-driven editorial stances. However, the dearth of literature on the relationship between perception of media functions and education, specifically the form of professionalized education of present interest, limits our ability to make predictions. Thus, we propose the following research questions:

- RQ3: How does the belief that the Singapore media should function as a watchdog change over the course of undergraduate education?
- RQ4: How does the belief that the Singapore media should serve national interests change over the course of undergraduate education?
- RQ5: How does the belief that the Singapore media should operate as commercial entities change over the course of undergraduate education?

In addition, we are interested in the interrelationships among change in preference for each of the three media functions, which the following research question conveys:

- RQ6: How is change in belief in each of the three media functions related to change in belief in each other function?

METHODS

Sample

Since the 2007–08 academic year, we have conducted an annual survey of incoming communication students in the fall and outgoing communication students in the spring. First-year students have received partial course credit, while final-year students have received movie or shopping vouchers for their participation. As of the most recent survey (April 2013), we have gathered responses from more than 900 first-year students and 600 final-year students. We have used a combination of online and pen-and-paper surveys.¹

The questionnaire asked for students' matriculation numbers so that we could match responses from final-year students with their responses as first-year students. We analyze both years of data from students who participated in the April 2012 and April 2013 final-year surveys. Of the 230 students who participated in the survey, we were able to match 168 with their first-year responses. The unmatched students likely reflect incomplete coverage of the sampling frame in the first-year survey (i.e., some final-year students might not have taken the survey during their first year) and the participation of some non-communication students in the final-year survey. We excluded cases that had more than 30% missingness in either the first- or final-year survey, which resulted in a final panel of $N = 166$.

Reflecting the school population, the sample was predominantly female (70.5%) with a mean age of 19.55 ($SD = 1.16$) at the time of the first-year survey. The majority of the sample indicated their race as Chinese (89.2%), followed by Malay (6.0%) and Indian (4.2%).

Measures

This study employed a combination of existing measures and novel measures. We conducted pretests and a pilot study to refine the initial drafts of the survey instrument. Table 1 contains wording, range of response options, and descriptive statistics for the measurement items (M and SD), as well as descriptive statistics for the composite indexes (M , SD , and Cronbach's α). We computed indexes as item means, and evaluated reliability estimates in reference to DeVellis (2003). In addition to the scaled items, we included a standard set of demographic items that asked respondents to indicate their gender, age, and ethnicity.

Ethical principles in journalism. We measured the four principles of the SPJ Code of Ethics—truth telling, minimizing harm, independence, accountability—using a combination of well-established novel scales. We adapted seven items for truth telling and four items for minimizing harm from a blogging ethics study (Cenite, Detenber, Koh, Lim, & Ng Ee Soon, 2009). In careful reference to the SPJ Code of Ethics, we developed three items to measure independence and four items to measure accountability. Response options ranged from 1 = “Strongly disagree” to 7 = “Strongly agree.” Reliabilities were generally respectable ($.7 \leq \alpha < .8$) or better for both samples. However, the measurement of independence had minimally acceptable reliability in the first year ($\alpha = .66$) and low reliability in the final year ($\alpha = .63$).

