

EXPLORING THE PROFESSIONAL VALUE SYSTEMS OF
CONVERGED JOURNALISTS:
WHAT ARE THEIR VALUES, AND DOES THE MEDIUM MATTER?

A Thesis
presented to
the Faculty of the Graduate School
at the University of Missouri-Columbia

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

By
JESSICA DAYNOR PUCCI
Dr. Lee Wilkins, Thesis Supervisor

MAY 2012

The undersigned, appointed by the dean of the Graduate School, have examined the thesis entitled

EXPLORING THE PROFESSIONAL VALUE SYSTEMS OF
CONVERGED JOURNALISTS:
WHAT ARE THEIR VALUES, AND DOES THE MEDIUM MATTER?

presented by Jessica Pucci,

a candidate for the degree of master's of arts,

and hereby certify that, in their opinion, it is worthy of acceptance.

Professor Lee Wilkins

Dean Esther Thorson

Professor Glenn Leshner

Professor Guy Adams

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I humbly thank my committee—Dr. Lee Wilkins, Dr. Esther Thorson, Dr. Glenn Leshner, and Dr. Guy Adams—for their time, support, and guidance, with extra thanks to Dr. Wilkins for her unwavering patience and inspiring expertise.

Extra thanks are due to library information specialist Sue Schuermann for her assistance in sampling.

Special thanks to my husband, Michael, for making the completion of this thesis possible, and my son, Vincenzo, for making it worthwhile.

EXPLORING THE PROFESSIONAL VALUE SYSTEMS OF CONVERGED
JOURNALISTS: WHAT ARE THEIR VALUES,
AND DOES THE MEDIUM MATTER?

Jessica Pucci

Dr. Lee Wilkins, Thesis Supervisor

ABSTRACT

Scholars have suggested that journalists working in print and online media may emphasize their professional values differently. But what about those inhabiting both worlds? This study investigates the professional value systems of 184 converged journalists—those working on both print and online platforms—to examine whether they emphasize the same values across different media. Respondents completed an online survey based on a portion of the American Journalist Survey; the journalists ranked the importance of 15 values in their print and online work, and selected which values they favored when presented with sets of two. The results reveal that the sample counts all 15 values among its professional value system. When working in print, the sample most emphasized accuracy, speed and providing analysis of complex problems; online, they most emphasized speed, accuracy and letting people express views. When asked to choose between two values, respondents favored accuracy, thoroughness and balance, with accuracy receiving the most emphasis. Although the sample generally emphasized values proportionately between the two platforms, they stressed values more strongly in print than online. The findings indicate that technology has indeed forced change in the values journalists emphasize, but also that social learning is alive in converged newsrooms, and that more traditional values have traveled fluidly to new media. The results lay a foundation for understanding how converged journalists make ethical decisions, and establish convergence journalism as a distinct segment of journalism worthy of further study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ii
ABSTRACT.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
CHAPTER	
1. Introduction: Clashing Cultures, Conflicting Values.....	1
2. Ethical “Osmosis” in the Newsroom.....	6
A History of Social Learning	
Journalists’ Professional Values	
Differences Among Journalists	
Value Systems in the Digital Age	
3. Measuring Value Emphasis.....	20
Journalists and Converged Journalists	
Professional Value Systems	
Sample Demographics	
4. Analyzing Converged Journalists’ Values.....	31
Data Screening	
Factor Analysis	
Converged Journalists Embrace 15 Values in Both Platforms	
Converged Journalists Emphasize Values Differently in Print and Online Work	
Ancillary Analyses: Comparative Rankings and Interviews	
5. Two Platforms, One Value System.....	37
Journalistic Values Unite	
Converged Journalists’ Values: Print versus Online Platforms	
Additional Findings: The Many Faces of Convergence	
6. Converged Journalists: More than Their Platforms.....	52
Implications for Social Learning in Converged Newsrooms	
Implications for Managers and Journalists	
Limitations of the Research	
Future Inquiries into Converged Newsrooms	
Conclusions	

APPENDIX

I: Values and their Corresponding Journalistic Roles.....64

II: Personal interviews.....65

 Respondent 1

 Respondent 2

 Respondent 3

 Respondent 4

 Respondent 5

 Respondent 6

 Respondent 7

III: Survey.....82

BIBLIOGRAPHY.....98

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Sample Demographic Characteristics.....	88
2. Comparative Demographic Characteristics.....	90
3. Principal Components Analysis with Varimax Rotation: Factor Loadings of 15 Journalistic Values.....	91
4. Journalistic Values for Print and Online Media.....	92
5. Paired Samples t Tests: Journalistic Values as a Function of Media (Print vs. Online).....	93
6. Comparative Journalistic Values for Print and Online Media.....	96
7. Spearman's Rho Correlations for Forced-Choice Values: Print vs. Online Media.....	97

CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION: CLASHING CULTURES,
CONFLICTING VALUES

Sixteen years ago, media scholar Michael Smith (1996) wrote, “Life in newsroom hell today is characterized by the feeling that values are not connected to the new work required.” At the time, newspapers were only beginning to establish websites, yet even then, Smith argued that technology (and the demographic shifts and economic forces technology introduces in the newsroom) had stirred up cynicism and skepticism in the journalistic workplace, and forced a disconnect between what a journalist’s values are and the work they produce. Years later, we’ve digitized our news and newsrooms, and many journalists who were hired for their print work now find themselves in converged newsrooms—that is, they and their coworkers produce news online as well as in print. How are their journalistic values faring in the converged newsroom, and in the tug-of-war between those values and the demands of print and online media platforms, which side is winning?

Long considered to be an occupational group that embraces and emphasizes its professional values, journalists outrank all but seminarians/philosophers, medical students and practicing physicians in terms of moral development (Coleman & Wilkins, 2004), and their professional ideals of fairness, balance and truth-telling are practically universal. But in an age in which the term “journalist” embraces both notebook-wielding beat reporters and laptop-armed online correspondents, the standards once known as journalistic values are no longer generalizable to the profession.

The new digital platforms journalists may find themselves working on necessitate a change in the values they emphasize in the newsroom. Several scholars have identified elements of online journalism that provoke those who create it to realign their professional values. The 24-hour online newsroom and the quick deadlines that accompany it may compel journalists to trade accuracy for speed (Arant & Anderson, 2001; Friend & Singer, 2007). And while editorial and circulation departments are often walled off in traditional media, online journalists are privy to Web traffic trends of their content, which has forced some journalists to rely less on their news judgment instincts and more on statistics (MacGregor, 2007), and others to worry that entertainment will eclipse news standards (Friend & Singer, 2007). Even the journalists themselves affect the online newsroom's values: Online newspapers typically have small staffs (Arant & Anderson, 2001), and some Web employees are recruited based on their Internet prowess rather than their journalism skills; because values are learned socially, staffs without journalism experience may never soak up traditional values (Arant & Anderson, 2001; Brill, 2001). The changes between traditional and new media aren't all doom and gloom: Some scholars have argued that the Web can improve the news' credibility due to the transparency of online journalism (Friend & Singer, 2007). Yet even that silver lining hasn't entirely changed the attitudes of online journalists toward their traditional counterparts: In Arant and Anderson's 2001 study, 30% of online editors agreed that online newspaper journalists are not as likely to follow traditional journalism standards as are their traditional print colleagues.

