

# Journalism ethics in a digital environment: How journalistic codes of ethics have been adapted to the Internet and ICTs in countries around the world

Jesús Díaz-Campo ([jesus.diaz@unir.net](mailto:jesus.diaz@unir.net))

Francisco Segado-Boj ([francisco.segado@unir.net](mailto:francisco.segado@unir.net))

## Journal Article

### How to cite:

Díaz-Campo, J., & Segado-Boj, F. (2015). Journalism ethics in a digital environment: How journalistic codes of ethics have been adapted to the Internet and ICTs in countries around the world. *Telematics and Informatics*, 32 (4), 735-744.

© 2015 Elsevier Ltd

Version: Accepted Manuscript, Pre-Print

Link(s) to article on publisher's

website: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0736585315000258>  
[doi:10.1016/j.tele.2015.03.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2015.03.004)

Copyright and Moral Rights for the articles on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. For more information on Re-Unir data policy on reuse of materials please consult <http://reunir.unir.net/>

## **Journalism Ethics in a Digital Environment: How Journalistic Codes of Ethics Have Been Adapted to the Internet and ICTs in Countries around the World**

### **Abstract:**

Journalism is facing new ethical issues because of the emergence of the Internet and Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs). In this article, we examine how journalistic codes of ethics have been updated to address this new reality. Three research questions are explored through a systematic analysis of 99 codes from around the world. Results show that, of the 99 codes analyzed, only 9 include references to the Internet and ICTs. We conclude with proposals for changes in the codes that would help journalists resolve these new moral issues.

**Keywords:** journalism ethics, code of ethics, online journalism, the Internet, self-regulation

### **Highlights**

- We examine how journalistic codes of ethics have been updated since the emergence of the Internet and ICTs.
- We have analyzed 99 journalistic codes of ethics from around the world.
- Only 9 of the 99 codes analyzed include references to the Internet and ICTs.
- All of the codes that do include references to the Internet were updated in the twenty-first century.
- The codes with the most references to the Internet and ICTs are those of Canada, the United Kingdom, and Norway.

## 1. Introduction

ICTs, in general, and the Internet, in particular, have created a fourth kind of journalism in addition to print, radio, and television journalism—the so-called cyber journalism, digital journalism, or online journalism. This new digital environment sets up a number of ethical dilemmas for journalists. While digital journalists still have the same dilemmas that journalists—and the journalism profession—have always faced, they now have some new dilemmas, as well.

The journalism process itself has changed radically, in fact, and we are in the middle of a changing media landscape (White, 2008). We speak of a bidirectional process in which everyone may take part in producing and presenting the news. In another words, every individual becomes a potential publisher. This is only one of the several—and major—transformations that have taken place in journalism in recent years. Interactivity, hypertextuality, the use of multimedia, and immediacy are some of the main features of digital journalism, and each of these, of course, raises its own new ethical issues. As Evers (2001: 38) asks, “*To what extent is a site owner legally or morally responsible for what is being posted?*” (including anonymous comments). Is the site also responsible for links leading to offensive content? There are other new moral issues, as well, related to intellectual property, digital manipulation, and the process of gathering news and contrasting sources, for example, that stem from the use of multimedia and the need for immediacy.

So, the main question could be formulated as follows: are the current codes of ethics in journalism valid for the Internet, too? While there is agreement that the Internet has changed journalism, there is no consensus on the impact such changes have had (Friend and Singer, 2007). Consequently, responses to this question reveal two opposing points of view.

On the one hand, those who remember Belsey and Chadwick’s statement (1994) that ethics and journalism are inseparable would argue that the existing ethical guidelines are equally effective for the new media. In other words, ethics is ethics—whether it is the new journalism or the old.

On the other hand, although the essence of journalism remains basically unchanged, it is obvious that the Internet “*shapes and redefines a number of moral and ethical issues confronting journalists when operating online or making use of online resources,*” as Deuze and Yeshua (2001: 276) have stated.

There seems to be consensus that Deuze and Yeshua’s statement is the most accurate; as many authors have pointed out (Cooper, 1998; Ess, 2008; Evers, 2001; Demir, 2011; García Capilla, 2012; Pavlik, 2001, Ward and Wasserman, 2010; Whitehouse, 2010, among others), new media calls for new ethics because the issues online journalists are confronting are different from those that traditional journalists face. So, as Hayes, Singer, and Ceppos (2007, 275) remark, in the digital environment, “*old assumptions about journalistic roles and values can no longer be accepted uncritically nor old approaches to them continued indefinitely.*” In other words, new ethical issues require new ethical rules—or traditional ethical standards must be reformulated, at least.

Journalists have met these challenges through self-regulation which, according to Evers (2001, 46), is “*the only way to create online standards and to control the observation of moral rules.*” According to Aznar (2005, pp. 13-14), the characteristics of this modality of regulation are 1) that its objective is to make effective use of or contribute to a particular activity’s deontology, and 2) that it is created and sustained by the same agents who engage in that activity.