TABLE 1
Scale Items, Descriptive Statistics, and Reliability Estimates

<i>Index</i>	<i>Item Wording</i>	<i>M(SD)₁</i>	<i>M(SD)₂</i>	<i>t(165)</i>	α_1	α_2
Truth telling ^a	Composite index (mean)	5.11 (0.77)	5.27 (0.79)	-2.24*	.74	.78
	1. Telling the truth should be a guiding principle when journalists write stories, even if the truth results in harm to others.	5.09 (1.21)	5.33 (1.18)	-2.07*		
	2. Journalists should always tell the complete truth, even if it results in harm to individuals.	4.45 (1.30)	4.64 (1.26)	-1.55		
	3. Journalists should always tell the complete truth, even if it results in harm to the local economy.	4.58 (1.27)	5.08 (1.20)	-4.20***		
	4. Journalists should always tell the complete truth, even if it results in harm to national security.	3.65 (1.48)	4.22 (1.43)	-3.83***		
	5. Journalists should always tell the complete truth, even if it hurts their relationship with advertisers.	5.46 (1.22)	5.59 (1.13)	-1.01		
	6. Journalists should always avoid distorting the truth in a story, even if it will sell more newspapers.	6.25 (1.06)	6.11 (0.98)	1.26		
	7. Journalists should never distort the truth, even if there is no harm in doing so.	6.33 (1.05)	5.95 (1.17)	3.14**		
Minimizing harm ^a	Composite index (mean)	5.58 (0.94)	5.47 (0.86)	1.48	.81	.77
	1. It is important to be mindful of others' feelings when journalists write stories.	5.05 (1.30)	5.08 (1.29)	-0.18		
	2. Journalists should protect confidential information of the people they write about.	6.08 (0.98)	5.72 (1.05)	3.59***		
	3. It is important to respect people's privacy when writing news stories.	5.60 (1.15)	5.52 (1.05)	0.84		
	4. Respect for others should be a guiding principle when journalists write stories.	5.59 (1.26)	5.54 (1.09)	0.46		
Independence ^a	Composite index (mean)	5.04 (1.12)	5.31 (0.96)	-2.44*	.66	.63
	1. Journalists should be free of obligations to any interest other than the public's right to know.	4.83 (1.45)	5.07 (1.40)	-1.75		
	2. Journalists should remain free of associations and activities that may compromise integrity.	5.57 (1.29)	5.61 (1.13)	-0.25		
	3. Journalists should avoid conflicts of interest, real or perceived.	4.72 (1.62)	5.24 (1.28)	-3.35***		
Accountability ^a	Composite index (mean)	5.45 (0.81)	5.62 (0.82)	-2.39*	.66	.72
	1. News media should accept public criticism for editorial decisions.	5.77 (0.98)	5.87 (0.89)	-1.19		
	2. News media should invite dialogue with the public over journalistic practices.	5.45 (1.14)	5.52 (1.28)	-0.60		
	3. Journalists should encourage the public to voice grievances against news media.	5.12 (1.22)	5.40 (1.13)	-2.36*		
	4. Journalists should be more accountable to the public than to their organization.	5.44 (1.22)	5.69 (1.13)	-2.27*		
Contentious methods ^b	Composite index (mean)	2.12 (0.46)	2.09 (0.52)	0.59	.70	.75
	1. Using confidential business or government documents without authorization.	1.83 (0.75)	2.10 (0.94)	-3.60***		
	2. Claiming to be someone other than a journalist in order to obtain information.	2.50 (0.86)	2.30 (0.83)	2.49*		
	3. Agreeing to protect confidentiality and not doing so.	1.33 (0.54)	1.41 (0.66)	-1.16		
	4. Repeatedly questioning unwilling informants in order to get a story.	2.52 (0.81)	2.42 (0.80)	1.17		
	5. Using personal documents such as letters and photographs without permission.	1.90 (0.79)	1.85 (0.78)	0.65		
	6. Becoming employed in a firm or organization in order to gain inside information.	2.53 (0.81)	2.20 (0.87)	3.73***		
	7. Using hidden microphones or cameras.	2.22 (0.82)	2.37 (0.89)	-1.68		

(continued)

TABLE 1
(Continued)

Index	Item Wording	<i>M(SD)</i> ₁	<i>M(SD)</i> ₂	<i>t</i> (165)	α_1	α_2
Watchdog ^c	Composite index (mean)	4.14 (0.62)	4.26 (0.53)	-2.20*	.86	.86
	1. News media should persistently investigate claims and statements made by the government.	3.99 (0.83)	4.11 (0.76)	-1.48		
	2. News media should persistently investigate claims and statements made by corporate leaders.	4.04 (0.78)	4.12 (0.75)	-0.97		
	3. News media should be able to critically assess the workings of government.	4.29 (0.71)	4.34 (0.61)	-0.83		
	4. News media should expose problems and issues that could be harmful to society.	4.40 (0.79)	4.44 (0.72)	-0.48		
	5. News media should be able to scrutinize government operations.	3.95 (0.91)	4.22 (0.66)	-3.54***		
	6. News media should critically assess the actions of corporations that may run counter to public interests.	4.17 (0.81)	4.33 (0.68)	-2.32*		
Lapdog ^c	Composite index (mean)	3.02 (0.61)	2.82 (0.68)	3.32**	.73	.74
	1. News media should not challenge government initiatives in order to facilitate their implementation.	2.52 (0.91)	2.33 (1.09)	0.65		
	2. News media should be supportive of the government in its efforts for national development.	3.50 (0.87)	3.22 (1.00)	3.12**		
	3. When reporting the news, national interests should take priority over people's right to know.	2.86 (1.02)	2.73 (0.97)	1.31		
	4. News media must not undermine the government's efforts for national development even if it means restricting information flow.	2.89 (0.92)	2.57 (0.94)	3.65***		
	5. Public or government-linked media organizations are better suited to serve national interests than purely private companies.	3.10 (0.96)	3.02 (1.08)	0.76		
	6. The most important function news media can serve is promoting the good of the nation.	3.23 (0.97)	3.07 (1.08)	1.56		
Guard dog ^c	Composite scale (mean)	2.56 (0.66)	2.52 (0.74)	0.66	.63	.64
	1. More than anything news media are businesses.	2.97 (0.92)	2.98 (1.09)	-0.06		
	2. News media should be free to publish anything that sells.	2.40 (0.95)	2.34 (1.09)	0.56		
	3. Journalistic principles have to give way to commercial interests.	2.27 (1.04)	2.16 (1.07)	1.06		
	4. Generating profits is as important as anything else news media do.	2.59 (0.92)	2.58 (1.00)	0.06		