In 1982, 1992 and again in 2002, Indiana University scholars Weaver, Wilhoit and their colleagues conducted a nearly identical survey that asked traditional journalists

(and a small, separate sample of online journalists in 2002) how important 15 journalistic values (such as verifying facts) were to them. The scholars also combined the values into four broader “roles”: interpretive, adversarial, disseminator and populist mobilizer (Weaver et al., 2007). The 2002 results revealed that print and online journalists emphasize many professional values similarly—as well as significant differences between the two groups. Both groups were almost equally likely to emphasize journalism’s adversarial functions, but online journalists were more likely than print journalists to stress interpretive values, and less likely to support populist mobilizer values. When it came to disseminator values, online journalists were as likely as traditional journalists to emphasize getting information to the public, but less likely to stress reaching a wide audience, providing entertainment and factual verification (Weaver et al., 2007).

The literature suggest that those working in print and online media may emphasize values differently. But what about the journalists inhabiting both worlds? Do converged journalists—those working in multimedia newsrooms—stress one set of values when writing a news blurb for the Web, and another when reporting an investigative piece for the Sunday paper? By 1994, about 20 newspapers offered an online product; today, virtually every daily newspaper has a Web site (Friend & Singer, 2007). Yet while newspapers have added digital platforms to their presences, they don’t double their staffs—the content that appears in print is often produced by journalists who also create for the screen. And while nearly all journalists share general ethical principles, journalists identify with both their profession and their media outlet, which may put their

professional values in conflict (Friend & Singer, 2007). According to Friend and Singer (2007, pg. 211),

“Restructured newsrooms seeking cross-platform content ask journalists to loosen allegiance to their organization in favor of a stronger allegiance to the more broadly defined profession of journalism...An issue that can occur is the translation of ethical standards across media platforms.”

The professional value systems of converged journalists have not yet been researched. However, Johnson and Kelly (2003) examined the values of 187 editors of online versions of traditional newspapers and found that while they ranked journalistic values similarly to the traditional journalists in an earlier Weaver and Wilhoit study, they emphasized them less; in other words, the scholars’ sample of online journalists stressed the same values as print journalists, but the print journalists clung to those values more. The authors argued that their value system separated online editors—trained as traditional journalists, but influenced by the online environment—from those working in either medium alone.

Thus, this thesis is a quantitative study that will explore the values of converged journalists via the following research questions:

RQ1: What are the professional value systems of converged journalists?

RQ2: Do converged journalists emphasize the same values across different media?

The thesis explores converged journalists’ ethics by asking them to identify their values, then asking which of those values they emphasize in each medium. The study is embedded in social learning theory, the prevailing theory as to how newsroom employees acquire their professional value systems: By asking converged journalists to articulate their values in both media, the study’s findings will ultimately speak to the degree to which social learning is taking place in converged newsrooms, and the fluidity of values

from traditional journalism to new media. The results will lay a foundation for understanding how converged journalists make ethical decisions.

This research has implications for both managers and scholars. Managers' failure to understand ideological differences between themselves and their employees is a major cause of occupational conflict; such conflict can be avoided or resolved by determining and aligning the value systems of subordinate and superior (Brown, 1976). Therefore, exploring converged journalists' professional values will assist news managers in guiding the direction of their newsrooms and tailoring their staffs. Most importantly, this study will add to the already wide body of research on journalism ethics and values, and help build the emerging literature on convergence journalism. This study furthers existing research—for example, extending Johnson and Kelly's (2003) study of online newspaper editors and Weaver and Wilhoit's methods to converged journalists—and establishes groundwork for understanding the ethical decision-making and socialization of converged newsrooms.

The thesis begins with a review of social learning theory and how it applies to professional values in the media. It then presents literature on the value systems of traditional journalists, studies that illustrate differences between journalists in various work environments, and research on values in the digital age that demonstrates how professional values in an online newsroom may differ from those in traditional media environments. After presenting the project's methodology, sampling data and results, the thesis concludes with a summary of the findings, implications for managers and scholars, and suggested areas for future research.

CHAPTER TWO ETHICAL “OSMOSIS” IN THE NEWSROOM

A history of social learning: Current literature in ethics and moral development suggests that people obtain their general values from family, religious and cultural environments—sources outside the professional realm—but that professional work influences how those values are prioritized in a professional context (Plaisance & Skewes, 2003). For example, journalists have been shown to value both truth and privacy; how journalists emphasize and balance those values when making ethical decisions in the workplace is a method honed in a professional setting where such decisions are replicated by coworkers and supported by the newsroom culture. In other words, if one journalist consistently weights truth above privacy, his newsroom peer may emulate that ranking in his own ethical decisions, creating a newsroom culture that tends to support truth over privacy. This manner of modeling and reinforcement—what scholars call newsroom socialization—are elements of a learning process that is described at its most basic level by social learning theory.

Social learning (or social cognition) is a groundbreaking concept fathered by Stanford scholar Albert Bandura in the mid-20th century. Social learning theory holds that people learn information and behaviors vicariously, by observing others and subsequently imitating them; in his 1977 book on the subject, “Social Learning Theory,” Bandura explained it this way:

“Learning would be exceedingly laborious, not to mention hazardous, if people had to rely solely on the effects of their own actions to inform them what to do. Fortunately, most human behavior is learned observationally through modeling: from observing others one forms an idea of how new behaviors are performed, and on later occasions this coded information serves as a guide for action.”

Later, Walter Mischel (1973) suggested that five “person variables”—including competencies, attention and expectancies—influenced the interaction between individuals and social environment.

Since its inception, researchers in many disciplines have investigated the inner workings of social learning. For example, psychologists’ studies in child and animal social learning have led to significant findings in animal cognition and child development; biologists have explored the impact of socially learned information on Darwinian fitness in a wide variety of contexts; sociologists have studied the consequences of social learning on group social structure; and anthropologists have examined how the social transmission of behavior in non-humans may explain human cultural evolution (Kendal, 2004).

Early in his development of social learning theory, Bandura extended the concept to moral behavior. His landmark (but also heavily criticized) “Bobo doll” experiments in the early 1960s suggested that aggression was learned by observation of an adult model. Later, in an addendum to a 1963 Bobo doll experiment and a response to attempts to replicate it, Bandura (1969) stressed that moral behavior was developmental in nature and more pliable than previously thought. He added that parents were not the sole source of children’s moral judgments and behavior; other adults, peers and “models presented in symbolic forms” influence moral development, too (Bandura, 1969). Later, Bandura made two important additions to his theory. First, he determined that reinforcement was not the sole factor that influenced behavior; behavior was a result of both external circumstances as well as mental states (such as satisfaction) (1986). Second, he eschewed the opinions of behaviorists and claimed social learning illustrates that people can learn

information without demonstrating new behavior, making a distinction between moral competence and performance. For example, one may know a behavior is wrong (moral competence) and perform the behavior anyway (moral performance). These notions form the foundation of social learning theory, and while scholars have since carried the ideas forward, many have also disapproved of Bandura's methods.

Yet even before Bandura's Bobo doll studies, there was evidence of social learning in newsrooms, though the theory wasn't correlated to the profession (or organizational behavior) until the latter half of the 20th century. In 1955, Breed interviewed 120 newspaper staffers, none of whom had participated in a job training program; he determined that the journalists learned policy socially, "by osmosis" (pg. 328). Breed wrote,

"When a reporter starts work he is not told what policy is. Nor is he ever told... The learning of policy is a process by which the recruit discovers and internalizes the rights and obligations of his status and its norms and values. He learns to anticipate what is expected of him so as to win rewards and avoid punishments (Breed, 1955, pg. 328)."

Respondents indicated several reasons for conforming to policy—feelings of obligation and esteem for superiors, aspirations of mobility and a drive to produce news among them. Breed argued that those elements contribute to the formation of a reference group behavior that team members emulate (Breed, 1955).