This second characteristic distinguishes self-regulation from legal regulation and, according to Mijatovic (2013, 5), represents one of its advantages in establishing rules of conduct for digital journalism: “*self-regulation appears to be a solution to increase online accountability while offering more flexibility than state regulation.*”

Self-regulation is evidenced through a number of mechanisms, among which are deontological codes—documents that define the minimal expectations of moral activity, the ideal standards of conduct, and the accepted conventions of behavior (Elliott-Boyle, 1985).

The codes set forth the principles that journalists, in keeping with their ethical conscience, must abide by as they carry out their work. As Bertrand (2000)

remarks, journalists around the world have found that, because the codes evidence a willingness to engage in self-regulation, they are an effective weapon against the threat of state intervention.

Even though the codes have sparked controversy on some occasions, a majority of academics and communications professionals still clamor for them because they are so effective (Heinonen, 2004).

Twenty years ago, Tina Laitila (1995) analyzed 30 journalistic codes of conduct in Europe, observing that most of them (21) had been adopted or revised in the 1990s. Laitila claims that the introduction of new information technologies—in addition to political changes, such as the fall of the Berlin wall and the European integration process—was one of the main reasons the journalism ethics debate was rekindled during those years.

So, given the huge impact the Internet has had on the work of journalists, it would be interesting to know whether a similar debate has again surfaced and whether the emergence of digital journalism has translated to new ethical guidelines. Let us remember that, in terms of ethics, journalism has been among the most dubious professions in recent years. According to Mamonova (2013), most European press councils are actively involved with the Internet as well as print, radio, and television journalism.

So it was that, in an attempt to adapt self-regulation mechanisms and, more specifically, journalistic codes of ethics to that new reality, a working group organized in the United States by ASNE (American Society of Newspaper Editors) and the Poynter Institute drew up a new code of ethics in 1997 in which the following issues are addressed (Mann, 1998):

1. Reliability of online content
2. Usage of database information
3. Linking
4. Editorial control of potentially hurtful or harmful content
5. Journalistic integrity and commercial pressure

The next question, then, would be: to what extent has the content of deontological codes around the world been adapted to the new digital scenario? This is a question that has been explored extensively with a focus on certain scenarios—for example, in the United States (Whitehouse, 2010), the Netherlands (Deuze and Yeshua, 2001), and Spain (Ruiz, Masip, Micó, 2007)—as well as in comparative studies of two countries (Micó et al, 2008). Until now, however, there has been no research of a global nature on this question. In contrast, in-depth studies on the current status and transformation of press councils have increased since the appearance of the Internet (Eberwein et al, 2011; Hulin & Stone, 2013).

Of all the research done on codes so far, probably the most ambitious is that of González Esteban et al (2011), which was conducted in Austria, Germany, Denmark, Estonia, Spain, France, and Poland; it examined other mechanisms, as well, such as press councils and the role of the ombudsman. These studies concluded that most of these countries lack any type of self-regulation mechanism for online journalism, in general, and all the initiatives that have appeared were spurred by individual media outlets.

No study to date, however, has systematically analyzed the degree to which journalistic codes around the world have been adapted to the new digital journalism reality. This study, therefore, seeks to determine the extent to which national journalistic codes of ethics have been adapted to the new online environment. To achieve this objective, we focused on three research questions:

RQ 1. Are the codes most recently created and/or updated the ones that have the most Internet-related content in their articles?

As Laitila (1995) has pointed out, introduction of the new technologies was one of the driving forces behind an updating or reformulation of the codes of ethics in Europe during the 1990s. One objective of this study is to determine whether the continued development of these ICTs has been a driving force or a consideration in the updating of codes over the past decade, as well.

RQ 2. What countries have modified their codes to the greatest extent in adapting them to the Internet's arrival?

Traditionally, countries in the West have been those most likely and among the first to develop the various self-regulation mechanisms, as several comparative studies have shown (in chronological order, Jones, 1980; Barroso, 1980; Villanueva, 1999; Bertrand, 2000; Himelboim and Limor, 2008). So, another objective of this study is to examine whether this same pattern has been seen in the adaptation to digital journalism.

RQ 3. What aspects of digital journalism and communications per se have the different countries incorporated into their codes?

The point of this question is to determine the extent to which elements specific to digital journalism have been integrated into their rules. What type of digital journalism-related content appears most frequently in the codes analyzed?

## **2. Material and methods**

To conduct this study and achieve the stated objectives, codes that include standards pertaining to the Internet and to journalists' activity on the Internet were identified. In addition, the aspects of digital journalism governed by those codes were determined.

To be specific, 99 journalistic codes of ethics currently in force around the world were studied (see complete list in Appendix I). Two main sources were used: EthicNet<sup>1</sup>, a collection of deontological codes supported by the Department of Journalism and Mass Communication at the University of Tampere, and the database run by the Donald W. Reynolds Journalism Institute (RJI)<sup>2</sup>. EthicNet and RJI list the names of all codes by their English translation.