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$. ^aResponse options ranged from 1 = "Strongly disagree" to 7 = "Strongly agree." ^bResponse options were 1 = "Never justifiable," 2 = "Rarely justifiable," 5 = "Sometimes justifiable," and 4 = "Often justifiable." ^cResponse options ranged from 1 = "Not at all important" to 5 = "Extremely important." Subscripts in column labels indicate measurement in the first year (1) and final year (2).

Justifiability of contentious methods. We measured justifiability of contentious methods of newsgathering using seven items that we adapted from Ball et al. (2006). We expanded the original dichotomous scale (often/never justifiable) to a four-point scale in order to account for greater variance in responses. Response options were 1 = "Never justifiable," 2 = "Rarely justifiable," 3 = "Sometimes justifiable," and 4 = "Often justifiable." Reliabilities were respectable ($.7 \leq \alpha < .8$) for both samples.

Importance of media as a watchdog. We developed six items to measure respondents' belief that the news media play an important role as a government watchdog. Three items were specific to the government, two were specific to corporations, and one referenced society at

large. Response options ranged from 1 = “Not at all important” to 5 = “Extremely important.” Reliabilities were very good ($.8 \leq \alpha < .9$) for both samples.

Importance of media for national development. We developed six items to measure respondents’ belief that it is important for the news media to support national development. These items asserted that the media should not challenge or undermine government initiatives, should actively support the government, and should assign priority to national interests over the public’s right to know. Response options ranged from 1 = “Not at all important” to 5 = “Extremely important.” Reliabilities were respectable ($.7 \leq \alpha < .8$) for both samples.

Importance of media as commercial entities. We developed four items to measure respondents’ belief that it is important for the news media to be business-oriented, be free to print what sells, focus on making profits, and that commercial interests should trump journalistic interests. Response options ranged from 1 = “Not at all important” to 5 = “Extremely important.” Reliabilities were a little low ($.6 \leq \alpha < .7$) for both samples.

Analyses

Missingness and imputation. We conducted missing value analysis on 124 scale items, of which 92 had no missing values, 28 had one missing value (0.6% missingness), and the remainder had three or fewer missing values (1.8% missingness or less). A nonsignificant Little’s MCAR suggests that the data were missing completely at random ($\chi^2 = 625.00$, $df = 3443$, $p = 1.00$). We imputed missing values using the expectation maximization algorithm (Collins, Schafer, & Kam, 2001). The imputation included age, gender, ethnicity, year of study, and media preferences as ancillary variables.

Comparison of means. We used paired-sample t -tests in SPSS to compare mean statistics between the two sampling waves. In the results section, we include only the t -statistic. For means and standard deviations, see Table 1.

Correlation of change. For this analysis, we first computed the amount of change in each variable between the two sampling waves. The intuitive approach, which is to compute a raw difference score by subtracting a variable’s value at time 1 from its value at time 2, can result in ceiling effects and low reliability (Cohen & Cohen, 1983). In correlation analyses, the use of a raw difference score can bias estimates of association (Rosenthal, 2013). Thus, we computed an index of change, which contains the partial variance of a variable’s value at time 2 controlling for its variance at time 1 (Cohen & Cohen, 1983). We created an index of change for each variable, the collection of which we submitted to correlation analysis in SPSS. Table 2 contains the results of this analysis. For all statistical tests, we used an alpha level of $p < .05$.