Thirty years later, Endres (1985) carried Breed's work forward with a quantitative study that sought to determine how, why and from whom ethical attitudes were formed. More than 400 journalists ranked eight ethical influences, six external to the newsroom and two internal; the journalists ranked the two internal influences—colleagues' behavior and journalistic experience—second and third in importance. Additionally, when asked if

they agreed with the statement that they observed colleagues' ethical behavior and attempted to emulate it, 89 percent agreed to some extent. Endres argued that the weight given to coworkers' behavior indicates the existence of role modeling and ethical socialization processes at work (Endres, 1985).

In the last decade, scholars have shifted attention from the socialization of basic ethical ideals to that of newsroom values. In their 2003 study of 355 newspaper journalists, Plaisance and Skewes found that personal values and professional roles interact to influence journalists' behavior; the authors hold that while more general, personal values are influenced by personal elements such as family, religion and culture, journalistic ones are influenced by professional socialization. In more recent literature, scholars commonly hold that values are closely influenced by the newsroom's social and organizational culture, as well as technology (Friend and Singer, 2007; MacGregor, 2007).

The literature suggest that the social learning of ethics carries through to nontraditional newsrooms. In an analysis of four newsroom case studies, Singer (2004) found that despite clashes of culture, staffers in converged newsrooms reported learning from colleagues with different strengths and an increased respect for different news jobs; the author also found that social norms defined the range of tolerable behavior and created standards for staffers.

Formal education, journalism training, and institutional ethics codes should not be disregarded as significant influences on journalists' professional value systems. Rather, these sources should be viewed as vehicles of newsroom socialization, as the values embedded in these avenues are communicated socially.

The foundation for journalists' professional value systems is often laid in the classroom, and built upon with the practical newsroom training that often accompanies a journalism degree. Several studies have found significant differences in journalists with and without formal education in the field. In 1989, the Poynter Institute evaluated a survey by the American Society of Newspaper Editors of 200 news interns at major U.S. papers, and found that most were journalism majors, 80 percent had student newspaper experience, and nearly all had some form of classroom ethics training (Fry, 1989). According to a committee of analysts, the interns generally reflected the traditional values of journalism, and in some cases reported even more idealistic views of conflicts of interest, and took harsher stances on plagiarism than their professional peers. And while journalism school provides a foundation of journalism values, practical experience grounds those ethical teachings in reality (Reinardy & Moore, 2007). Coleman and Wilkins (2004) also claim that while education plays a critical role in journalists' ethical development, their ethical reasoning changes in response to age and experience.

Formal ethics codes have also been shown to affect journalists' management and performance; one survey showed that editors at newspapers with ethics codes had more stringent views of ethical violations, and suspended or dismissed more employees (Morin & Giles, 1986). Another survey of managing editors showed that the respondents actively distributed copies of their code to staffers and disciplined them for violations of it (Anderson, 1987). But a written code may not influence journalists as much as a newsroom's interpretation and implementation of it. Following a qualitative examination of ethics codes in three newsrooms, Boyeink (1994) found that the mere presence of a code was unlikely to inspire journalists to depend on it; only when used and shared by a

newsroom leadership that is committed to institutional standards and fosters a culture of ethical sensitivity do codes become important; he also argues that that ethical debates in newsrooms are essential to decision-making. Both findings imply that while codes may suggest how to handle ethical decisions, emphasizing the code's values is the work of the social newsroom. However, Battistoli's (2008) findings suggest that codes have less power in communicating values. He, too, examined a single newsroom with a longstanding ethics code and an 11-person ethics team, and found that journalists relied first on their personal codes of ethics and coworker assistance and support to resolve ethical dilemmas, and that interpersonal communication was the primary mode of communication of ethical information (Battistoli, 2008).

Instead of codes affecting values, research has suggested the opposite: Wilkins and Brennen (2004) suggest that ethics codes are influenced by the social newsroom culture, which supports the idea that the value system of a print newsroom may emphasize different values from that of a converged newsroom. The authors suggest, "analysis of ethics codes should consider the specific context surrounding the creation of the codes as well as the actual issues and concepts addressed in the codes and the language used to convey both strictures and aspirations," (Wilkins & Brennen, 2004, pg. 298).

The professional values conveyed through codes, journalism education and on-the-job training slowly and subtly makes its way into a journalist's reality through workplace communication over time (Donsbach, 2004), which is the essence of newsroom socialization. Thus, by researching converged journalists' professional value systems, this study examines the extent to which socialization takes place in

nontraditional newsrooms. The sources of socialization in converged newsrooms (which may be small-staffed, non-traditionally educated and without formal codes) is an area for future study.

Journalists' professional values: As the literature has shown, professional journalistic values have developed normatively into a set of moral standards that drive editorial decisions big and small. The traditional values of journalism—truth-telling, timeliness and integrity among them—are part of the newsroom soul; nearly universal, they have been found to be indifferent to the size or location of the media organization where they are held (Smith, 1996).

Several scholars have attempted to profile journalists' professional values, although much of the literature confounds professional values with personal ones and other journalistic standards. "Accuracy" and "truth" were also ranked highly by journalist respondents in other studies (Sylvie & Huang, 2008; Boudana, 2008; Battistoli, 2009; Klaidman & Beauchamp, 1987). Although commonly known as an ideal more than a value, "objectivity" has been identified in several studies as the value most dear to journalists (Boudana, 2008; Battistoli, 2009; Schultz, 2007; White, 1950). "Honesty" topped more than one-third of journalists' ranked values in Plaisance and Skewes' 2003 study, followed by "fair" "Justice" (Quinn, 2007) and "balance" have been identified as important values in other research. The French combine two values in their own term for journalism's key ideal: *etre juste*, "to be accurate and fair" (Boudana, 2008).

Weaver and Wilhoit have developed the most comprehensive profile of journalists' professional values with their American Journalist Survey, conducted in 1982, 1992 and 2002. The survey—nearly identical in each decade—asked traditional

journalists how important 15 journalistic values (such as *serve as an adversary of government*) were to them. Of those values, two—*investigating government claims* and *getting information to the public quickly*—have remained dominant among journalists over the survey’s three decades; in the 2002 sample, 59% of respondents emphasized timeliness, while 71% emphasized the government watchdog role (Weaver et al., 2007). Conversely, the 2002 ranked lowest the values *point to possible solutions* (24%), *motivate people to get involved* (39%), and *let people express views* (39%) (Weaver et al., 2007).

But balance, truth-telling and the others do not act alone. Rather than measure values singularly, Kamakura and Mazzon (1991) urge scholars to examine values in systems using methodology based in the Rokeach Values Survey (which emphasizes analyzing values in terms of relational groups) in order to compare populations via these systems instead of the mere existence of singular values. Weaver et al. (2007) used a different survey to group values into four larger “roles” or value systems, while Plaisance and Skewes (2003) combined both surveys to examine how values interact with Weaver’s roles. Brown (1976) argues that value systems—what she defines as “an enduring organization of beliefs concerning preferable modes of conduct or end-states of existence along a continuum of relative importance”—are the most critical element of workplace success; she holds that employees and their managers can only avoid conflict when their professional value systems align as closely as possible.

Viewing professional values in systems reveals interesting implications for newsroom managers: Because journalists’ professional value systems shape their editorial decisions (Sylvie & Huang, 2008), understanding those systems may allow

managers to predict their team's behavior. Additionally, comprehending professional values may help managers to tailor their staffs as they see fit, as staffs of different sizes tend to embrace different value systems (Weaver et al., 2007).

Differences among journalists: Disparities in education and training levels and the existence of formal codes—some of the main tools of ethics socialization, and therefore professional value development—differ within subsets of journalists, and likely appear between traditional print journalists, online journalists, and those that work in both mediums. Though few scholars have attempted to examine the differences between online journalists and those working in traditional media, this study assumes differences do exist, based on research that has uncovered disparities in the value systems of other journalist cohorts.