Only generic codes used nationwide were included in the sample; regional or supranational codes were excluded. The sample also excluded thematic codes and

---

<sup>1</sup> See [http://ethicnet.uta.fi/ethicnet\\_collection\\_of\\_codes\\_of\\_journalism\\_ethics\\_in\\_europe](http://ethicnet.uta.fi/ethicnet_collection_of_codes_of_journalism_ethics_in_europe)

<sup>2</sup> See <http://www.rjionline.org/codes-ethics>

self-regulation rules applicable only to certain topics or areas of journalism. So, codes like the Deontological Code from Catalonia (Spain), the Guidelines for News Embargoes from Belgium, and the Media and Sports Code from Italy, all of which can be found on the EthicNet website, were not included in the sample.

To find the codes that address digital journalism issues, a set list of terms (Table 1) was drawn up, and the entire text of the codes was searched for these terms. They were chosen on the basis of previous studies of a similar nature (Deuze and Yeshua, 2001; Hulin and Stone, 2013; Ruiz, Masip, and Micó, 2007) because they are terms used as synonyms for digital journalism (online, digital, or cyber journalism) or in referring to popular web features (site, website, email, social media, social networking sites) and services (Twitter, Facebook, etc.).

**Table 1.** Search terms used to locate self-regulation codes addressing issues related to Digital Journalism

<b>Blog</b>	<b>Chat</b>
<b>Cyber</b>	<b>Database</b>
<b>Digital</b>	<b>Email</b>
<b>Facebook</b>	<b>Forum</b>
<b>Infographics</b>	<b>Interactive</b>
<b>Internet</b>	<b>Link</b>
<b>Online</b>	<b>Site</b>
<b>Social media</b>	<b>Social networking sites</b>
<b>Twitter</b>	<b>Website</b>

**3. Results and discussion**

According to the results of our study, only a small number of national journalistic codes of ethics include rules for online journalism. Of the 99 self-regulation codes included in the sample, those of only 9 countries mention the Internet and Information and Communication Technologies (ICTs): Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Hungary, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland,



Romania, and the United Kingdom. In other words, 91% of codes around the world lack references to the digital landscape.

At the same time, only Canada's and Luxembourg's code—two of those nine codes—include a section on journalism and digital media, specifically. The remaining codes include different aspects of journalism and online activity in sections devoted to the key principles of professional deontology, such as the respect for privacy and the commitment to accuracy.

The considerations related to digital journalism that appear in the codes analyzed are primarily the management of user-generated content, the use of social media as vehicle and as source, and links to other websites.

The main trends found in these codes are discussed below.

### 3.1 General principles applicable to the online environment

Of the nine codes that make reference to these new forms of communication, seven of them (Albania, Cyprus, Hungary, the Netherlands, Poland, Romania, and the United Kingdom) mention the Internet, explicitly, as a medium they regulate, stating that online material enjoys the same rights and must comply with the same responsibilities as material in the traditional media. For instance, the United Kingdom Editors' Code of Practice assures that "*It is the responsibility of editors and publishers to apply the Code to editorial material in both printed and online versions of publications.*" The Canadian code states that websites are another form of news organization, along with newspapers, magazines, radio, and television, and reminds us that "*Ethical practice does not change with the medium.*"

Something similar happens with the British code's rules regarding privacy of communications. It reminds us that "*The press must not seek to obtain or publish material acquired by using hidden cameras or clandestine listening devices; or by intercepting private or mobile telephone calls, messages or emails*" and that correspondence "*including digital communications*" must be respected.

Along the same line, the Canadian code—as assurance of media independence—grants the right to refuse to share unpublished material “*such as notes and audio tapes of interviews, documents, emails, digital files, photos and video*” with third parties. An exception to this rule could be made when “*such sharing may be necessary to check facts, gain the confidence of sources or solicit more information.*”

Adding the term “online” or “digital” to generic principles of journalistic ethics, however, does not resolve all ethical dilemmas that arise from this new journalism scenario. The United Kingdom Editors’ Code of Practice may be cited as an example, for it stipulates, with regard to privacy, that “*Everyone is entitled to respect for his or her private and family life, home, health and correspondence, including digital communications.*” This statement begs certain questions, however: would the use of social networks fall into the category of digital communications? To what extent may journalists use messages that an individual—named or anonymous—posts on a social network? Clearly, then, this new paradigm raises particular issues that cannot be resolved simply by inserting adjectives into the existing traditional principles of ethics.

Mention of the Internet as a mass medium subject to the rights and ethical obligations addressed in the code constitutes the one and only reference to the online environment in the code of three countries: Hungary, Poland and Romania. This fact implies that they consider new or specific rules for digital journalism to be unnecessary because all the generic rules for traditional media are directly adaptable to the new media. Under these three codes, then, digital journalists would be guided by the same general ethical principles as their colleagues in other media.

