

DOWNLOAD PDF SHOULD JOURNALISTS AVOID ACTIONS THAT COMPROMISE OBJECTIVITY?

Chapter 1 : to compromise the objectivity - Dutch translation â€“ Linguee

To avoid conflicts of interest, reporters should publicly disclose any large payments they receive for engagements outside their regular job. No: Journalists Do Not Need to Avoid Actions.

Product and Process Objectivity Objectivity is a value. To call a thing objective implies that it has a certain importance to us and that we approve of it. Objectivity comes in degrees. Claims, methods and results can be more or less objective, and, other things being equal, the more objective, the better. The admiration of science among the general public and the authority science enjoys in public life stems to a large extent from the view that science is objective or at least more objective than other modes of inquiry. Understanding scientific objectivity is therefore central to understanding the nature of science and the role it plays in society. Given the centrality of the concept for science and everyday life, it is not surprising that attempts to find ready characterizations are bound to fail. For one thing, there are two fundamentally different ways to understand the term: According to the first understanding, science is objective in that, or to the extent that, its productsâ€”theories, laws, experimental results and observationsâ€”constitute accurate representations of the external world. The products of science are not tainted by human desires, goals, capabilities or experience. According to the second understanding, science is objective in that, or to the extent that, the processes and methods that characterize it neither depend on contingent social and ethical values, nor on the individual bias of a scientist. Especially this second understanding is itself multi-faceted; it contains, inter alia, explications in terms of measurement procedures, individual reasoning processes, or the social and institutional dimension of science. The semantic richness of scientific objectivity is also reflected in the multitude of categorizations and subdivisions of the concept. If what is so great about science is its objectivity, then objectivity should be worth defending. The close examinations of scientific practice that philosophers of science have undertaken in the past fifty years have shown, however, that several conceptions of the ideal of objectivity are either questionable or unattainable. This article discusses several proposals to characterize the idea and ideal of objectivity in such a way that it is both strong enough to be valuable, and weak enough to be attainable and workable in practice. We begin with a natural conception of objectivity: We motivate the intuitive appeal of this conception, discuss its relation to scientific method and discuss arguments challenging both its attainability as well as its desirability. We then move on to a second conception of objectivity as absence of normative commitments and value-freedom, and once more we contrast arguments in favor of such a conception with the challenges it faces. The third conception of objectivity which we discuss at length is the idea of absence of personal bias. After discussing three case studies about objectivity in scientific practice from economics, social science and medicine as well as a radical alternative to the traditional conceptions of objectivity, instrumentalism, we draw some conclusions about what aspects of objectivity remain defensible and desirable in the light of the difficulties we have discussed. Objectivity as Faithfulness to Facts The idea of this first conception of objectivity is that scientific claims are objective in so far as they faithfully describe facts about the world. In this view, science is objective to the degree that it succeeds at discovering and generalizing facts, abstracting from the perspective of the individual scientist. Although few philosophers have fully endorsed such a conception of scientific objectivity, the idea figures recurrently in the work of prominent 20th century philosophers of science such as Carnap, Hempel, Popper, and Reichenbach. It is also, in an evident way, related to the claims of scientific realism, according to which it is the goal of science to find out the truths about the world, and according to which we have reason to believe in the truth of our best-confirmed scientific theories. While the experiences vary, there seems to be something that remains constant. The object in front of a person does not, at least not necessarily, disappear just because the lights are turned off. There is a conception of objectivity that presupposes that there are two kinds of qualities: The latter are the objective properties. Thomas Nagel explains that we arrive at the idea of objective properties in three steps Nagel The first step is to realize or postulate that our perceptions are caused by the actions of things on us, through their

DOWNLOAD PDF SHOULD JOURNALISTS AVOID ACTIONS THAT COMPROMISE OBJECTIVITY?

effects on our bodies. The second step is to realize or postulate that since the same properties that cause perceptions in us also have effects on other things and can exist without causing any perceptions at all, their true nature must be detachable from their perspectival appearance and need not resemble it. Many scientific realists maintain that science, or at least natural science, does and indeed ought to aim to describe the world in terms of this absolute conception and that it is to some extent successful in doing so for a detailed discussion of scientific realism, see the entry on scientific realism. There is an immediate sense in which the absolute conception is an attractive one to have. If two people looking at a colored patch in front of them disagree whether it is green or brown, the absolute conception provides an answer to the question e. By making these facts accessible through, say, a spectroscope, we can arbitrate between the conflicting viewpoints viz. Another reason for this conception to be attractive is that it will provide for a simpler and more unified representation of the world. To the extent, then, that science aims to provide explanations for natural phenomena, casting them in terms of the absolute conception would help to realize this aim. Bernard Williams makes a related point about explanation: A third reason to find the view from nowhere attractive is that if the world came in structures as characterized by it and we did have access to it, we could use our knowledge of it to ground predictions which, to the extent that our theories do track the absolute structures, will be borne out. A fourth and related reason is that attempts to manipulate and control phenomena can similarly be grounded in our knowledge of these structures. To attain any of the four purposes—settling disagreements, explaining the world, predicting phenomena and manipulation and control—the absolute conception is at best sufficient but not necessary. We can, for instance, settle disagreements by imposing the rule that the person who speaks first is always right or the person who is of higher social rank or by an agreed-upon measurement procedure that does not track absolute properties. We can explain the world and our image of it by means of theories that do not represent absolute structures and properties, and there is no need to get things absolutely right in order to predict successfully. No matter how desirable, it is clear that our ability to use scientific claims to represent all and only facts about the world depends on whether these claims can unambiguously be established on the basis of evidence. We test scientific claims by means of their implications, and it is an elementary principle of logic that claims whose implications are true need not themselves be true. It is the job of scientific method to make sure that observations, measurements, experiments, tests—pieces of the scientific evidence—speak in favor of the scientific claim at hand. Alas, the relation between evidence and scientific hypothesis is not straightforward. By making these theories more and more verisimilar, that is, truthlike, scientific knowledge grows over time e. If this picture is correct, then over time scientific knowledge will become more objective, that is, more faithful to facts. However, scientific theories often change, and sometimes several theories compete for the place of the best scientific account of the world. It is inherent in the above picture of scientific objectivity that observations can, at least in principle, decide between competing theories: This position has been adopted by Karl R. Popper, Rudolf Carnap and other leading figures in broadly empiricist philosophy of science. Many philosophers have argued that the relation between observation and theory is way more complex and that influences can actually run both ways e. The most lasting criticism, however, was delivered by Thomas S. Kuhn provided several historical examples in favor of this claim. Can observations undermine such a paradigm, and speak for a different one? This hypothesis has two important aspects. First, the meaning of observational concepts is influenced by theoretical assumptions and presuppositions. In other words, Kuhn denies that there is a theory-independent observation language. Second, not only the observational concepts, but also the perception of a scientist depends on the paradigm she is working in. Practicing in different worlds, the two groups of scientists [who work in different paradigms, J. Where a Ptolemaic astronomer like Tycho Brahe sees a sun setting behind the horizon, a Copernican astronomer like Johannes Kepler sees the horizon moving up to a stationary sun. If this picture is correct, then it is hard to assess which theory or paradigm is more faithful to the facts, that is, more objective. The thesis of the theory-ladenness of observation has also been extended to the incommensurability of different paradigms or scientific theories, problematized independently by Thomas S. Kuhn [] and Paul Feyerabend For instance, the Special Theory of Relativity