On a large scale, research has found that journalists' value systems vary culturally. For example, a study of French and U.S. journalists uncovered that while both groups agreed that breaching confidentiality was almost universally wrong, the French were more likely to approve of badgering sources, paying for confidential information, and assuming a false identity, while Americans were more supportive of using personal documents in their reporting (McMane, 1993). A recent ethnographic study of Asian and Middle Eastern journalists revealed that journalists in those regions were suspicious of a Western-imposed journalistic value system, and eschew values such as truth-telling in favor of respect, tolerance, freedom and truth-telling with restraint (Rao & Lee, 2005). A year later, Quandt et al. (2006) used Weaver and Wilhoit's value systems to compare American online journalists with German ones, and found that although both groups

emphasize journalism's interpreter and disseminator roles, Americans have been found to be more likely to use aggressive reporting methods.

Further research has identified slighter value differences among subsets of media. A 2005 interview-based study examined 22 U.K. journalists' switch from the mainstream to the alternative press, and determined that those journalists used a hybrid-style collection of traditional and alternative skills, attitudes and ethics to do their jobs, though respondents also cited using different news values at each organization type (Harcup, 2005). The recent phone hacking scandal of *News of the World* and other British tabloids (in which News Corporation owner Rupert Murdoch was said to have fostered a "do whatever it takes to get the story" newsroom culture) further illustrated the ethical divide between newspaper types. Recent research at the University of Missouri found that journalists at American daily newspapers and alternative weeklies defined "objectivity" slightly differently (Painter, 2009).

Value systems in the digital age: Naturally, the discourse on normative journalism ethics has turned to its interpretation and practice in the digital age. Is the collective value system of journalists today the same as it always was? Are the values the industry hold dear prevailing—or failing?

Because Web-based job titles are relatively new to journalism (and because there is no one definition of "journalist" adequate for all purposes), online journalists have not been studied extensively, and converged journalists even less so. Still, Weaver (2007) and Wilhoit have developed a profile of online journalists via data from their 2002 American Journalist Survey, which included a small sample of online journalists. Generally, online journalists are more similar to traditional print journalists than they are

to broadcast journalists. Like print journalists, online journalists are roughly one-third female; Web journalists average 39 years of age, while print journalists average 41. Online, journalists, are more often politically liberal, and tend to be more highly educated; 36% of online journalists reported some graduate education compared to 23% of print, while 27% of online had earned a graduate degree, compared to 18% of print journalists. Both groups were nearly equally as likely to have majored in journalism (Weaver et al., 2007).

But while print and online journalists share similar demographics, the same survey identifies undeniable differences between their value systems. The sample emphasized the values of *getting information to the public quickly, investigating government claims, analyzing complex problems, and discussing national and international policy*, but downplayed *reaching the widest audience, providing entertainment and relaxation, setting the political agenda, pointing to solutions, and developing cultural interests* (Weaver et al., 2007). Compared to the survey's sample of traditional journalists, the online journalists were less likely to consider factual verification, reaching a large audience, and provide relaxation; overall, the group downplayed the disseminator function that traditional journalists emphasized in favor of the interpretive role (Weaver et al., 2007).

Converged journalists have not been studied in a similar fashion. However, one recent European study examines a sample of print journalists who transitioned to online work: Thurman and Myllylahti's (2009) inquiry of the Finnish daily financial paper *Taloussanommat*, which shuttered its print edition in 2007 (and was the first paper in Europe to do so). Analyzing the staff's transition from a print model to an online one, the

authors made several noteworthy findings: First, the new goals to maximize traffic and target certain types of users while maintaining quality caused tensions between reporters and editors. Reporters and editors differed in how much weight they assigned to traffic statistics, but both reported pressure from the publisher to increase site visitation, which by some standards could constitute a breach of “the wall” between editorial and business, which could certainly affect ethics in the newsroom. The increased speed of the news cycle also affected the team: First, the site’s news editor reported that while the journalists’ workload had increased, they had the same time to consult and fact-check sources as they always did; not all of the journalists agreed. The journalists wrestled with their desire to publish complete, full stories rather than immediate, incomplete one that may be updated later. The newsroom also reported a deviation from original reporting in favor of increased aggregated content. (Thurman & Myllylahti, 2009)

Thurman & Myllylahti’s study touches on the notion that, while online journalism is still journalism, journalists working on digital platforms require some very different technologies, skills and responsibilities that provoke a change in the professional values they emphasize. According to Friend & Singer (2007),

“Journalists are journalists whatever the medium, so principles such as truth and independence are universally applicable. But at the same time, the online medium poses particular ethical challenges, rooted both in its technical structure and in the social norms that have taken shape around and because of that structure (pg. 54).”

The authors argue that the speed at which information is published online affects professional value systems: In the rush to post content, stories may not undergo thorough reporting or fact-checking. Several scholars have linked digital journalism (and all of the speed, traffic statistics and interactivity that come with it) with changing value systems.

In Arant and Anderson's 2001 survey, 47% of online news editors said the ability to publish information immediately online has caused an erosion of fact-checking standards, and there was no consensus on how to correct erroneous content. Additionally, that survey suggests that editors find small Web staffs to be problematic, and that when it comes to online news, the traditional "wall" between advertising and editorial has been lowered: 26% of respondents said editorial staffers also write and design ads, and 58% had no qualms with publishing links to preferred advertisers within editorial content.

In an article that appeared in the Society of Professional Journalists' periodical *Quill*, several ethics educators expressed concern over Web journalists' values; sources said that because news is reported faster than ever online, ethics may be lost in the process (South, 2004). One educator said, "[The] cut and paste technology makes it easier to appropriate somebody else's work, and online culture espouses that 'everything on the Net is free for the taking,'" (South, 2004, pg. 11), while others questioned the ethical sensitivity of current students as using digital platforms becomes standard. According to ethicist Clifford Christians (2005), today's media exists in what Nietzsche called the era beyond good and evil, one in which ethics have been replaced by aesthetics.

Domingo (2007) observed that the existence of interactivity affected news decisions; in an ethnographic study of four newsrooms—one online-only organization, two newspapers and one broadcast station—one newspaper and the Web-only portal checked their traffic statistics several times each day. When asked whether that data influenced their news decisions, editors said that "newsworthiness criteria should prevail," but one reporter said, "You would not change the main story, but surely a popular piece will keep its place on the homepage rather than other secondary stories

with less readers,” (Domingo, 2007, pg. 12). The study also looked at audience feedback: The newspapers received only some response that was channeled from generic email addresses through editors to reporters if necessary, but at the online-only newsroom, every story was bylined and each author received direct feedback; those reporters received more emails than the newspaper journalists. Additionally, only the online newsroom ran comments beneath each article, and the journalists at that organization reported feeling more closely connected with their readers (Domingo, 2007).

In O’Sullivan and Heinonen’s 2008 study of European journalists in 11 countries, the authors noted several disparities between print and online journalists. They reported that 93 percent of print journalists held that face-to-face conversation was the most valued mode of newsgathering, while only 63 percent of online journalists shared that view. And while 48 percent of print journalists reported having no knowledge of what content audiences read, 100 percent of the Web journalists had some knowledge of their audiences’ reading behaviors (O’Sullivan & Heinonen, 2008). As a whole, the sample did not view the Internet as a threat to the quality of journalism, but are hesitant to abandon traditional values and instead cling to the values they feel legitimizes journalism and elevates the status of the profession.

Undoubtedly, different media platforms force journalists to emphasize different skills. Do journalists also emphasize different values when working with (and constantly switching between) print and the Web? That question is the heart of the proposed study. This research project seeks to answer two research questions:

RQ1: What are the professional value systems of converged journalists?