TABLE 2
Correlations among Indices of Change

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Truth-telling	—						
2. Minimizing harm	-.07	—					
3. Independence	.26***	.16*	—				
4. Accountability	.39***	.18*	.36***	—			
5. Contentious methods	.09	-.24**	-.07	-.15	—		
6. Watchdog	.29***	.10	.29***	.34***	-.15	—	
7. Lapdog	-.14	.09	-.04	.03	-.03	-.20*	—
8. Guard dog	-.10	-.20*	-.27***	-.18*	.08	-.16*	.26***

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$.

RESULTS

Ethical Principles

The first hypothesis asserted positive relationships between education and agreement with each of the four tenets of the SPJ Code of Ethics. Compared with at the end of their final year, students in their first year reported less agreement with the principles of truth telling [$M = 5.11$, $SD = .77$ versus $M = 5.27$, $SD = .79$; $t(165) = -2.24$, $p = .03$], independence [$M = 5.04$, $SD = 1.12$ versus $M = 5.31$, $SD = .96$; $t(165) = -2.44$, $p = .02$], and accountability [$M = 5.45$, $SD = .81$ versus $M = 5.62$, $SD = .82$; $t(165) = -2.39$, $p = .02$]. These results support H1a, H1c, and H1d. We failed to support H1b: Students reported no change in agreement with the principle of minimizing harm from the start of their first year to the end of their final year [$M = 5.58$, $SD = .94$ versus $M = 5.47$, $SD = .86$; $t(165) = 1.48$, $p = .14$].

The first research question was interested in correlations of change in agreement with the four ethical principles. Change in agreement with truth telling was positively correlated with change in agreement with independence ($r = .26$, $p < .001$) and accountability ($r = .39$, $p < .001$); change in agreement with minimizing harm was positively correlated with change in agreement with accountability ($r = .18$, $p = .02$) and with change in agreement with independence ($r = .16$, $p = .04$); and change in agreement with independence was positively correlated with change in agreement with accountability ($r = .36$, $p < .001$). The only non-significant relationship among these variables was between truth-telling and minimizing harm ($r = -.07$, $p = .39$).

Contentious Methods

The second hypothesis asserted a positive relationship between education and belief that contentious newsgathering methods are justifiable. The results failed to support H2: Students reported no change in their belief in justifiability from the start of their first year to the end of their final year [$M = 2.12$, $SD = .46$ versus $M = 2.09$, $SD = .52$; $t(165) = 0.59$, $p = .56$].

The second research question was interested in the relationships between the belief that contentious newsgathering methods are justifiable and agreement with each of the four ethical

principles. We found that, change in belief in justifiability was not correlated with change in agreement with truth telling ($r = .09, p = .25$), independence ($r = -.07, p = .40$), or accountability ($r = -.15, p = .05$), but that it was negatively correlated with change in agreement with minimizing harm ($r = -.24, p = .002$).

Media Functions

The next three research questions (RQ3, RQ4, and RQ5) addressed how the perceived importance of three media functions changed over the course of undergraduate education. Respectively, we found that students' beliefs that media should function as a watchdog was lower at the start of their first year than at the end of their final year [$M = 4.14, SD = .62$ versus $M = 4.26, SD = .53$; $t(165) = -2.20, p = .03$], that the media should serve national interests was higher at the start of their first year than at the end of their final year [$M = 3.02, SD = .61$ versus $M = 2.82, SD = .68$; $t(165) = 3.32, p = .001$], and that the media should operate as commercial entities did not differ from the start of their first year to the end of their final year [$M = 2.56, SD = .66$ versus $M = 2.52, SD = .74$; $t(165) = 0.66, p = .51$].

Finally, our sixth research question was interested in how change in belief in each media function correlated with change in belief in each other function. We found that change in belief that media should function as a watchdog was negatively correlated with change in belief that media should serve national interests ($r = -.20, p = .01$) and with change in belief that media should operate as commercial entities ($r = -.16, p = .04$). Change in belief that media should serve national interests was positively correlated with change in belief that media should operate as commercial entities ($r = .26, p < .001$).

DISCUSSION

Replication

This study had two overarching goals. First, we sought to replicate Detenber et al. (2012) using panel data from a matched cohort. We could not replicate the entire study because the questionnaire did not contain the full set of items until 2009. Thus, we were missing data on a few variables for most students in their first year and could only replicate part of the prior study. This discussion begins with a comparison of the two studies.