According to the Canadian code, blogging is a form of journalism subject to the same obligations as other content; it specifies that “*The need for speed should never compromise accuracy, credibility or fairness. Online content should be reported as carefully as print content, and when possible, subjected to full editing.*” This code places special emphasis on the accuracy of information and expressly prohibits the re-posting of rumors.

In contrast, other codes—the Norwegian code, for example—contain no statement whereby they take digital media, specifically, under their jurisdiction, although they do set rules for specific aspects of online journalism, as detailed later in this article.

### 3.2 Uses of social media

The Canadian code sums up several advantages that social networking sites offer journalists—providing an additional source, for instance. According to this code, *“Journalists are increasingly using social networking sites to access information about people and organizations.”*

The code acknowledges that what individuals post on these networks loses its private message status and, generally speaking, allows these posts to be used as informative material: *“When individuals post and publish information about themselves on these sites, this information generally becomes public, and can be used.”* It also warns, however, that journalists must abide by certain rules for accessing messages on social networks, if their authors had no intention of making them public: *“However, journalists should not use subterfuge to gain access to information intended to be private.”* Likewise, even though the code stipulates that *“We generally declare ourselves as journalists and do not conceal our identities, including when seeking information through social media”*, it adds that *“journalists may go undercover when it is in the public interest.”* Abiding by these stipulations in the Canadian code, a journalist would not be able to impersonate a third person or hack a user’s account to access information. The code also instructs that *“even when such information is public, we must rigorously apply ethical considerations including independent confirmation and transparency in identifying the source of information.”* Under the Canadian code, using social networks to obtain information is subject to the same transparency obligations as traditional journalistic activity.

Within those considerations, the code makes special mention of children: *“we take special care when reporting on children or those who are otherwise unable to give consent to be interviewed (...) we take special care when using any material*

*posted to social media by minors, as they may not understand the public nature of their postings.”*

### 3.3 Linking

The use of links is another of the features unique to digital media and, as such, is addressed in the codes of Canada, Luxembourg, and Norway. These countries all concur in warning that the websites to which links point may be unreliable or fail to comply with ethical norms. Accordingly, the Norwegian code warns that “*digital publication pointers and links could bring you to other electronic media that do not comply with the Ethical Code*” and believes that users of the links must be informed that the links will direct them to other media: “*See to it that links to other media or publications are clearly marked.*”

The Luxembourg code, in turn, states that journalists are obligated to confirm that the website they are creating a link to does not harbor illicit material: “*Before proceeding to creating hyperlinks, the press agrees to verify that the sites concerned do not contain illicit material. If this is the case, the press shall refrain from creating any electronic link.*” Likewise, the Canadian code states: “*When we publish outside links, we make an effort to ensure the sites are credible; in other words, we think before we link.*”

### 3.4 User-generated content

The Internet has progressively facilitated the public’s inclusion and participation in the communication process in such a way that user-generated content is ever more important. Comments was one of the early mechanisms through which the public could participate. The Dutch code has an entire section on “*responses on websites,*” according to which, the editorial office is ultimately responsible for the content appearing on the website, and although they “*cannot be expected to check all these responses in advance,*” they can decide to “*remove previously placed responses.*” In other words, this code requires that comments be moderated not

beforehand but afterwards. The code stresses, in particular, that *“If a response to an article on the website contains a serious accusation or a defamatory expression towards one or more known individuals, the editorial office, on the request of the person(s) involved, must investigate whether there are actual grounds for the accusation or allegation and, if this is not the case, remove the response.”*

To make this task easier for the editor, the Dutch code recommends that the website publish *“the terms and conditions for selection and inclusion of responses.”* This information lets users know what types of messages are acceptable and what types will be filtered for violating ethical norms and could be deleted from the website.

The Norwegian code grants this authority and responsibility for deleting content in connection with digital chatting, as well, stating that *“The editorial staff has a particular responsibility, instantly to remove inserts that are not in compliance with the Ethical Code.”*

There has also been controversy surrounding authorship and the right to quote material that users have uploaded to platforms like YouTube and Flickr. The Canadian code maintains that, in these cases, citing the website from which the material was obtained is not enough—the user who created the material must also be cited. *“We try to obtain permission whenever possible to use online photos and videos, and we always credit the source of the material, by naming the author and where the photo or video was previously posted.”* The code does not take into account, however, the possibility that an author might upload material under a pseudonym. It recommends, also, that user-created material be published solely with informative and not sensationalist zeal: *“We use these photos and videos for news and public interest purposes only, and not to serve voyeuristic interests.”*

### 3.5. Journalists’ use of the Internet

Even though journalists’ personal activity on the Internet is a thorny issue in the digital environment, only the Canadian code targets this for regulation. *“Personal online activity, including emails and social networking, should generally be*

*regarded as public and not private. Such activity can impact our professional credibility.”* It recommends that *“we take special caution in declaring our political leanings online.”* It is understood, then, that the perception of a journalist’s independence could be damaged through his/her activity on Facebook and Twitter.