RQ2: Do converged journalists emphasize the same values across different media?

CHAPTER THREE METHODS: MEASURING VALUE EMPHASIS

Following other scholars who have measured values quantitatively, this study employs an Internet survey (as well as follow-up interviews) to examine the following research questions:

RQ1: What are the professional value systems of converged journalists?

RQ2: Do converged journalists emphasize the same values across different media?

The thesis investigates journalists' professional value systems through the eyes of social learning theory, the predominant theory as to how journalists acquire their professional value systems. The theory holds that people learn information and behaviors vicariously, by observing others and subsequently imitating them; applied to journalism, the theory has shaped studies that have suggested that values are closely influenced by the newsroom's social and organizational culture, as well as technology (Friend & Singer, 2007; MacGregor, 2007), and that those values influence journalists' professional behavior (Plaisance & Skewes, 2003). In converged newsrooms, journalists trained in print or online media have been shown to bridge culture clashes and share skills and professional respect. For the purposes of this study, asking converged journalists to articulate their values in print and online platforms sheds light on the degree to which social learning is taking place in converged newsrooms, and the fluidity of values from traditional journalism to new media.

Answering the research questions requires operational definitions of "converged journalists" and "professional value systems":

Journalists and converged journalists: For this research’s purposes, explications of “converged journalist” and begins with “journalist” first to divide the profession from the rest of the public; beginning with the “converged” aspect would force the definition to classify those who provide content on multiple media platforms first, rather than those who do journalism. Some research has defined “journalists” according to time spent doing the job and amount of focus on traditional values. Another paper, in an attempt to explicate “journalists,” argued that because exceptions exist to every other definition, a journalist can be defined as only one who is perceived by their audience as presenting meaningful information to the public (Hayes, Singer & Ceppos, 2007). In 1997, a forum of the Committee of Concerned Journalists described journalists in terms of their purpose, defining them as providers “of reliable, verified, true information—even seeker[s] of truth” (CCJ, 1997). Friend & Singer (2007) recognize that other definitions of “journalist” center on the profession’s gatekeeping role. Those definitions, however, may include those who follow journalism’s ideals but are not paid for their work, employed by a media outlet or work in a newsroom.

Thus, the current study follows other research that has placed importance on on-staff status by including only employed journalists in their samples (Arant & Anderson, 2001; Coleman & Wilkins, 2004; Weaver et al., 2007). Hayes, Singer and Ceppos (2007) argue that journalistic credibility is attached primarily to media companies rather than individual journalists. In their 2007 report, Ugland and Henderson divide journalists into three tiers: public communicators, second-level journalists and top-level journalists. Second-level journalists and top-level journalists differ in training, affiliation with news organizations, and standards of practice; top-level journalists have moral duties to the

news and that their commitments are often expressed through ethics codes and other traits (Ugland & Henderson, 2007), and are typically found on staffs of media organizations. Finally, in February 2009 the U.S. House of Representatives passed the Free Flow of Information Act, which offers a promising definition of a journalist: "...a person who regularly gathers, photographs, records, writes, edits, reports, or publishes information concerning matters of public interest for dissemination to the public for a substantial portion of the person's livelihood or substantial financial gain" (H.R. 985).

Therefore, for the purposes of this study, the definition of "journalist" combines the definitions set forth by the Free Flow of Information Act and Weaver (2007) and Wilhoit, who described journalists as "those who had responsibility for the preparation or transmission of news stories or other timely information—all full-time reporters, writers, correspondents, editors, news announcers, columnists, photojournalists and other news people." This study defines "journalist" as "a person who gathers, photographs, records, writes, edits, reports, prepares or transmits news stories or other timely information for dissemination to the public full-time."

To define "convergence journalist," it should be reiterated here that this study evaluates only journalists working on both print and online platforms. As of 2002, most American journalists were employed by print media (more specifically, daily newspapers), and more closely share perceptions of journalism roles than those working in broadcast journalism (Weaver et al., 2007). Friend and Singer (2007) define "convergence" as "a combination of news staffs, technologies, products or geography from previously distinct print, television and online media," and "convergence journalists" as "newspaper and television journalists in partnered organizations cross-

promoting each other's stories to reporters producing content for print, on-air and online distribution," this study removes mentions of broadcast from its definition. Therefore, this study defines "convergence journalist" as "a person who gathers, photographs, records, writes, edits, reports, prepares or transmits news stories or other timely information for dissemination to the public via print and online distribution full-time."

Professional value systems: This study adopts Brown's (1976) definitions of values and, further, value systems. Brown describes values as beliefs on which a person acts on by preference; a belief that a particular way of acting is preferable to another way. Values cannot be true or false, good or bad, and "to say that a person has a value is to say that he or she knows (cognition) the correct way to behave or the correct end-state to strive for; can feel (emotion) about it, i.e. be for or against it, and will act in a certain way (behavior) as a result of the way he or she feels about it" (Brown, 1976, pg. 16). Value systems, then, are collections of values that are comparable among populations (Kamakura & Mazzon, 1991). As defined by Brown (1976), value systems are "organization[s] of beliefs concerning preferable modes of conduct or end-states of existence along a continuum of relative importance" (pg. 16). Because this research explores only those values related to the journalism profession and not personal ones, "professional value systems" will be defined here as "organizations of beliefs concerning preferable modes of professional of conduct or end-states of existence along a continuum of relative importance." It is important to note that Weaver and Wilhoit's survey—the method on which this research is based—refers to the items on their 15-item scale as "values" and "ideals," and the four larger groupings of values as "roles" and "functions,"

and subsequent literature has followed suit. For the purposes of this study, the survey items will be termed “values” for clarity.

To examine the research questions, this study will administer a Web-based survey (see Appendix III) to a sample of converged journalists working in both print and online media. Aside from being an established method of values studies (Endres, 1985; Weaver et al., 2007), survey methodology is appropriate for this research because it allows for a larger population of study, important here because newsrooms are currently converged in varying degrees (that is, some converged journalists work more heavily in one medium than another, while others balance their responsibilities between media). A survey allows for a broader sample of journalists in several levels of convergence, yielding a clearer picture of which values are emphasized among converged journalists as a whole. Although several previous ethics studies have employed the Rokeach Values Survey, its design (which asks participants to rank 18 values in its original form) may introduce user fatigue in an online survey. Additionally, that survey, while tweaked for recent studies, does not differentiate between personal and professional values; “honesty” for instance—one of the survey’s values—is not defined as either a personal value or as a synonym for the widely held professional value of “truth-telling.” Therefore, this study employs a version of the more current, shorter, and occupation-focused values survey created by scholars Weaver and Wilhoit for their 2002 American Journalist Survey.

Other scholars have employed Weaver and Wilhoit’s survey in several ways. In 2003, Johnson and Kelly adopted the same survey in their own study of online newspaper editor’s values. Quandt et al. (2006) used the 2002 survey’s results along with a similar survey of German online journalists to compare the value systems of both samples.

Finally, Plaisance and Skewes (2003) used Weaver and Wilhoit's role structures in addition to a version of the Rokeach survey to evaluate how personal values predict professional roles.

Within Weaver and Wilhoit's extensive journalist survey, one section asked the sample of traditional journalists (and a separate sample of online journalists in 2002) how important 15 journalistic values (such as "provide analysis of complex problems") were to them, then used factor analysis to combine the values into four broader attitudinal groups—essentially, value systems—to evaluate the sample's core journalistic beliefs; the systems (called roles by the study's authors) are: interpretive, disseminator, adversarial and populist mobilizer (Weaver et al., 2007). They also asked a battery of demographic questions, although the personal factors did not significantly predict role conceptions.