Ethical principles. The previous cohort study failed to show a difference over time in agreement with the four ethical principles between first-year and final-year students. In contrast, the current panel study found that over the course of their program in communication, students increasingly agreed with the principles of truth-telling, independence, and accountability. We did not find such change in agreement with the principle of minimizing harm. As Table 1 shows, students in their first year indicated moderately strong agreement with each of the four principles, and agreed the most with the principle of minimizing harm. Perhaps the null finding regarding the latter principle is the result of a ceiling effect: throughout their program in communication, students felt strongly that journalists should respect privacy and be mindful of others' feelings when reporting. Interestingly, agreement with the remaining

three ethical principles was quite high among students in their first year. Although their agreement increased over time on these principles, our findings suggest that first-year university students in Singapore—at least those who study communication—have fairly high expectations of journalists. However, some prior research has suggested universal aspects of such ethical principles (e.g., Christians & Traber, 1997; Herrscher, 2002; Ward, 2005) which may explain the high agreement among students in their first year. Thus, in theory, such expectations of journalists may be independent of interest in communication as a course of study. This remains an empirical question that future studies may address.

Contentious methods. The test of our second hypothesis revealed another divergence from the prior study, but for the opposite reason. Whereas the previous study found that final-year students found contentious newsgathering methods to be more justifiable than did first-year students, the current study found no such difference in students between their first and final years. We conducted a post-hoc paired-samples *t*-test on the individual items comprising the composite variable and found significant differences between samples on three of the eight items (items 1, 2, and 6 under “Contentious methods” Table 1). The latter two items related to deception and also showed the greatest change over time. The four remaining items all related to individual privacy and confidentiality. With regard to items 2 and 6, it seems that students increasingly reject deception as a justifiable method to gather otherwise inaccessible information. A recent study of Australian journalists found that, while some kinds of fortuitous deception are generally accepted—for example, taking advantage of mistaken identity—many journalists outright reject deliberate deception as unethical (Muller & Gawenda, 2010). Items 2 and 6 in the current study gave examples of deliberate deception. Perhaps, then, students became increasingly aware of the ethical ramifications of deliberate deception. It would be informative, and a task for future research, to know how students’ acceptance of fortuitous deception changed, as well, over the course of their education.

The nonsignificant comparisons of our post-hoc analysis suggest that prior to starting in the communication program, students already had a well-developed sense of what is and is not a justifiable invasion of privacy or violation of confidentiality. Thus, over the course of the communication program, these beliefs did not change significantly. The high agreement with the ethical principle of minimizing harm supports this assertion. We will explore this linkage later in our discussion.

Extension

The second goal of this study was to extend Detenber et al. (2012) with novel analyses. Mainly, these analyses examined how change in one variable was related to change in other variables. We also analyzed three new variables related to the societal function of media.

Ethical principles. Our first research question asked whether change in agreement with each ethical principle was related to change in agreement with each other principle. Results showed consistent positive associations among change in agreement with each of the four principles. These findings suggest that the development of a sense of journalism ethics involves the simultaneous cultivation of principles of truth-telling, minimizing harm, independence, accountability, and perhaps other concepts that we did not measure.

Contentious methods. Our second research question asked whether change in justifiability of contentious methods was related to change in agreement with the four ethical principles. The former was negatively related to change in agreement with minimizing harm and unrelated to the change in agreement with the remaining three principles. In other words, the more students agreed over time with minimizing harm, the less they believed contentious newsgathering methods are justifiable. This finding is rather interesting because, although change in agreement with minimizing harm was slight, there was sufficient change to yield this significant correlation. On the other hand, this finding is quite intuitive: five of the contentious methods involve intrusions of privacy or violations of confidentiality, and two of the four items measuring agreement with minimizing harm specifically reference respecting privacy and protecting confidentiality.

Media functions. Finally, we directed a series of research questions to address the societal functions of media. Three of our research questions (RQ3, RQ4, and RQ5) mirrored our hypotheses structurally, as they sought to determine whether change in students' beliefs over time were significant. We found that relative to their first year, students in their final year ascribed more importance to the watchdog function and less importance to the lapdog function. We also found that students did not change in their evaluation of the guard dog function. We would like to note two aspects of these findings. First, although students increasingly valued the watchdog function of the media, they had highly positive evaluations to begin. On the 5-point scale, the average response among students in their first year was 4.14, which increased to 4.26 by the end of their final year. Second, although students evaluated the lapdog function of the media less favorably over time, their evaluations began and remained moderate. Also on a 5-point scale, the average response among students in their first year was 3.02, which declined to 2.82 by the end of their final year. Thus, it seems that students may prefer a blend of media functions that have the greatest benefit to society. Students in their final year were most supportive of media that "expose problems and issues that could be harmful to society" and "critically assess the actions of corporations that may run counter to public interests." Furthermore, these students were most supportive of media that are linked to the public or government, as opposed to purely private companies, and are "supportive of the government in its efforts for national development." Such watchdog and lapdog functions can be complementary and can engender media practices that simultaneously serve public interests and national development.