The Canadian code warns, moreover, that cyberactivism and civic engagement via social media could compromise the journalist’s impartiality. It states: *“As fair and impartial observers, we must be free to comment on the activities of any publicly elected body or special interest group. But we cannot do this without an apparent conflict of interest if we are active members of an organization we are covering, and that includes membership through social media.”*

Although the meaning of *“active membership”* here remains ambiguous, journalists are asked, further on in the text, to take into consideration their *“political activities and community involvements—including those online—(...) if there is a chance we will be covering the campaign, activity or group involved.”*

The code suggests some ways to keep journalists’ private online lives from being marred. *“Our private lives online present special challenges. For example, the only way to subscribe to some publications or social networking groups is to become a member. Having a non-journalist subscribe on your behalf would be one solution, as would be joining a wide variety of Facebook groups so you would not be seen as favouring one particular constituency.”*

The code does acknowledge, however, that these services are useful not only as a source of information but also as a tool for establishing new contacts: *“We encourage the use of social networks as it is one way to make connections, which is part of our core work as journalists.”*

### 3.6 Other aspects

The Internet affords the option to modify or delete content after it has been published. The Canadian code views these options as unlawful, however—even when it is at the request of the public or when the source of the information has requested it. The code stipulates, as the only exceptions, that this information may

be deleted when it concerns “*matters of public safety, an egregious error or ethical violation, or legal restrictions such as publication bans.*” Furthermore, if corrections are made to “*errors online, we indicate that the content has been altered or updated, and what the original error was.*”

The possibility of information available online being modified also has an impact on the reliability of the information sources and query tools to which journalists have access. The Dutch code covers this point, stating that “*The Internet, and search engines connected to it, has largely increased access to archive databases.*” With regard to querying databases, this code states a preference for databases with archives that cannot be user-modified—as they can be on Wikipedia. Under this code, a Dutch journalist should not use this source, given that, “*In principle, public interest in reliable archives, which are as complete as possible and the contents of which cannot be changed, outweighs any individual interest in removing or anonymizing archived articles, the contents of which may be displeasing to this individual. This socially important principle may be deviated from for reasons of private interest, in exceptional cases only.*”

Another issue—this one related to privacy—is the gathering and use of users’ personal information, normally through cookies or similar resources. The Norwegian code is the only one that addresses this issue, stating: “*It is considered good press conduct to inform the users of interactive services on how the publication registers you, and possibly exploits your use of the services.*” This code does not state that it is unlawful to collect such information but recommends that visitors to the website be informed as to what information is being gathered and how it will be used.

Lastly, in the Bosnian code, the Internet is viewed as an additional tool to encourage and promote communication between media outlets and their public. It recommends that “*every issue of each publication shall contain in an appropriate place the name, address, telephone, and if available, fax number and internet/e-mail address of the publisher and editor responsible to whom complaints can be addressed.*”

Also, in a kind of self-referential way, the Luxembourg code speaks of the Internet as a vehicle to promote the visibility of the code itself, stating that “*The Code is the object of a specific publication which will appear on the Internet site of the Press Council. This will also be the case of any update of the Code of Deontology.*”

#### **4. Conclusions**

As this article has shown, the fact that a journalistic code of ethics has recently been adopted or updated is no guarantee that it will include rules for digital activity. Since 2001, 31 codes have been written or revised, but only 9 of them have added specific references to the Internet and ICTs. In other words, in 22 instances of codes that were written or adapted in the twenty-first century, digital journalism was deemed not worth mentioning.

The 9 countries that do include references to it in their codes are in the West; so, as this type of document has been adapted to the new Internet reality, the historical pattern has continued, to some extent: in terms of journalistic self-regulation, countries in the West have always been the most advanced. Then again, there was one unexpected reality: many of the countries where the tradition of self-regulation is strongest—the United States and France, to name two—have not made the decision to modify their codes to adapt them to the Internet and ICTs. Notable among the countries that have the most references to the Internet in their codes are Canada, the United Kingdom, and Norway.

The codes of ethics analyzed reflect an attitude toward the Internet and digital journalism that may be characterized, in short, as a widespread lack of interest and a lack of consistency. As pointed out earlier, in most of the 9 codes that do include references to ICTs, there is nothing more than a statement that online journalism is subject to the same principles as traditional journalism. There are no uniform trends as to how aspects specific to digital journalism are incorporated into the codes of ethics. Each country incorporates recommendations and isolated rules, stemming from the particularities of their national context, and there are hardly any



themes or references that are common to all these codes. The only detectable trend is a concern about the website's and the journalist's responsibility with regard to creating links to other websites—an issue that, even so, is addressed in only 3 of the codes analyzed.