DOWNLOAD PDF SHOULD JOURNALISTS AVOID ACTIONS THAT COMPROMISE OBJECTIVITY?

appears to be more faithful to the facts and therefore more objective than Newtonian mechanics because it reduces, for low speeds, to the latter, and it accounts for some additional facts that are not predicted correctly by Newtonian mechanics. This picture is undermined, however, by two central aspects of incommensurability. First, not only do the observational concepts in both theories differ, but the principles for specifying their meaning may be inconsistent with each other. Feyerabend. Second, scientific research methods and standards of evaluation change with the theories or paradigms. A meaningful use of objectivity presupposes, according to Feyerabend, to perceive and to describe the world from a specific perspective, *e.* Only within a peculiar scientific worldview, the concept of objectivity may be applied meaningfully. That is, scientific method cannot free itself from the particular scientific theory to which it is applied; the door to standpoint-independence is locked. As Feyerabend puts it: Therefore Kuhn later returned to the topic of scientific objectivity, of which he gives his own characterization in terms of the shared cognitive values of a scientific community. For a more profound coverage, see section 4 in the entry on theory and observation in science, section 3 in the entry on the incommensurability of scientific theories and section 4. There is a sense in which the claim that this relation is problematic is not so surprising. Scientific theories contain highly abstract claims that describe states of affairs far removed from the immediacy of sense experience. This is for a good reason: But surely, one might think, the evidence itself is objective. So even if we do have reasons to doubt that abstract theories faithfully represent the world, we should stand on firmer grounds when it comes to the evidence against which we test abstract theories. Theories are seldom tested against brute observations, however. This too is for good reason: Genuine scientific theories are tested against experimental facts or phenomena, which are themselves unobservable to the unaided senses. Experimental facts or phenomena are instead established using intricate procedures of scientific measurement and experimentation. We therefore need to ask whether the results of scientific measurements and experiments can be *aperspectival*. Collins, a prominent sociologist of science, claims that in order to know whether an experimental result is correct, one first needs to know whether the apparatus producing the result is reliable. But what he does argue is that the experimental results do not represent the world according to the absolute conception. Rather, they are produced jointly by the world, scientific apparatuses, and the psychological and sociological factors mentioned above. The facts and phenomena of science are therefore necessarily *perspectival*. In a series of contributions, Allan Franklin, a physicist-turned-philosopher of science, has tried to show that while there are indeed no algorithmic procedures for establishing experimental facts, disagreements can nevertheless be settled by reasoned judgement on the basis of *bona fide* epistemological criteria such as experimental checks and calibration, elimination of possible sources of error, using apparatuses based on well-corroborated theory and so on. Franklin. The main issue for us in this debate is whether there are any reasons to believe that experimental results provide an *aperspectival* view on the world. According to Collins, experimental results are co-determined by the facts as well as social and psychological factors. According to Franklin, whatever else influences experimental results other than facts is not arbitrary but instead based on reasoned judgment. What he has not shown is that reasoned judgment guarantees that experimental results reflect the facts alone and are therefore *aperspectival* in any interesting sense. But they argue more than that. Not only is *perspectivity* the human condition, it is also a good thing to have. This is because perspectives, especially the perspectives of underprivileged classes, come along with certain epistemic advantages.

DOWNLOAD PDF SHOULD JOURNALISTS AVOID ACTIONS THAT COMPROMISE OBJECTIVITY?

Chapter 2 : Journalism ethics and standards - Wikipedia

But when those beliefs compromise the objectivity that should be the foundation of their craft, it becomes problematic. Participating in a physical political protest or event should be allowed by newsrooms, but only if the participant is not taking part in a journalistic capacity as it relates to the larger story.