Our final research question asked whether change in evaluation of each media function is related to change in evaluations of the other two functions. All three variables were interrelated: Change in evaluation of the watchdog function was negatively related to change in evaluation of the lapdog function and the guard dog function, and change in evaluation of the lapdog function was positively related to change in evaluation of the guard dog function. The first findings are intuitive: The role of watchdog media is to scrutinize government and commercial activity. Conversely, roles of lapdog and guard dog media are to support, respectively, government and commercial activity. As we noted earlier, there are some aspects of watchdog and lapdog media that can be complementary; however, other aspects may be contradictory. On first glance, the third finding may not be as intuitive; however, understanding the structure of news media in Singapore may help explain the positive relationship. As we mentioned in the front end of this study, news media in Singapore must be publicly listed companies in

which ordinary shareholders cannot have more than a 3% stake. Former Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew explained part of the rationale behind this requirement: “I do not subscribe to the Western practice that allows a wealthy press baron to decide what voters should read day after day” (Lee Kuan Yew, 2000). By distributing ownership among the Singapore public, this policy links government oversight with market aspects of news media in which the public may play an enhanced role. However, we are unsure whether our latter finding is the result of the communication curriculum or more general cultural learning.

Implications for Moral Development and Education

As with intellectual development, moral development proceeds through multiple stages of increasing complexity and abstraction (Kohlberg, 1973). In adulthood, people become increasingly cognizant of relativistic morality and come to understand that personal ethical principles may sometimes conflict with social guidelines. Such a moral orientation permits the situational transgressions of normally valid rules; thus, the necessity to abide by the rules is variable. In the context of media ethics, this process suggests that as media practitioners become increasingly adept at navigating the moral hazards of their practice, they also become increasingly able to reconcile their moral duty with sometimes conflicting situational needs. From this perspective, we might have expected to find that contentious methods for gathering news become increasingly acceptable over the course of education.

Such an observation would be consistent with Reinardy and Moore’s (2007) finding that graduating students expressed lower ethical standards than did introductory students. Many of the differences they found between the two groups of students seem to reflect a balancing of moral duty and work efficiency. For example, graduating students found it more acceptable to use facts and information from other stories without reconfirmation, to use file video without identifying it as such to audiences, and to mislead sources about a story to get information. Such activities may simplify the news production process, thus increasing work efficiency. On the other hand, introductory students found it more acceptable to ask warm-up questions before an interview and to share a story with sources to confirm facts before publication. Such activities create additional work for journalists and may reduce their work efficiency. If, indeed, the graduating students were simply prioritizing efficiency over ethical considerations, their (situational) approval of certain media practices likely reflects a more nuanced understanding of media ethics. This more advanced state of morality is certainly related to age and probably related also to education.

In the current study, final-year students found it less acceptable than did first-year students to conceal or falsify their identity in order to gain access to information. Such activities might increase work efficiency by hastening the flow of information, and thus we might conclude that the students we surveyed did not grow to prioritize efficiency over morality. Yet the items in our survey are not directly comparable to the items in Reinardy and Moore’s survey; thus, we cannot be certain that our samples differ in regard to balancing moral duty with other situational factors.

An alternative view of the current findings is that, as a result of formal ethics education, communication students may come into a sense of what is considered “ethical” and is expected of them as communication practitioners. Without real-world experience, they might not fully appreciate some of the additional factors and work pressures that may contend with technically

ethical communication practices. Although the local curriculum provides a well-rounded education in communication and an internship can provide some of the real-world experiences that may contextualize ethics, the tendency of students to express a concrete sense of ethics with increasing education may reflect a local, culturally bound mindset. As members of a generally collectivistic society, Singaporeans may trend toward convergence over divergence of ideology. Consequently, widely held beliefs regarding ethics may grow even stronger as a result of formal communication training. Future research might attempt to separate factors related to culture, education, and practice that may influence ethical beliefs among communication students.

Limitations

This study was largely exploratory, so we can tolerate many of its limitations. However, we would like to point out three of those limitations. First, measurement was not consistently reliable. In particular, our measures of agreement with independence and importance of media as commercial entities had estimates of alpha that did not exceed .7, and we cannot be certain that the measurement items converged on common factors. Consequently, our inference from findings—at least with respect to those two concepts—is limited.