It seems reasonable, therefore, to suggest that an in-depth revision of the content of many of these codes is needed—like the revision accomplished 20 years ago (Laitila, 1995) and like the task undertaken by the Pew Project for Excellence in Journalism a few years ago (Kovach y Rosenstiel, 2003). Based on the testimony of more than 300 professionals and input from several public forums, that project attempted to redefine the existing basic principles upon which the practice of ethical and high-quality journalism should be founded. At that time, concentration of media ownership and sensationalism in content were the two primary incentives for reformulating the basic lines of consensus.

The point is that, even though many of these countries have written specific documents or guidelines to address digital journalism or some particular aspect of it (blogging, social media, etc.), the codes themselves also should be reformulated—for they are, after all, self-regulation's benchmark documents. This is exactly what happened back in the 1990s. Associations and/or press councils formulated a large number of recommendations to regulate very specific issues, such as publication of sensationalist content and news coverage on children, to mention two such issues—but that did not preclude a reformulation of the corresponding codes (Laitila, 1995). In view of the advancement and consolidation of the Internet and ICTs, it only makes sense that something similar would happen now and the text of the codes would be revised in connection with tackling issues such as privacy, for example—an issue that, apart from the new technologies, is still handled in an archaic manner.

With reference to the ASNE and Poynter Institute criteria (Mann, 1998) mentioned at the beginning of this article, the conclusion is that the organizations responsible for adapting journalistic codes of ethics have not applied these criteria consistently. There are references, even though in a minority of cases, to four of the key established principles—reliability of online content, linking, editorial control

of potentially hurtful or harmful content, and the uses of database information—and virtually no reference to the fifth—journalistic integrity and commercial pressure.

So, professional journalist organizations and associations around the world could work along these two lines when proceeding to update, as needed, the content of their codes of ethics. As we have seen, it is these very documents that set forth the standard moral criteria for all journalists. At the same time, however, they clearly define, for the public, the ground rules of the profession—a profession that will have a difficult time maintaining credibility, if those basic norms are obviously out-of-date and belong to a bygone reality.

Even though the ASNE and Poynter Institute criteria have not been applied consistently, it should be pointed out that, in the more than 15 years since those recommendations were made, the journalistic codes of ethics that did get updated have incorporated other aspects of ICTs not addressed by the Poynter Institute—for instance, to mention only two examples, the use of information that users gather when accessing services on the web, and the function of social networks as a source for journalists. The pace at which new services and features are launched means that the Internet is a shifting reality that alters even the basic principles of traditional ethics, such as the respect for privacy: to what extent is a social network a public realm or a private realm?

Journalist organizations around the world should try to keep pace with these changes, as best they can, and fine-tune the content and functioning of their self-regulation mechanisms to the new reality. One step in this direction that might be very useful would be to start revising some of the major supranational codes that were last updated many years ago now. The latest version of the International Federation of Journalists Code was approved in 1986; UNESCO's Principles of Professional Ethics in Journalism dates from 1983; and the European Code of Journalism Deontology dates from 1993. In theory, these revisions could serve as an incentive for member countries of the organizations involved to undertake a similar revision of their own code.

## **References**

- Aznar, H., 2005. *Comunicación responsable*. Second ed. Ariel, Barcelona.
- Barroso, P. 1980. *Principios fundamentales de deontología periodística*. Tesis doctoral. Universidad Complutense, Madrid.
- Belsey, A., Chadwick, R., 1992. *Ethical Issues in Journalism and the Media*. Routledge, London.
- Bertrand, C. J., 2000. *Media Ethics and Accountability Systems*. Transaction Publishers, New Brunswick, NJ.
- Cooper, T. W., 1998. New Technology Effects Inventory: Forty Leading Ethical Issues. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*. 13 (2), 71-92.
- Demir, M., 2011. Importance of Ethic, Credibility and Reliability in Online Journalism. *European Journal of Social Sciences*. 24 (4), 537-545.
- Deuze, M., Yeshua, D., 2001. Online Journalists Face new Ethical Dilemmas. Lessons from the Netherlands. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*. 16 (4), 273-292.
- Eberwein, T. et al (Eds.), *Mapping Media Accountability – in Europe and Beyond*. Harlem, Colonia, pp. 77-89.
- Elliott-Boyle, D., 1985. A conceptual analysis of ethics codes. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*. 1(1), 22–26.
- Ess, C., 2009. *Digital media ethics*. Polity Press, Cambridge and Malden.
- Evers, H., 2001. New Moral Dilemmas in Online. *Journalism.forummedienethik*. 1, 37-46.
- Friend, C., Singer, J. B., 2007. *Online journalism ethics*. ME Sharpe, Armonk, NY.
- García Capilla, D. J., 2012. From Postmodern Ethics to the New Ethics of the Me Generation: The Transition from Mass Media to the Internet. *Comunicación y Sociedad*. 25(1) 165-187.
- González Esteban, J.L. et al., 2011. Professional self-regulation facing new journalistic challenges: a comparative European study. *Revista Latina de Comunicación Social*. 66, 426-453.
- Hayes, A. S., Singer, J. B., Ceppos, J., 2007. Shifting roles, enduring values: The credible journalist in a digital age. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, 22(4): 262–279.