In the performance of any professional service, a member shall maintain objectivity and integrity, shall be free of conflicts of interest, and shall not knowingly misrepresent facts or subordinate his or her judgment to others. A member shall be considered to have knowingly misrepresented facts in violation of rule [ET section If the member believes that the professional service can be performed with objectivity, and the relationship is disclosed to and consent is obtained from such client, employer, or other appropriate parties, the rule shall not operate to prohibit the performance of the professional service. Certain professional engagements, such as audits, reviews, and other attest services, require independence. Independence impairments under rule [ET section A member has provided tax or personal financial planning PFP services for a married couple who are undergoing a divorce, and the member has been asked to provide the services for both parties during the divorce proceedings. In connection with a PFP engagement, a member plans to suggest that the client invest in a business in which he or she has a financial interest. A member provides tax or PFP services for several members of a family who may have opposing interests. A member has a significant financial interest, is a member of management, or is in a position of influence in a company that is a major competitor of a client for which the member performs management consulting services. A member refers a PFP or tax client to an insurance broker or other service provider, which refers clients to the member under an exclusive arrangement to do so. The above examples are not intended to be all-inclusive. Under rule [ET section Rule [ET section Under this rule, if a member and his or her supervisor have a disagreement or dispute relating to the preparation of financial statements or the recording of transactions, the member should take the following steps to ensure that the situation does not constitute a subordination of judgment: The member should consider documenting his or her understanding of the facts, the accounting principles involved, the application of those principles to the facts, and the parties with whom these matters were discussed. If, after discussing his or her concerns with the appropriate person s in the organization, the member concludes that appropriate action was not taken, he or she should consider his or her continuing relationship with the employer. In this connection, the member may wish to consult with his or her legal counsel. The member should at all times be cognizant of his or her obligations under interpretation [ET section Educational services for example, teaching full- or part-time at a university, teaching a continuing professional education course, or engaging in research and scholarship are professional services as defined in ET section Services provided or actions taken pursuant to such types of client requests are professional services [ET section Furthermore, in the performance of any professional service, a member shall comply with rule [ET section When performing professional services requiring independence, a member shall also comply with rule [ET section Moreover, there is a possibility that some requested professional services involving client advocacy may appear to stretch the bounds of performance standards, may go beyond sound and reasonable professional practice, or may compromise credibility, and thereby pose an unacceptable risk of impairing the reputation of the member and his or her firm with respect to independence, integrity, and objectivity.

DOWNLOAD PDF SHOULD JOURNALISTS AVOID ACTIONS THAT COMPROMISE OBJECTIVITY?

Chapter 3 : SPJ Code of Ethics - Society of Professional Journalists

1) *journalism's first obligation is to the truth: in order to be true, a reporter needs to be accurate, explanatory and objective* 2) *journalism's first loyalty is to its citizens* 3) *its essence is a discipline of verification.*

Evolution and purpose of codes of journalism[edit] This section needs expansion with: You can help by adding to it. January The principles of journalistic codes of ethics are designed as guides through numerous difficulties, such as conflicts of interest , to assist journalists in dealing with ethical dilemmas. The codes and canons provide journalists with a framework for self-monitoring and self-correction. Journalism is guided by five important values. The first is honesty: The second is independence: The third is fairness: The fourth is productiveness: The last value is pride: The written codes and practical standards vary somewhat from country to country and organization to organization, but there is substantial overlap between mainstream publications and societies. The International Federation of Journalists IFJ launched a global Ethical Journalism Initiative in aimed at strengthening awareness of these issues within professional bodies. This coalition of international and regional media associations and journalism support groups campaigns for ethics, good governance and self-regulation across all platforms of media. One of the leading voices in the U. The Preamble to its Code of Ethics states: The duty of the journalist is to further those ends by seeking truth and providing a fair and comprehensive account of events and issues. Conscientious journalists from all media and specialties strive to serve the public with thoroughness and honesty. The Radio Television Digital News Association , an organization exclusively centered on electronic journalism, maintains a code of ethics centering on public trust, truthfulness, fairness, integrity, independence, and accountability. Please help improve this section by adding citations to reliable sources. Unsourced material may be challenged and removed. June The primary themes common to most codes of journalistic standards and ethics are the following. Accuracy and standards for factual reporting[edit] Reporters are expected to be as accurate as possible given the time allotted to story preparation and the space available and to seek reliable sources. Events with a single eyewitness are reported with attribution. Events with two or more independent eyewitnesses may be reported as fact. Controversial facts are reported with attribution. Independent fact-checking by another employee of the publisher is desirable. Corrections are published when errors are discovered. Defendants at trial are treated only as having "allegedly" committed crimes, until conviction, when their crimes are generally reported as fact unless, that is, there is serious controversy about wrongful conviction. Opinion surveys and statistical information deserve special treatment to communicate in precise terms any conclusions, to contextualize the results, and to specify accuracy, including estimated error and methodological criticism or flaws. Slander and libel considerations[edit] Reporting the truth is almost never libel, [15] which makes accuracy very important. Private persons have privacy rights that must be balanced against the public interest in reporting information about them. Public figures have fewer privacy rights in U. In Canada , there is no such immunity; reports on public figures must be backed by facts. Publishers vigorously defend libel lawsuits filed against their reporters, usually covered by libel insurance. Harm limitation principle[edit] During the normal course of an assignment a reporter might go about gathering facts and details, conducting interviews , doing research and background checks , taking photos , and recording video and sound. Harm limitation deals with the questions of whether everything learned should be reported and, if so, how. This principle of limitation means that some weight needs to be given to the negative consequences of full disclosure, creating a practical and ethical dilemma. Use special sensitivity when dealing with children and inexperienced sources or subjects. Be sensitive when seeking or using interviews or photographs of those affected by tragedy or grief. Recognise that gathering and reporting information may cause harm or discomfort. Pursuit of the news is not a license for arrogance. Recognise that private people have a greater right to control information about themselves than do public officials and others who seek power, influence or attention. Avoid pandering to lurid curiosity. Be cautious about identifying juvenile suspects or victims of sex crimes. Be judicious about naming criminal suspects

DOWNLOAD PDF SHOULD JOURNALISTS AVOID ACTIONS THAT COMPROMISE OBJECTIVITY?