This study uses a purposive sample of converged journalists to amass a large respondent group that matches the definition of "converged journalists" set forth above: "a person who gathers, photographs, records, writes, edits, reports, prepares or transmits news stories or other timely information for dissemination to the public via print and online distribution full-time." This study concentrates on only those journalists working in both print and online capacities to maximize the response rate; as of 2002, most full-time American journalists were print journalists concentrated in daily newspapers, and online journalists were found to have more role conceptions in common with print journalists than broadcast journalists (Weaver et al., 2007). To amass the sample, all news editors employed by English-language American print newspapers (daily, weekly

and alternative newspapers) within the Cision media database were emailed an invitation to complete the survey.

Participants were asked to rank the importance of 15 randomized journalistic values (see Appendix I)—the same 15 set forth by Weaver and Wilhoit (2007)—in both their print and online work. Four values correspond with journalism’s interpretive role: *provide analysis of complex problems*, *discuss national policy*, *discuss international policy*, and *investigate government claims*. Four more correspond with the disseminator role: *get information to the public quickly*, *avoid stories with unverified content*, *concentrate on the widest possible audience*, and *provide entertainment and relaxation*. Five values correspond with the role of populist mobilizer: *develop intellectual/cultural interests*, *set the political agenda*, *let people express views*, *motivate people to get involved*, and *point to possible solutions*. Finally, two values—*serve as an adversary of government* and *serve as an adversary of business*—correspond with journalism’s adversarial role. Using Likert-scale responses of “extremely important,” “quite important,” “somewhat important,” and “not really important,” respondents ranked the degree to which they emphasize each value in their print journalism work, and then repeated the ranking for their online work.

Additionally, respondents will answer nine forced-ranking questions for each medium, in which they will select which they favor between two values in order to evaluate whether converged journalists favor values differently between their print and online work. Using a 9-point Likert scale, the survey asks respondents to select which value they favor between nine sets of commonly conflicting journalist values; the survey pits *be first with the story*, *frame the story to draw as many readers as possible* and *make*

the story as stimulating as possible against ensure the story is accurate before submitting, ensure the story is as thorough as possible, and frame the story to be as balanced as possible.

The survey also presents several demographic questions. Although Weaver and Wilhoit's survey contained more than 20 organizational and personal items, they were narrowed down for this survey to avoid fatigue. Therefore, the survey inquires about three organizational factors—participants' print medium (whether they work at a daily newspaper or magazine, for example), income and staff size—and seven personal factors: gender, ethnicity, religion, education level, political affiliation, degree of liberalness/conservativeness, whether the participant majored in journalism, and how long they have worked as a journalist. The sample was also asked to provide their estimated percentage of time spent working on each medium; for example, a participant may dedicate 80% of his time to work on his employer's print medium, and just 20% on Web duties; another journalist may split his time evenly. This question allows for an analysis of the levels of convergence in the respondents' newsrooms.

Finally, willing respondents participated in 15-minute phone interviews to discuss and provide context to their survey responses.

Statistical analysis of the data allowed the research questions to be evaluated. To answer the first research question (What are the professional value systems of converged journalists?), descriptive statistics were calculated for the value rankings for both media; ranking means paints a picture of which values journalists emphasize in print, and which they emphasize in their online work. Following Weaver and Wilhoit's (2007) American Journalist Survey, the data was also subjected to factor analysis to determine which of the

four professional roles the sample emphasize through the values they stress (see Appendix I). To evaluate whether converged journalists emphasize the same values when working with different media, the rankings were subjected to *t* tests, to compare the means of the value rankings between the two media. Additionally, Spearman's rho correlations were calculated for six forced-ranking questions between two values to evaluate whether the journalists favor values differently between their print and online work. Correlation tests were also run to determine any connections between the sample's demographic characteristics and the values they emphasize.

Sample demographics: A link to the online survey was emailed to 3,202 American newspaper journalists; 222 emails were returned as undeliverable. Of the 2,980 delivered emails, 185 respondents returned the survey, resulting in a 6.2% response rate, which is very low though consistent with similar types of research (Sheehan, 2006).

Of the 185 collected responses, 146 (78.9%) respondents completed the survey in full. The journalists sampled were 64.8% ($n = 92$) male and 35.2% ($n = 50$) female; they reported an average age of 47.9 years ($SD = 10.45$). Most of the respondents (95.1%, $n = 143$) identified as Caucasian. Most (69.7%, $n = 101$) had earned a bachelor's degree, whereas 17% ($n = 24$) also had earned a master's or doctorate degree. Of those with a bachelor's degree or higher, 66.2% ($n = 86$) majored in journalism. Reported annual earnings ranged from \$15,000-\$19,000 to upwards of \$80,000, with half (49.3%, $n = 68$) earning \$30,000-\$69,000 per year. Politically, the sample identified as 44.1% ($n = 60$) independent, 26.5% ($n = 36$) democrat, and 11.8% ($n = 16$) republican, with the remainder identifying as libertarian, green, nonpartisan and others. Respondents leaned

slightly liberal; on a 7-point Likert scale on which 1 was very conservative and 7 was very liberal, respondents averaged a score of 4.33 ($SD = 1.30$). (See Table 1.)

Nearly all respondents (96.6%, $n = 141$) were employed by daily newspapers in newsrooms with an average of 85 employees ($SD = 193.4$), though responses ranged from 1 employee to 2,000. Respondents reported working an average of 12.7 years ($SD = 10.5$) in their current newsroom and 24.9 years ($SD = 11.1$) as a paid journalist. They reported spending an average of 29.0% ($n = 147$) of their time on work intended for print only, 8.3% on work intended for the web only, and most of their time (62.6%) of their time on work intended for both media.

In contrast, the last American Journalist Survey—which was conducted in 2002—reported an average age of 41 years for print journalists. That sample was roughly two-thirds male, and more than 91% white; when combined with broadcast journalists, they reported a median income of \$43,500. (Weaver et al., 2007) That study's ancillary sample of online journalists—also two-thirds male—reported an average age of 39 years and a median salary of \$64,000. The group was also slightly less inclusive of minorities, with more than 93% of respondents identifying as white.

Comparatively, respondents of both the present study and Weaver and Wilhoit's 2002 print and online samples tended to be quite similarly white and male. The present study's sample aligned closer with Weaver and Wilhoit's online sample in terms of salary, with both groups reporting median annual earnings in the \$60,000s. The converged journalists in this study, however, were considerably older than Weaver and Wilhoit's print and online journalists; the converged journalists reported a median age of

50, whereas in the last American Journalist Survey, respondents reported median ages of 41 and 39 for print and online, respectively. (See Table 2.)

Of the respondents who completed the survey, 45 indicated willingness to discuss further their responses in a 15-minute phone interview with the researcher. Of the willing respondents, 25 conveyed sufficient contact information; those respondents were asked to participate in a brief phone interview, and seven interviews were conducted (see Appendix II). The interviews discussed the journalists' high and low rankings, and touched on the differences in the values they emphasize in their print and online work. The interviews give real-world context to the survey's results, notably that while the sample emphasizes the same 15 values in work on both print and web platforms, the degree to which those values are emphasized varies between media.

CHAPTER FOUR: ANALYZING CONVERGED JOURNALISTS' VALUES

This study explores the professional values of converged journalists via two research questions:

RQ1: What are the professional value systems of converged journalists?

RQ2: Do converged journalists emphasize the same values across different media?

The study, anchored in an online survey, explores converged journalists by asking them to identify how they emphasize their professional values. The study is embedded in social learning theory, the prevailing theory as to how journalists acquire their professional value systems: By asking journalists in convergence positions to articulate their values in their print and online work, the research ultimately addresses the degree to which social learning is taking place in converged newsrooms, and the fluidity of values from traditional journalism to new media.