Second, the results of this study do not generalize well to students outside Singapore as well as those in other programs at the same university, nor does it generalize well to students of communication who are part of a different cohort. As we continue to build our database, future analyses will have increasingly generalizable and useful findings.

Third, our intention was, in part, to replicate Detenber et al. (2012), which we did not fully accomplish. Missing data on variables of interest limited the possible scope of the current study. In the future, our panel analyses will include measures of ethical ideology (specifically, idealism and relativism), perceived importance of a journalism code of ethics, evaluations of micro case studies, concern over plagiarism and fabrication, media use, and newsroom experience.

Despite these limitations, this study provides an informative glimpse into some of the potential effects of communication education on ethical considerations, decisions, and behaviors. As a large number of students of communication go on to work in media-related fields, there is value in knowing what they have and have not learned over the course of their education. Not only should students learn what makes for ethical and unethical practice, but they should also understand how their practice fits into a larger social framework. Furthermore, the findings of this study can help guide the development of training courses in journalism, advertising, and public relations to ensure that lessons are having the greatest possible impact.

NOTE

1. Human subjects review was undertaken and permission granted (Ref. #).

REFERENCES

- Ball, A., Hanna, M., & Sanders, K. (2006). What British journalism students think about ethics and journalism. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, 61(1), 20–32.

- Borkowski, S. C., & Ugras, K. J. (1998). Business students and ethics: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Business Ethics, 17*(11), 1117–1127.
- Cenite, M., Detenber, B. H., Koh, A. W. K., Lim, A. L. H., & Ng Ee Soon. (2009). Doing the right thing online: A survey of bloggers' ethical beliefs and practices. *New Media & Society, 11*(4), 575–597.
- Cenite, M., Yee, C. S., Juan, H. T., Qin, L. L., & Lin, T. X. (2008). Perpetual development journalism? Balance and framing in the 2006 Singapore election coverage. *Asian Journal of Communication, 18*(3), 280–295.
- Chang, T. K. (1999). Reporting public opinion in Singapore: Journalistic practices and policy implications. *Harvard International Journal of Press-Politics, 4*(1), 11–28.
- Christians, C. G., & Traber, M. (1997). *Communication ethics and universal values*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Chua, B. H. (2002). *Communitarian ideology and democracy in Singapore*. London, England: Routledge.
- Cohen, J., & Cohen, P. (1983). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Collins, L. M., Schafer, J. L., & Kam, C. M. (2001). A comparison of inclusive and restrictive strategies in modern missing data procedures. *Psychological Methods, 6*(4), 330–351.
- Detenber, B. H., Cenite, M., Malik, S., & Neo, R. L. (2012). Examining education and newsroom work experience as predictors of communication students' perceptions of journalism ethics. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator, 67*(1), 45–69.
- DeVellis, R. F. (2003). *Scale development: Theory and applications* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Donohue, G. A., Tichenor, P. J., & Olien, C. N. (1995). A guard dog perspective on the role of media. *Journal of Communication, 45*(2), 115–132.
- George, C. (2005). *Calibrated coercion and the maintenance of hegemony in Singapore*. Singapore: Asia Research Institute, National University of Singapore.
- George, C. (2009, October 30). Reflections on journalism education at the Wee Kim Wee School. Retrieved from <http://journalism.sg/wp-content/uploads/2010/09/journalism-education-oct091.pdf>
- Goh, C. T. (2005, October 31). Speech by Mr. Goh Chok Tong, Senior Minister, at the 5th anniversary dinner of *Today* newspaper.
- Gomez, J. (2005). *Freedom of expression and the media in Singapore*. London, England: Article 19.
- Groshek, J., & Conway, M. (2012). The effectiveness of the pervasive method in ethics pedagogy: A longitudinal study of journalism and mass communication students. *Journalism, 1*–18. doi: 10.1177/1464884912454503
- Hao, X., George, C., & Shi, C. (2011). *Job satisfaction of journalists: Professional aspirations, newsroom culture and social context*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the International Association of Media and Communication Research, Istanbul, Turkey.
- Heider, D., McCombs, M., & Poindexter, P. M. (2005). What the public expects of local news: Views on public and traditional journalism. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly, 82*(4), 952–967.
- Herrscher, R. (2002). A universal code of journalism ethics: Problems, limitations, and proposals. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics, 17*(4), 277–289.
- Hood, A. B., & Deopere, D. L. (2002). The relationship of cognitive development to age, when education and intelligence are controlled for. *Journal of Adult Development, 9*(3), 229–234.
- Hunt, T., & Tirpock, A. (1993). Universal ethics code: An idea whose time has come. *Public Relations Review, 19*(1), 1–11.
- Kay, L., Reilly, R. C., Amend, E., & Kyle, T. (2011). Between a rock and a hard place: The challenges of reporting about trauma and the value of reflective practice for journalists. *Journalism Studies, 12*(4), 440–455.
- Kohlberg, L. (1973). Stages and aging in moral development—Some speculations. *The Gerontologist, 13*(4), 497–502.
- Lambeth, E. B., Christians, C., & Cole, K. (1994). Role of the media ethics course in the education of journalists. *Journalism Educator, 49*(3), 20–26.
- Lau, C. L. L. (2010). A step forward: Ethics education matters! *Journal of Business Ethics, 92*(4), 565–584.
- Lee Kuan Yew. (2000). *From third world to first*. Singapore: Times Editions and Singapore Press Holdings.
- Lee, T. (2002). The politics of civil society in Singapore. *Asian Studies Review, 26*(1), 97–117.
- McAdams, K. C. (1986). Nonmonetary conflicts of interest for newspaper journalists. *Journalism Quarterly, 63*(4), 700–727.
- Muller, D., & Gawenda, M. (2010). Ethical free-for-all over media access to the fire zone. *Media International Australia (137)*, 71–79.
- Mutalib, H. (2000). Illiberal democracy and the future of opposition in Singapore. *Third World Quarterly, 21*(2), 313–342.