before the formal filing of charges. Self-regulation[edit] In addition to codes of ethics, many news organizations maintain an in-house ombudsman whose role is, in part, to keep news organizations honest and accountable to the public. The ombudsman is intended to mediate in conflicts stemming from internal or external pressures, to maintain accountability to the public for news reported, to foster self-criticism, and to encourage adherence to both codified and uncodified ethics and standards. This position may be the same or similar to the public editor , though public editors also act as a liaison with readers and do not generally become members of the Organisation of News Ombudsmen. An alternative is a news council , an industry-wide self-regulation body, such as the Press Complaints Commission , set up by UK newspapers and magazines. Such a body is capable of applying fairly consistent standards and of dealing with a higher volume of complaints but may not escape criticisms of being toothless. Ethics and standards in practice[edit] Main articles: Sensationalism is also a common complaint. Minor factual errors are also extremely common, as almost anyone who is familiar with the subject of a particular report will quickly realize. There are also some wider concerns, as the media continue to change, for example, that the brevity of news reports and use of soundbites has reduced fidelity to the truth, and may contribute to a lack of needed context for public understanding. From outside the profession, the rise of news management contributes to the real possibility that news media may be deliberately manipulated. Selective reporting spiking , double standards are very commonly alleged against newspapers, and by their nature are forms of bias not easy to establish, or guard against. This section does not address specifics of such matters, but issues of practical compliance, as well as differences between professional journalists on principles. Standards and reputation[edit] Among the leading news organizations that voluntarily adopt and attempt to uphold the common standards of journalism ethics described herein, adherence and general quality vary considerably. The professionalism, reliability, and public accountability of a news organization are three of its most valuable assets. An organization earns and maintains a strong reputation in part through the consistent implementation of ethical standards, which influence its position with the public and within the industry. Genres, ethics, and standards[edit] This section does not cite any sources. December Learn how and when to remove this template message Advocacy journalists “a term of some debate even within the field of journalism” by definition tend to reject “objectivity”, while at the same time maintaining many other common standards and ethics. Civic journalism adopts a modified approach to objectivity; instead of being uninvolved spectators, the press is active in facilitating and encouraging public debate and examining claims and issues critically. This does not necessarily imply advocacy of a specific political party or position. Creative nonfiction and literary journalism use the power of language and literary devices more akin to fiction to bring insight and depth into the often book-length treatment of the subjects about which they write. Such devices as dialogue , metaphor , digression and other such techniques offer the reader insights not usually found in standard news reportage. However, authors in this branch of journalism still maintain ethical criteria such as factual and historical accuracy as found in standard news reporting. They venture outside the boundaries of standard news reporting in offering richly detailed accounts. Investigative journalism often takes an implicit point of view on a particular public interest , by asking pointed questions and intensely probing certain questions. With outlets that otherwise strive for neutrality on political issues, the implied position is often uncontroversial—for example, that political corruption or abuse of children is wrong and perpetrators should be exposed and punished, that government money should be spent efficiently, or that the health of the public or workers or veterans should be protected. Advocacy journalists often use investigative journalism in support of a particular political position, or to expose facts that are only concerning to those with certain political opinions. Regardless of whether or not it is undertaken for a specific political faction, this genre usually puts a strong emphasis on factual accuracy, because the point of an in-depth investigation of an issue is to expose facts that spur change. Not all investigations seek to expose facts about a particular problem; some data-driven reporting does deep analysis and presents interesting results for the general edification of the audience which might be interpreted in different ways or which may contain a wealth of facts concerned with many different potential problems. A

DOWNLOAD PDF SHOULD JOURNALISTS AVOID ACTIONS THAT COMPROMISE OBJECTIVITY?

factually-constrained investigation with an implied public interest point of view may also find that the system under investigation is working well. New Journalism and Gonzo journalism also reject some of the fundamental ethical traditions and will set aside the technical standards of journalistic prose in order to express themselves and reach a particular audience or market segment. These favor a subjective perspective and emphasize immersive experiences over objective facts. Tabloid journalists are often accused of sacrificing accuracy and the personal privacy of their subjects in order to boost sales. The News International phone hacking scandal is an example of this. Supermarket tabloids are often focused on entertainment rather than news. A few have "news" stories that are so outrageous that they are widely read for entertainment purposes, not for information. Some tabloids do purport to maintain common journalistic standards but may fall far short in practice. Others make no such claims.

Relationship with freedom of the press[edit] In countries without freedom of the press , the majority of people who report the news may not follow the above-described standards of journalism. Non-free media are often prohibited from criticizing the national government, and in many cases are required to distribute propaganda as if it were news. Various other forms of censorship may restrict reporting on issues the government deems sensitive. Under the First Amendment, the government is not allowed to censor the press. The government does not have the right to try to control what is published and cannot prevent certain things from being published by the press. Prior constraint is a term used to describe an attempt by the government to prevent the expression of ideas before they are published. Some countries that have freedom of the press are the U. Laws concerning libel and slander vary from country to country, and local journalistic standards may be tailored to fit. For example, the United Kingdom has a broader definition of libel than does the United States. Different organizations may balance speed and accuracy in different ways. The New York Times , for instance, tends to print longer, more detailed, less speculative, and more thoroughly verified pieces a day or two later than many other newspapers. Because of the fast turn-around, reporters for these networks may be under considerable time pressure, which reduces their ability to verify information. Laws with regard to personal privacy , official secrets, and media disclosure of names and facts from criminal cases and civil lawsuits differ widely, and journalistic standards may vary accordingly. Different organizations may have different answers to questions about when it is journalistically acceptable to skirt, circumvent, or even break these regulations. Another example of differences surrounding harm reduction is the reporting of preliminary election results. In the United States, some news organizations feel that it is harmful to the democratic process to report exit poll results or preliminary returns while voting is still open. Such reports may influence people who vote later in the day, or who are in western time zones, in their decisions about how and whether or not to vote.

DOWNLOAD PDF SHOULD JOURNALISTS AVOID ACTIONS THAT COMPROMISE OBJECTIVITY?

Chapter 4 : Polis – “Should news get personal? Emotion and objectivity in the face of suffering

It wasn't always so, as objectivity was mostly an invention of the 19th and early 20th century in order for journalism to appeal to a wider variety of people, rather than niche audiences. Before.