- Heinonen, A., 2004. Journalistic ethics in the age of net, in: Salaverría, R. y Sádaba, C. (Eds.), *Towards New Media Paradigms. Content, Producers, Organisations and Audiences*. Eunote, Pamplona, pp. 213-224.
- Hulin, A., Stone. M. (eds.), 2013. *The Online Media Self-Regulation Guidebook*. OSCE Representative on Freedom of the Media, Vienna.
- Jones, C. 1980. *Mass Media Codes of Ethics and Councils: A Comparative International Study on Professional Standards*. UNESCO, Paris.
- Kovach, B., Rosenstiel, T., 2003. *The Elements of Journalism*. Three Rivers Press, New York.
- Laitila, T., 1995. Journalistic Codes of Ethics in Europe. *European Journal of Communication*. 10, 527-544
- Mamonova, O., 2013. Area of activity of modern press councils in Europe, in: Hulin, A., Stone. M. (Eds.). *The Online Media Self-Regulation Guidebook*. OSCE Representative on Freedom of the Media, Vienna, pp. 104-105.
- Mann, F. (1998). "New Media" Bring a New Set of Problems. Retrieved August, 8, 2013, from <http://www.poynter.org/uncategorized/1734/new-media-bring-a-new-set-of-problems/>
- Micó, J.-L. et al, 2008. La ética en el ejercicio del periodismo: credibilidad y autorregulación en la era del periodismo en internet. *Estudos em comunicação*, 4, 15-39. Retrieved September, 2, 2012, from <http://www.ec.ubi.pt/ec/04/pdf/02-Jose-Lluis-Mico-La-etica-en-el-ejercicio-del-periodismo.pdf>
- Mijatovic, D., 2013. Foreword, in: Hulin, A & Stone. M. (Eds.). *The Online Media Self-Regulation Guidebook*. OSCE Representative on Freedom of the Media, Vienna.
- Pavlik, J., 2001. *Journalism and New Media*. Columbia University Press, New York.
- Ruiz, C., Masip. P., Micó, J. L., 2007. Una ética del ciberespacio o una ética en el ciberespacio? Análisis de los códigos de autoregulación de la profesión periodística, in: VV. AA. *La ética y el derecho de la información en los tiempos del postperiodismo*. Fundación COSO, Valencia, pp. 509-529.

- Villanueva, E., 1999. Códigos deontológicos de la prensa escrita en el mundo. Universidad Iberoamericana, México.
- Ward, S., Wasserman, H., 2010. Towards an Open Ethics: Implications of New Media Platforms for Global Ethics Discourse. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*. 25 (4), 275-292.
- White, A. (coord.), 2008. The Ethical Journalism Initiative. International Journalists Federation, Brussels.
- Whitehouse, G., 2010. Newsgathering and Privacy: Expanding Ethics Codes to Reflect Change in the Digital Media Age. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*. 25 (4), 310-27.

## Appendix I: List of Codes

<b>Country</b>	<b>Code</b>	<b>Adopted/ Last revised in</b>
Albania	Code of Ethics of Albanian Media	2006
Algeria	Algerian Journalists' Charter of Personal and Professional Ethics	2000
Armenia	Code of the Yerevan Press Club Member	2002
Australia	Australian Journalists' Association Code of Ethics	1994
Austria	Code of Ethics for the Austrian Press	1983
Azerbaijan	Code of Professional Ethics for Journalists	2002
Bangladesh	Press Council Code	2002
Belarus	Journalists Ethics Code	1995
Belgium	Code of Journalistic Principles	1982
Benin	Press Code of Ethics	1999
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Press Code of Bosnia and Herzegovina	2006
Brazil	Code of Ethics of the National Federation of Brazilian Journalists	1987
Bulgaria	Ethical Code of the Bulgarian Media	2004
Canada	Canadian Association of Journalists Statement of Principles	2002
Colombia	Code Of Ethics of the Journalists Circle of Bogota	1990
Democratic Republic of the Congo	Code of Ethics of the Congolese Journalist	2004
Costa Rica	Code of Ethics of the Journalists of Costa Rica	1991
Croatia	Honour Codex of Croatian Journalists	2006
Cuba	Ethics Code of the Union of Journalists of Cuba	2013
Cyprus	Journalists' Code of Practice	1997
Czech Republic	Journalists' Code of Ethics	1999
Chad	The Charter of the Tchadian Journalists	1994
Chile	Code of Ethics of the Chilean Order of	1999