- Navas, A. L. (2009). Means of moral education in ethics and communication deontology. *Comunicacion Y Sociedad*, 22(2), 35–58.
- New York Times*. (2005). *The New York Times* company policy on ethics in journalism. Retrieved from <http://www.nytc.com/press/ethics.html>
- Paterno, S. (1998, March). The intervention dilemma. *American Journalism Review*. Retrieved from <http://www.ajr.org/article.asp?id=662>
- Peterson, D., Rhoads, A., & Vaught, B. C. (2001). Ethical beliefs of business professionals: A study of gender, age and external factors. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 31(3), 225–232.
- Reinardy, S., & Moore, J. (2007). When do journalists learn ethics? An examination of introductory and graduating students' ethical perceptions. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, 62(2), 161–175.
- Reporters Without Borders. (2013). 2013 world press freedom index. Retrieved from http://fr.rsf.org/IMG/pdf/classement_2013_gb-bd.pdf
- Rest, J. R. (1979). *The impact of higher education on moral judgment development. Project report 1*. Minneapolis, MN: Minnesota University Press.
- Rest, J. R., Narvaez, D., Thoma, S. J., & Bebeau, M. J. (1999). DIT2: Devising and testing a revised instrument of moral judgment. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 91(4), 644–659.
- Rosenthal, S. (2013). Measuring differentials in communication research: Issues with multicollinearity in three methods. *Communication Methods & Measures*, 7(2), 105–125.
- Sanders, K., Hanna, M., Berganza, M. R., & Aranda, J. J. S. (2008). Becoming journalists: A comparison of the professional attitudes and values of British and Spanish journalism students. *European Journal of Communication*, 23(2), 133–152.
- Shedden, D. (2011). Tip sheets: Ethics (1994–2010). Retrieved from <http://www.poynter.org/how-tos/10532/tip-sheets-ethics-1994-2010/#>
- SPJ. (1996). SPJ code of ethics. Retrieved from <http://www.spj.org/ethicscode.asp>
- Thompson, M. R. (2004). Pacific Asia after 'Asian values': authoritarianism, democracy, and 'good governance'. *Third World Quarterly*, 25(6), 1079–1095.
- VanBelle, D. A. (1997). Press freedom and the democratic peace. *Journal of Peace Research*, 34(4), 405–414.
- WAN-IFRA. (2011). World press trends, 2011. Retrieved from <http://www.wan-ifra.org/articles/2012/04/17/world-press-trends-2011>
- Ward, S. J. A. (2005). Philosophical foundations for global journalism ethics. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, 20(1), 3–21.
- Whitehouse, G. (2010). Newsgathering and privacy: Expanding ethics codes to reflect change in the digital media age. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, 25(4), 310–327.
- Wilkins, L., & Coleman, R. (2005). *The moral media: How journalists reason about ethics*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.