Julian Baggini 14 May Subjects: Loyn advocates a rather old-fashioned sounding role for the journalist. The cognoscenti must have choked on their sun-blush tomato ciabattas. But the cognoscenti are wrong. The problem with many actors in the debate over truth and objectivity in the media is that they slide too easily from a healthy scepticism about the possibility of knowing the truth and full objectivity to a defeatist form of relativism. We need to be sophisticated about how we understand truth and objectivity, without being dismissive of either. To show just how difficult it is to avoid sliding from healthy scepticism to unhealthy relativism, I want to first look at how Loyn himself describes his commitment to truth and objectivity. In doing so he reveals the confusions such a position entails. This is surely what any sophisticated person believes. Knowledge and truth come together. If there is no truth there is no knowledge, only a variety of opinions, some of which we have more reason to believe than others. Loyn seems to sense this and wants to resist it. To do so, he distinguishes between the truth and the pursuit of the truth. The pursuit of truth is impossible if there is no truth to pursue. Loyn seems to be suggesting that we have to act in a kind of bad faith, accepting that there is no truth but acting as though there is, in order to prevent a lapse into relativism. But if relativism is the true view ignoring for the moment the problems of describing a denial of the possibility of truth as true why is it so important to avoid lapsing into it? Loyn maintains this unsustainable combination of denying truth and objectivity on the one hand while trying to hang on to a surrogate version of it with the other. And that objectivity has to remain a goal, the only sacred goal we have. Loyn, in his desire not to be seen to be committed to outmoded ideas about truth and objectivity, thus concedes too much. This plays into his critics hands. There are many truths, they will say, and many stones [to be unturned]. To sort out the confusions of both sides, we could do worse than bring in two of our most important living philosophers: Bernard Williams and Thomas Nagel. Nagel, in his admirably lucid *The View From Nowhere*, explains what the sceptics have got right when they doubt the possibility of objective knowledge. The title is deliberately paradoxical. There can be no view from nowhere: But this is not the only way to understand objectivity. Nagel explains his alternative by contrasting it with subjectivity. The purely subjective is that viewpoint which is entirely determined by the particular perspective of the individual. What happens when we get a less subjective, and hence more objective, viewpoint is that we expand our frames of reference and thus gain dimensions of understanding that go beyond our own perceptions of the world. Hence the physics of light wavelengths and reflection is much more objective than our perception of colour, because it is a mode of understanding that transcends our particular viewpoints. It is understanding that does not depend on experiencing the world as we do. A blind person can, for example, understand the physics of light as well as a sighted person. So while it is true that there is no pure objectivity, one can always try to get a more objective viewpoint. I suspect this is what Loyn is trying to get at when he talks about the pursuit of truth being worthwhile even though there is no single absolute truth. The idea that journalists should be striving for objectivity is neither anachronistic nor incoherent. It shows how the idea that journalists should be striving for objectivity is neither anachronistic nor incoherent. Indeed, objectivity is precisely what they should be aiming for. They need to make sure their reporting removes as much as is possible of the particular, local perspectives they start out with. Sceptics who retort that such biases can never be fully removed are simply stating a trite truism. But that in no way undermines the idea that maximising objectivity is an achievable and worthwhile aim. Not Truth but truthfulness While Nagel takes care of objectivity, Bernard Williams can deal with truth. Williams, in his *Truth and Truthfulness*, diagnoses what he sees as an unsustainable tension between our desire for truthfulness and our scepticism about truth. Truthfulness is cherished while truth is dismissed. Williams, like Nagel, is keen to identify what the sceptics have got right. In this case, the real insight is that

DOWNLOAD PDF SHOULD JOURNALISTS AVOID ACTIONS THAT COMPROMISE OBJECTIVITY?

for anything that happens, there is no such thing as the true account. Nevertheless, there are many true accounts and they are made true by the fact that they comprise true descriptions of what happened. If we add to this the requirement that the account be truthful, we can now see how truth in reporting is an attainable and just aspiration. The job of the news reporter is not just to tell us a string of true facts, since by what they leave out, for example, they may nonetheless mislead us. But that does not mean some accounts are not more truthful than others and that a news reporter cannot aspire to be as truthful as possible. We can and should defend truth and objectivity in news reporting, with the sophistication required to answer the legitimate doubts of the sceptic but without sliding from truisms about the limits of knowledge to misleading myths about relativism. We encourage anyone to comment, please consult the.

DOWNLOAD PDF SHOULD JOURNALISTS AVOID ACTIONS THAT COMPROMISE OBJECTIVITY?

Chapter 5 : SPJ Ethics Committee Position Papers - Society of Professional Journalists

Should journalists show emotion and is objectivity still used in journalism? - Site Title January 13, at am - Reply [] question of 'should news get personal?' is asked in this blog.

Messenger Journalistic objectivity has come under the spotlight as debate rages over a recent High Court decision that ruled that offshore processing of asylum seekers is legal. This is no doubt an emotionally charged debate, and the way Australia deals with asylum seekers has been under scrutiny for some time. For journalists working on the story, it can create a conundrum – particularly if they have a strong personal view on the issue. How can they do this in a world of social media where journalists are increasingly becoming their own brands and it is expected that they offer personal views? Should they even aim for objectivity, or just acknowledge that it is an unrealistic ideal and all journalism is advocacy anyway? Advocacy versus objectivity

The emergence of the Twitter hashtag *lethemstay* and its use by journalists reporting on the asylum seeker issue prompts such questions over whether reporting and advocacy are becoming increasingly blurred. Advocacy journalism also came under scrutiny in light of revelations that an ABC story reporting that a five-year-old boy had been raped on Nauru was incorrect. The reporting led to the Department of Immigration and Border Protection secretary, Michael Pezzullo, lamenting the rise of bias in journalism. It also ties in with a larger debate over recent years. Some argue that advocacy journalism is on the rise. Before then, however, party-political journalism was very much the norm. In a time where journalism is becoming more fragmented, it appears that niche audiences are more important again, with some publications specialising for certain types of audiences. The pendulum may be swinging again. It is well known, for example, that *The Australian* leans to the right politically, while *The Guardian* takes a left-leaning approach. This is no big secret, and journalists I have spoken to readily admit as much. There also seems to be an increasing acknowledgement among many journalists that objectivity is an unattainable ideal in any case, because no-one can ever completely ignore their personal views and biases. Objectivity and the rise of social media