Data screening: The responses were examined for missing data; analysis revealed about one-eighth missing data on the 30 value-ranking questions to be submitted for factor analysis. Further evaluation showed the missing data were found to be missing completely at random; finding no pattern to the missing data, analysis proceeded with confidence. Data were examined for univariate outliers; none was found. Data were then examined for any multivariate outliers. Using Mahalanobis distance scores, one case was found to be a significant outlier and was removed from further analysis. The data set, then, was considered fit for further analyses.

Factor analysis: Following Weaver and Wilhoit's (2007) American Journalist Survey in which the researchers studied journalists' values via four professional roles

honed through factor analysis, the value rankings in the present study were evaluated likewise. Factor analysis, however, proved to be problematic, and not a worthy test for this data set.

The data was subjected to a principal components analysis with varimax rotation. Kaiser-Meyer-Olin measure of sampling adequacy (KMO = .71) indicated adequate correlations among the variables to conduct factor analysis. Although Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant, $\chi^2(105) = 782.33, p < .001$, this test is highly sensitive and its significance is likely a function of the sample size rather than a true indicator that the correlations in the matrix are zero; hence, factor analysis proceeded. The resulting factor structure yielded five factors with Eigenvalues greater than 1.0 and accounted for 67.45% of the variance. Examination of the scree plot suggested that this 5-factor solution ought to be retained (see Table 3). All items had factor loadings greater than .40, with three significant cross-loadings across factors. Cronbach's alphas for the five subscales ranged from excellent (.88) to extremely poor (.03). One factor consisted of only one item and, thus, did not provide a measure of internal consistency. Reliability analysis (Cronbach's alpha) using the four journalistic roles as outlined by Weaver and Wilhoit (2007) yielded relatively high consistency for three of the roles, but the disseminator role proved problematic, with alphas of $\alpha = .29$ and $\alpha = .26$ for print and online, respectively. Eliminating the values associated with the disseminator role and rerunning the factor analysis did not improve the factor structure or reliability of the scales. When all 15 values were combined together, reliability analysis yielded Cronbach's alphas of $\alpha = .78$ for print and $\alpha = .80$ for online.

Because factor analysis proved unsuccessful, the sample cannot be said to emphasize any of the four professional roles as set forth by Weaver and Wilhoit (2007). Thus, assessing converged journalists' collective value system will be done exclusively via evaluating the descriptive statistics of their value rankings in both print and online work.

Converged journalists embrace 15 values in both platforms: Research Question 1 asked: What are the professional value systems of converged journalists? In order to answer this question, descriptive statistics were calculated for all values in both media (see Table 4); the results reveal that all 15 values are emphasized to some degree in both print and online work. When working in print, respondents most emphasized *avoiding the use of unverified content* ($M = 6.77, SD = 0.64$), and least emphasized *discussing international policy* ($M = 2.46, SD = 1.45$) and *influencing the political agenda* ($M = 2.93, SD = 1.80$). All but two values showed minimum responses of 1 and maximum responses of 7—the lowest and highest choices available, respectively—meaning at least one journalist ranked every value as extremely important, while at least one journalist ranked nearly every value as not at all important.

When working online, respondents most emphasized *getting information to the public quickly* ($M = 6.32, SD = 0.92$) and *avoiding the use of unverified content* ($M = 6.31, SD = 1.26$). The sample least emphasized *discussing international policy* ($M = 2.28, SD = 1.36$) and *discussing national policy* ($M = 2.88, SD = 1.54$). All but one value received responses ranging from 1 to 7.

Additionally, Pearson correlations were calculated between all ranked and rated values in both media and staff size, years as a paid journalist, education and

conservatism/liberalism. Only staff size yielded significant relationships: In both media, high staff size was positively correlated with *discussing national policy* (print, $r = .37$; online, $r = .34$) and *discussing international policy* (print, $r = .47$; online, $r = .45$), and negatively correlated with *letting people express their views* (print, $r = -.34$; online, $r = -.31$) and *motivating people to get involved* (print, $r = -.35$; online, $r = -.29$). When working in print, staff size was also negatively correlated with *getting information to the public quickly* ($r = -.20$), *pointing to possible solutions* ($r = -.21$), and *serving as a critic of government* ($r = -.19$).

Altogether, the respondents emphasized all 15 values in both their print and online work. However, the degree to which they emphasized those values varied between media platforms—the subject of Research Question 2.

Converged journalists emphasize values differently in print and online work:

Research Question 2 asked: Do converged journalists emphasize the same values across different media? The data indicate that while journalists emphasize the same general value system in both print and web work, they tend to stress that value system more in print than online.

The value rankings for both print and online work were subjected to a series of repeated measures t tests to examine whether there was a significant difference in journalistic values between the two platforms (see Table 5). Results indicated that participants emphasized values, generally speaking, more when working in print ($M = 70.32$, $SD = 10.86$) than when working online ($M = 66.17$, $SD = 12.04$), $t(124) = 6.51$, $p < .001$. Four of the values showed no significant differences between media: *providing entertainment and relaxation*, *influencing the political agenda*, *letting people express*

their views, and motivating people to get involved. Additionally, there was no difference between media for the importance of the disseminator role ($M = 22.37$, $SD = 2.81$, and $M = 22.08$, $SD = 3.00$, respectively), $t(136) = 1.26$, $p = .21$, suggesting no difference in respondents' emphasis of disseminator values between print and online work. Of those that were significant, all but one were rated as more important in print than in online media; *getting information to the public quickly* was the sole value emphasized higher in online work than print.

For three of the four journalistic roles established by Weaver and Wilhoit (2007), the values corresponding to those roles were emphasized as more important in print than in the online medium (see Table 5): The populist mobilizer role (print, $M = 22.94$, $SD = 5.27$; online, $M = 21.91$, $SD = 5.52$; $t = 3.67$, $p < .001$), the adversarial role (print, $M = 8.20$, $SD = 2.99$; online, $M = 7.24$, $SD = 3.13$; $t = 3.82$, $p < .001$), and the interpreter role (print, $M = 16.55$, $SD = 4.12$; online, $M = 14.72$, $SD = 4.48$; $t = 6.95$, $p < .001$). For the disseminator role, there was no difference between media (print, $M = 22.37$, $SD = 2.81$; online, $M = 22.08$, $SD = 3$; $t = 1.26$, $p = .21$).

The t test results show a difference between how professional values are stressed in print work versus online work; to further explore that dichotomy, the survey's 12 forced-choice value ranking questions were evaluated to gauge whether media platform plays a role in the professional values converged journalists favor.

Ancillary analyses: Comparative rankings and interviews: In addition to the 15 value-ranking question sets for both media, the sample was asked to choose between two values on six Likert-scale-response questions for both media (see Table 6). A series of Spearman's rho correlations was conducted to determine whether there was a relationship

between the forced-choice responses across media, that is, whether there was consistency in these rankings between print and online media. Results indicated significant positive relationships between all pairs, indicating consistency in rankings across print and online media (see Table 7).

Descriptive statistics were calculated for the forced-ranking value sets for both media (see Table 6). Responses tended toward the higher end of the scales, meaning the sample emphasized *ensuring the story is accurate*, *ensuring the story is as thorough as possible*, and *framing the story to be balanced* more than *being first with the story*, *framing the story to draw as many readers as possible*, and *making the story stimulating*. However, respondents indicated an equal or stronger emphasis on the values they favored in print; for example, respondents favored framing the story to be balanced more than making the story stimulating, but emphasized their stance in print ($Med = 8.00$, $SIQ = 1.50$) more than online ($Med = 7.00$, $SIQ = 1.50$). Cumulatively, accuracy received the most emphasis in both mediums.