	Journalists	
Denmark	The National Code of Conduct	1992
Ecuador	Federacion Nacional de Periodistas Code of Ethics	1978
Egypt	Supreme Council of the Press Code of Ethics <sup>1</sup>	1983
El Salvador	Association of Journalists in El Salvador Code of Ethics	1999
Estonia	The Code of Ethics for the Estonian Press	1997
Ethiopia	Professional Code of Ethics	1998
Fiji	The Media Council's General Media Code Of Ethics And Practice	1999
Finland	Guidelines for Journalists	2005 <sup>2</sup>
France	Charter of the Professional Duties of French Journalists	1938
Georgia	Code of Journalistic Ethics	2001
Germany	German Press Code	2006
Ghana	National Council of the Ghana Journalists Association Code of Ethics	1994
Greece	Code of Ethics for Professional Journalists	1998
Guatemala	Code of Ethics of the Association of Journalists of Guatemala	2000
Hong Kong	Hong Kong Journalists' Association Code of Ethics	1983
Hungary	Ethical Code of the National Association of Hungarian Journalists	2007
Iceland	Rules of Ethics in Journalism	1991
India	Norms of Journalistic Conduct	1995
Iraq	Rules of Professional Ethics	1969
Ireland	Code of Conduct	2007
Italy	Charter of Duties of Journalists	1993

---

<sup>1</sup> The "Supreme Press Council" is not a press council but a government-controlled body.

<sup>2</sup> Adopted by the Union of Journalists in Finland and confirmed by the Council for Mass Media in 2004, operational from 1 January 2005

Ivory Coast	Rights and Duties of the Ivoirian Journalist	1992
Japan	Japan Newspaper Publishers and Editors Canon of Journalism	1995
Kazakhstan	Code of Ethics for Journalists in the Republic of Kazakhstan	1997
Kenya	Code of Conduct for the Practice of Journalism in Kenya	2007
Kosovo	Press Code for Kosovo	2005
Kyrgyzstan	Code of the Association of Journalists of Kyrgyzstan	1999
Latvia	Code of Ethics	1992
Liberia	Code of Ethics of the Press Union of Liberia	1997
Lithuania	Code of Ethics of Lithuanian Journalists and Publishers	2005
Luxembourg	Code of Deontology	2004
Macedonia	Principles of Conduct	2001
Malasya	Canons of Journalism	1989
Mali	Code of Ethics of the Malian Journalist	1991
Malta	Code of Journalistic Ethics	2000
Mexico	Journalists' Code of Ethics	1996
Moldova	Code of Professional Ethics for Journalists	1999
Montenegro	Codex of Montenegrin Journalists	2002
Nepal	Code of Conduct of Journalist	1999
Netherlands	Guidelines from the Netherlands Press Council	2008
New Zealand	The Journalists' Code of Ethics	2000
Nigeria	Code of Ethics for Nigerian Journalists	1999
Norway	Code of Ethics of the Norwegian Press	2007
Pakistan	General Assembly of the Committee of the Press Code of Conduct	1972
Panama	Technical Council of Journalism Declaration of Principles	1979
Papua New Guinea	Journalists Association Code of Ethics	1975
Paraguay	Code of Ethics of the Sindicato de Periodistas del Paraguay	1999
Peru	Code of Ethics of the National Association of	1988



	Journalists of Peru	
Philippines	Journalist's Code of Ethics	1997
Poland	The Code of Journalistic Ethics	2001
Portugal	Journalists' Code of Ethics	1993
Romania	The Journalists' Code of Ethics	2004
Russia	Code of Professional Ethics of Russian Journalist	1994
Rwanda	Charter of Duties and Rights of the Journalists in Rwanda	?
<u>Saudia Arabia</u>	Council of Ministers Media Charter	1982
Senegal	Ethical Charter of Sud Quotidien	1993
Serbia	Journalists' Code	2006
Singapore	Journalists' Code of Professional Conduct	1970s
Slovakia	The Code of Ethics of the Slovak Syndicate of Journalists	1990
Slovenia	Code of Ethics of Slovene Journalists	2002
South Korea	Press Ethics Code	1981
Spain	Deontological Code for the Journalistic Profession	1993
Sri Lanka	Sri Lanka Press Council Code of Ethics for Journalists	1981
Sweden	Code of Ethics for the Press, Radio and Television	2006
Switzerland	Declaration of the Duties and Rights of a Journalist	1999
Thailand	Code of Conduct for Members of the Thai Journalists Association	2000
Togo	Code of Ethics of the Journalists of Togo	1999
Tonga	Tonga Media Council General Code of Ethics for the News Media	?
Tunisia	Association of Tunisian Journalists Code of Ethics	1975
Turkey	Code of Professional Ethics of the Press	1989
Uganda	National Institute of Journalists of Uganda Code of Ethics	1995
Ukraine	Code of Ethics of Ukrainian Journalists	2002

United Kingdom	Code of Conduct	2007
United States of America	Society of Professional Journalists Code of Ethics	1996
Venezuela	Media Code of Practice	1997
Zambia	Code of Ethics of the Media Council	2010