Still, it seems that the idea of objectivity is largely ingrained in Australian journalists. A survey I conducted in revealed that three in four of them thought it was very or extremely important to be detached observers. In contrast, just over one-third saw it as very or extremely important to advocate for social change. Unfortunately, we do not yet have reliable longitudinal data available to test whether this number is on the increase. You need to present a personal as much as a professional persona. This is an issue that many journalists – as well as their employers – are struggling with. The most successful journalists have developed quite elaborate brands, and many employers certainly now have this expectation of their reporters. Opinion is important in this mix, as journalists know very well, given that opinion pages of newspapers have always been among their most popular sections. There have been some high-profile cases where journalists have lost their jobs as a result. Social media guidelines are still murky and changeable. Some journalists now list a disclaimer in their Twitter profiles that their views are their own. So, where does this leave journalists who are reporting on the asylum seeker issue, but also tweeting using *lethemstay*? It is an incredibly vexed issue, and journalists need to make their own considered decision on how they want to engage with the hashtag, as merely using it in a tweet may not necessarily signal endorsement. But in such an emotional issue, it is unrealistic to expect journalists not to have a view, and it might actually be good for them to be open about this. Journalists who express their opinion and declare their biases may be seen as more honest, and are contributing to increased transparency of journalistic work – a de-mystification of the craft even. This would in turn allow audiences to better appreciate and understand the news they consume.

DOWNLOAD PDF SHOULD JOURNALISTS AVOID ACTIONS THAT COMPROMISE OBJECTIVITY?

Chapter 6 : ET Section - Integrity and Objectivity

Specifically, journalists should consider the consequences of their actions on others and also exercise good taste and restraint when appropriate, even if the targeted action falls fully within their legal rights.

She has worked as a reporter and a columnist for The Daily Texan. Objectivity is often considered a core covenant of journalistic integrity. Reporters are encouraged to avoid any appearance of bias in both their jobs and their day-to-day lives. However, transparency is another aspect of journalism that is arguably as "if not more" important. In an effort to maintain the faith of the public we serve, reporters have spent decades skirting around questions about our political beliefs. However, the public needs to understand we have been taught to suppress that bias and produce truthful, informed content. That attending a rally or protest does not negate the credibility or objectivity of a reporter. We are only human and we all have opinions, but we are trained to keep our biases in check. Journalists routinely take in the black and white of the world, but also see the gritty grey in between. Seeing the world at its best and its worst builds strong opinions. The public should know that their trusted sources are indeed biased. But they should also know that personal bias will never stop them from getting the facts, responding to and rendering them in an honest manner. The good reporters enter every situation searching for the truth of the matter, and regardless of their views, will share it. There is a difference between standing up for something and standing against something. Attending a rally in protest of an individual is different from standing up in defense of a common liberty or to protect fundamental rights. The press should always search for the entire story, and we limit ourselves when we attack rather than listen. We hunt the truth every day to ensure that those we serve are well informed, and we take this responsibility very seriously. But this does not negate our own interests or opinions. We are more than just gatekeepers—we are people who should pursue both objectivity and transparency. Just remember, acknowledging that the human beings behind the words are biased does not make the news they report any less true. Ryan Phillips, 27, editor, Starkville Miss. Daily News Before joining the Daily News this year, Phillips previously worked as a reporter and editor for weather. The last election cycle brought out a previously unseen brand of divisiveness across the U. The primary catalyst for the creation of this gulf between medium and audience could be seen in the popularity of partisan media—most notably in the months and days leading up to the November general election. Traditional media famously overlooked a considerable part of the country and failed in their predictions, leaving the likes of neoconservative and neoliberal outlets to pick up the slack. The mission and purpose of the journalist is not to stoke the flame, but inform the masses of its existence. But when those beliefs compromise the objectivity that should be the foundation of their craft, it becomes problematic. Participating in a physical political protest or event should be allowed by newsrooms, but only if the participant is not taking part in a journalistic capacity as it relates to the larger story. Someone covering the possibility of a protest should never be the first to throw a brick through a window. When considering what events to participate in, it all boils down to grade school maturity, requiring an informed and balanced understanding of what the bigger picture truly. It may be fun to be a part of a story, but a journalist ceases to be an observer when they become part of the story. If anything, I would encourage journalists to be politically active—or at least engaged outside of work. If you register to vote, you should vote and at least be engaged in the policies you want to see put into action by an elected government. Politics in the workplace should be handled equally across job sectors.

DOWNLOAD PDF SHOULD JOURNALISTS AVOID ACTIONS THAT COMPROMISE OBJECTIVITY?

Chapter 7 : Principles of Journalism - American Press Association

It is journalism's job to be true to the readers and viewers, and true to the facts, in a way that will stand up to history's judgment. To do anything less would be untenable.

By Alan Sunderland Updated September 10, Being objective as a reporter takes constant practice and can always be improved. Malcolm Sutton Anyone who simply collects facts and sets them down is not a reporter. I very rarely disagree with my esteemed former colleague Jonathan Holmes Objective reporting: On one matter, Jonathan is absolutely right. The notion of objective reporting is seen by many as out of fashion and out of date. That is certainly a problem, and we see plenty of examples of it. Anyone who simply collects facts and sets them down is not a reporter. It has always been the case that reporters need to sift through facts, weigh them up, make editorial judgements about their relative strength and importance, and then present them in a way that illuminates the truth of a matter. This process of making editorial judgements about facts is fundamental to great journalism. It explains why a program like Four Corners can expose what is going on inside the greyhound racing industry or stores without in any way compromising its commitment to objective journalism. The journalism is passionate, compelling and influential. It also happens to be in the best tradition of objective journalism. Nor does it involve handing out undigested facts by the truckload and leaving a bewildered audience to try and make sense of it. What it does involve is gathering information without fear or favour, weighing and assessing that information and then reaching a conclusion based on the evidence. Conclusions arrived at using this process are all the stronger for it. The passion and purpose that drives good journalism comes from the facts and not from rhetoric, spin or sophistry. The key here is what tools a reporter uses in this process of weighing the evidence. Or you can try to set aside your own views and instead be led by the facts, by what you uncover as you turn over an issue and examine all sides. Being objective as a reporter is not a state of perfection like sainthood or barracking for Richmond. It is a discipline. Like so many important skills, it takes constant practice and can always be improved. At the ABC we are committed to this discipline, and we are always looking for ways to reflect on it and improve it. But at its best it means that the passion and power of what we produce is driven by the facts we uncover, not by the personal views we hold. After all, we expect scientists to examine the evidence on issues like climate change or cancer research, and reach conclusions based on rigorous and professional judgements rather than their opinions or their hunches. We expect a similar objectivity from our judicial system, from our police and from many other professionals who serve the public. We know they are fallible human beings like the rest of us, but we ask them to do their best to set their views aside and do their job. We should ask no less of reporters. It is difficult and we should continue to expect failures along the way. But in this information rich, connected world, it has never been more important. We are assailed on all sides by information presented to us by those with hidden agendas, causes to push and products to sell. What we need are at least some people who are trying to cut through the manipulation and the spin and let the facts do the talking. This article was first published in The Age.

DOWNLOAD PDF SHOULD JOURNALISTS AVOID ACTIONS THAT COMPROMISE OBJECTIVITY?

Chapter 8 : Ethics in the Accounting Profession | www.nxgvision.com

The elements of journalism. In their book The Elements of Journalism, Bill Kovach and Tom Rosenstiel identify the essential principles and practices of journalism.. Here are 10 elements common to good journalism, drawn from the book.

Should journalists covering suffering allow their own emotions to become part of the story? Will it help the cause he so obviously cares about? And does it make for good journalism? Sometimes the journalist will become involved and that can have a dramatic impact, as when Anderson Cooper famously rescued a child in Haiti from a riot on camera. Journalism is a craft not a science. And viewers more sympathetic to Israel may also wonder if his heart is in it when he has to take other sides to task. Editorial Introspection I always welcome it when journalists talk publicly about their work. It is good that journalists are transparent about how they do their job. Of course, journalists are only human and the strain of suppressing normal feelings in the face of the horrors of war is immense. He had bottled up those emotions for over a year. But that is the job. To provide as honest and informed an account as possible. Though with platform convergence that kind of separation loses meaning. Some have argued that TV regulation is out of date and this kind of more personal narrative should be allowed on terrestrial TV. Impartiality is measured over a programme or series of programmes. The idea is that you are tough on an Israeli in an interview but then suitably tough on a Palestinian. It fits into their increasingly creative offering online. But does it represent a shift in the ethos of public service broadcasting that ITN is legally obliged to follow? Channel 4 already has a remit to be an alternative to the BBC so in that sense this kind of experiment is in their DNA. Does Channel 4 News want to adopt the Fox News strategy of speaking on behalf of a particular political demographic? I worked for eight happy years at Channel 4 News. Jon is not the only journalist talking about their emotions in connection with reporting on Gaza. There are some comments attached to this blog but here is a sample of some the tweets. I will only include those that made critical or additional points and I realise that twitter is hardly representative of wider audiences. Yes, Jon is perfectly capable of being balanced. My problem is not with his journalism, but what is in the mind of the viewer. I think this is one of the problems of convergence. This tongue in cheek? Every newspaper and bulletin I have seen has shown huge amounts of emotionally searing testimony. There is a bigger and more complex question about how that coverage has been framed. But I would argue that taking an emotional approach actually hinders those who are trying to draw attention to the wider geo-politics that means Israel is able to carry out this operation without any threat of serious sanctions or reprimand. We need more analysis, not angst.

DOWNLOAD PDF SHOULD JOURNALISTS AVOID ACTIONS THAT COMPROMISE OBJECTIVITY?

Chapter 9 : Online Journalism Ethics: Guidelines from the Conference | Poynter

Journalistic objectivity is a considerable notion within the discussion of journalistic www.nxgvision.comlistic objectivity may refer to fairness, disinterestedness, factuality, and nonpartisanship, but most often encompasses all of these qualities.

Mass Media Ethics Instructor: The First Amendment, protecting freedom of expression from abridgment by any law, guarantees to the people through their press a constitutional right, and thereby places on newspaper people a particular responsibility. To this end the American Society of Newspaper Editors sets forth this Statement of Principles as a standard encouraging the highest ethical and professional performance. The primary purpose of gathering and distributing news and opinion is to serve the general welfare by informing the people and enabling them to make judgments on the issues of the time. Newspapermen and women who abuse the power of their professional role for selfish motives or unworthy purposes are faithless to that public trust. The American press was made free not just to inform or just to serve as a forum for debate but also to bring an independent scrutiny to bear on the forces of power in the society, including the conduct of official power at all levels of government. Freedom of the press belongs to the people. It must be defended against encroachment or assault from any quarter, public or private. They must be vigilant against all who would exploit the press for selfish purposes. Journalists must avoid impropriety and the appearance of impropriety as well as any conflict of interest or the appearance of conflict. They should neither accept anything nor pursue any activity that might compromise or seem to compromise their integrity. Good faith with the reader is the foundation of good journalism. Every effort must be made to assure that the news content is accurate, free from bias and in context, and that all sides are presented fairly. Editorials, analytical articles and commentary should be held to the same standards of accuracy with respect to facts as news reports. Significant errors of fact, as well as errors of omission, should be corrected promptly and prominently. To be impartial does not require the press to be unquestioning or to refrain from editorial expression. Sound practice, however, demands a clear distinction for the reader between news reports and opinion. Articles that contain opinion or personal interpretation should be clearly identified. Journalists should respect the rights of people involved in the news, observe the common standards of decency and stand accountable to the public for the fairness and accuracy of their news reports. Persons publicly accused should be given the earliest opportunity to respond. Pledges of confidentiality to news sources must be honored at all costs, and therefore should not be given lightly. Unless there is clear and pressing need to maintain confidences, sources of information should be identified. Photojournalists try to avoid manipulating photographs using Photoshop software because the integrity of a professionally produced photo gives news photography its credibility. Visual journalists operate as trustees of the public. Our primary role is to report visually on the significant events and varied viewpoints in our common world. Our primary goal is the faithful and comprehensive depiction of the subject at hand. As visual journalists, we have the responsibility to document society and to preserve its history through images. Photographic and video images can reveal great truths, expose wrongdoing and neglect, inspire hope and understanding and connect people around the globe through the language of visual understanding. Photographs can also cause great harm if they are callously intrusive or are manipulated. This code is intended to promote the highest quality in all forms of visual journalism and to strengthen public confidence in the profession. It is also meant to serve as an educational tool both for those who practice and for those who appreciate photojournalism. Code of Ethics Visual journalists and those who manage visual news productions are accountable for upholding the following standards in their daily work: Be accurate and comprehensive in the representation of subjects. Resist being manipulated by staged photo opportunities. Be complete and provide context when photographing or recording subjects. Avoid stereotyping individuals and groups. Treat all subjects with respect and dignity. Give special consideration to vulnerable subjects and compassion to victims of crime or tragedy. Intrude on private moments of grief only when the public has an overriding and

DOWNLOAD PDF SHOULD JOURNALISTS AVOID ACTIONS THAT COMPROMISE OBJECTIVITY?

justifiable need to see. While photographing subjects do not intentionally contribute to, alter, or seek to alter or influence events. Do not manipulate images or add or alter sound in any way that can mislead viewers or misrepresent subjects. Do not pay sources or subjects or reward them materially for information or participation. Do not accept gifts, favors, or compensation from those who might seek to influence coverage. Do not intentionally sabotage the efforts of other journalists. Ideally, visual journalists should: Defend the rights of access for all journalists. Think proactively, as a student of psychology, sociology, politics and art to develop a unique vision and presentation. Work with a voracious appetite for current events and contemporary visual media. Strive for total and unrestricted access to subjects, recommend alternatives to shallow or rushed opportunities, seek a diversity of viewpoints, and work to show unpopular or unnoticed points of view. Strive to be unobtrusive and humble in dealing with subjects. Respect the integrity of the photographic moment. Strive by example and influence to maintain the spirit and high standards expressed in this code. When confronted with situations in which the proper action is not clear, seek the counsel of those who exhibit the highest standards of the profession. Visual journalists should continuously study their craft and the ethics that guide it. Radio-Television Digital News Association PREAMBLE Professional electronic journalists should operate as trustees of the public, seek the truth, report it fairly and with integrity and independence, and stand accountable for their actions. Professional electronic journalists should recognize that their first obligation is to the public. Professional electronic journalists should: Professional electronic journalists should pursue truth aggressively and present the news accurately, in context, and as completely as possible. Professional electronic journalists should not: Professional electronic journalists should present the news fairly and impartially, placing primary value on significance and relevance. Professional electronic journalists should present the news with integrity and decency, avoiding real or perceived conflicts of interest, and respect the dignity and intelligence of the audience as well as the subjects of news. Confidential sources should be used only when it is clearly in the public interest to gather or convey important information or when a person providing information might be harmed. Journalists should keep all commitments to protect a confidential source. Professional electronic journalists should defend the independence of all journalists from those seeking influence or control over news content. Professional electronic journalists should recognize that they are accountable for their actions to the public, the profession, and themselves. Investigate complaints and correct errors promptly and with as much prominence as the original report. In meeting its responsibility to the profession of electronic journalism, RTDNA has created this code to identify important issues, to serve as a guide for its members, to facilitate self-scrutiny, and to shape future debate. Society for Professional Journalists Preamble Members of the Society of Professional Journalists believe that public enlightenment is the forerunner of justice and the foundation of democracy. The duty of the journalist is to further those ends by seeking truth and providing a fair and comprehensive account of events and issues. Conscientious journalists from all media and specialties strive to serve the public with thoroughness and honesty. Seek Truth and Report It Journalists should be honest, fair and courageous in gathering, reporting and interpreting information. Deliberate distortion is never permissible. Clarify conditions attached to any promise made in exchange for information. They should not oversimplify or highlight incidents out of context. Image enhancement for technical clarity is always permissible. Label montages and photo illustrations. If re-enactment is necessary to tell a story, label it. Analysis and commentary should be labeled and not misrepresent fact or context. Minimize Harm Ethical journalists treat sources, subjects and colleagues as human beings deserving of respect. Use special sensitivity when dealing with children and inexperienced sources or subjects. Pursuit of the news is not a license for arrogance. Avoid pandering to lurid curiosity. Be Accountable Journalists are accountable to their readers, listeners, viewers and each other. Bottom line, successful public relations hinges on the ethics of its practitioners. Under the Code, widely regarded as the industry standard, members pledge to core values, principles and practice guidelines that define their professionalism and advance their success. Fundamental values like advocacy, honesty, loyalty, professional development and objectivity structure ethical practice and interaction with clients and the public. Translating values into principles of ethical practice, the

DOWNLOAD PDF SHOULD JOURNALISTS AVOID ACTIONS THAT COMPROMISE OBJECTIVITY?

Code advises professionals to: Protect and advance the free flow of accurate and truthful information. Foster informed decision making through open communication. Protect confidential and private information. Promote healthy and fair competition among professionals. Avoid conflicts of interest. Code guidelines, like tactics supporting strategies, zero in on putting value and principles into play for working professionals facing everyday tasks and challenges. Among them, professionals should: Be honest and accurate in all communications. Reveal sponsors for represented causes and interests. Act in the best interest of clients or employers. Safeguard the confidences and privacy rights of clients and employees. Follow ethical hiring practices to respect free and open competition.