CHAPTER FIVE: TWO PLATFORMS, ONE VALUE SYSTEM

This research study investigated the professional values of converged journalists, and asked whether converged journalists emphasize the same values across different media. It employed an online survey of 184 converged journalists who indicated the importance of 15 different values across print and online media, and were asked to choose between sets of values. The results lay a foundation for understanding how converged journalists make ethical decisions.

Journalistic values unite: In both media, respondents varied in how important they viewed individual professional values. When working in print, respondents most emphasized avoiding the use of unverified content, followed by getting information to the public quickly, and providing analysis of complex problems. When working online, the sample most emphasized getting information to the public quickly, followed by avoiding the use of unverified content, and letting people express their views. When asked to choose between two values, respondents favored accuracy, thoroughness and balance above speed, drawing a wide audience and making the content stimulating. Cumulatively, accuracy received the most emphasis, which was consistent with respondents' perceived importance of avoiding unverified content as a value. But whereas getting information to the public quickly also was identified as an important value, when forced to choose between that value and accuracy, thoroughness and balance, the journalists ranked the latter values above speed.

The sample's emphasis on accuracy and speed both confirm and confound the opinions of journalism scholars. In the last American Journalist Survey (conducted in

2002), Weaver and Wilhoit (2007) found that journalists also emphasized accuracy and speed, although *investigating government claims* topped them in that survey. Whatever the scale, accuracy has long been found to top journalists' values (Sylvie & Huang, 2008; Boudana, 2008; Battistoli, 2009; Klaidman & Beauchamp, 1987), and its emphasis in this study suggests journalists remain committed to truth-telling and error-free reporting. But although *getting information to the public quickly* also has tended to rank highly among journalists' professional values (Weaver and Wilhoit, 2007), the speed at which digital publishing occurs has forced the journalism community to wonder: At what point does "quickly" become "hastily"? In Arant and Anderson's 2001 survey, nearly half of online news editors said the ability to publish information immediately online had eroded their fact-checking standards. Similarly, in Thurman and Myllylahti's 2009 study of a Finnish news organization, journalists reported insufficient time to fact-check their work, as well as conflict between publishing complete stories with immediate ones.

The strong emphasis on speed in the present study, however, is coupled with a stronger emphasis on accuracy. This is contrary to scholars' opinion that the fast nature of the digital newsroom would compel journalists to trade accuracy for speed (Arant & Anderson, 2001; Friend & Singer, 2007). When respondents were forced to choose between *being first with a story* and other values, *accuracy*, *thoroughness* and *balance* took priority above speed in both print and online work. Notably, those three values also trumped *drawing the widest possible audience* and *making the story stimulating*.

The seven respondents who were interviewed echoed the importance of both speed and accuracy on the job. On the significance of being first with a story, one reporter said,

“When stories get big enough... obviously from a [search engine optimization] standpoint, you want to be out there first, get that recognition, have [the audience] come to you and keep coming to you for that story, to get a foothold you can expand (pg. 68).”

Conversely, other journalists equated truth and accuracy with credibility; in fact, the only instances in which “credibility” was mentioned in the interviews coincided with a discussion of truth. “Journalism is based on truth and accuracy, and without that, you don’t have credibility,” said one journalist. “You can’t print something unless it’s verified.” Said another journalist,

“Credibility is very important, especially in a small-town community newspaper. If they don’t think the newspaper’s [going to] get it right, they won’t talk to you. Avoiding unverified content, even if it proves to be true, gives the impression that you’re not spreading rumors. I prefer to hold a story a day just to get correct information (pg. 70).”

Still, the interviewed sample reported that their newsrooms take measures to balance speed and accuracy: Some publications break news and provide updates piecemeal via social networking sites like Facebook and Twitter, whereas others publish short stories online, adding updates to them throughout the day and compiling the full picture in a print story at the end of the day. This contradicts Thurman and Myllylahti’s ethnographic study of one newsroom, in which the authors reported that journalists wrestled between publishing incomplete stories immediately or full stories later (Thurman & Myllylahti, 2009).

In both media, the journalists ranked *discussing national and international policy*, and *influencing the political agenda* as the least important of their values, with many respondents reporting those values as “not at all important.” Said one journalist, “What [political candidates] want to tell the public about, I want to tell the public about. I try not

to exert influence; I want to report on what the public wants to ask, not what I want to ask.” Another journalist commented,

“On the news side, our goal is to report the facts and let readers make their decisions. There are very clear and strong boundaries between news and editorial. We only report facts and both sides of the story. We’re not intending to have an impact on the agenda (pg. 78).”

However, journalists who worked in larger newsrooms tended to favor discussing policy more than those who worked for smaller organizations. (Journalists on bigger staffs were also less likely to rank *letting people express their views* and *motivating people to get involved* highly in both media, and downplayed *getting information to the public quickly*, *pointing to possible solutions*, and *servicing as a critic of government*. One respondent explained the difference thusly: “There are big national [newspapers], big regionals, and community papers. As a community paper... what we consider a front-page story, they may not.” The respondents’ differences in their ranking of policy and political values may simply be a result of their publication’s reach. Weaver and Wilhoit (2007) came to a similar conclusion after their latest (2002) survey when they found that large staffs tended to stress the interpretive and adversarial roles, and *letting people express their views* and *reaching a wide audience* declined in emphasis from previous surveys; the authors suggested journalists had begun to believe that because of increased competition, they could only succeed at a very targeted publication.

Viewing the survey results through the lens of Weaver and Wilhoit’s (2007) four journalistic roles, the sample most emphasized the values of the populist mobilizer role, which centers on developing cultural and political agendas, and empowering the audience to get involved and share their views, and the disseminator role, which stresses speed, truth, entertainment and a broad audience. However, factor analysis revealed the four-role

structure to be unreliable. The survey's low response rate did not yield a favorable sample size for factor analysis. Additionally, further evaluation reveals possible problems with the survey instrument.

Weaver and Wilhoit based their original American Journalist survey, conducted from 1982 to 1983, on a 1971 study that identified two journalist roles; they subjected their own data to factor analysis and found three roles: adversarial, interpretive and disseminator. A factor analysis of the 1992 study found that another role, the populist mobilizer role, had emerged. Although the 2002 study explored the same 15 values and the data also aggregated into four roles with titles matching the 1992 study, the values assigned to those four roles changed. Across Weaver and Wilhoit's work, the values that comprise their four values have changed over time—most notably in the disseminator function that proved so problematic in the current study. For example, in Weaver and Wilhoit's 1992 data, the values *getting information to the public quickly* and *avoiding unverifiable facts* alone comprised the disseminator role, whereas in 2002, factor analysis clustered those roles together with *providing entertainment and relaxation* and *reaching the widest possible audience*. Additionally, the 2002 survey showed a sharp decline in emphasis of the values within the disseminator role.

The present study, nearly 10 years after the last American Journalist survey, suggests that these four roles are no longer statistically reliable or valid, particularly because the roles combine values that are not necessarily consistent with one another. For instance, many journalists perceive their role as one that emphasizes truth, which is not necessarily consistent with a role that provides entertainment. Those values touch on two very different aspects of the journalist's role as an information disseminator, thus

resulting in poor internal consistency of that role construct as measured by the survey. Weaver and Wilhoit's surveys have suggested that the roles journalists emphasize (and the values that comprise those roles) change over time, and they may need to evolve yet again to reflect the digital-age journalism values ("maximizing web traffic" and "maintaining autonomy") that the current literature has identified.

The failed factor analysis does not permit the present study to evaluate the sample's emphasis of the four roles; however, the study *does* measure the emphasis of values, and looking at them through the framework of Weaver and Wilhoit's last study (2007) allows for those values to be cautiously interpreted in terms of roles. Evaluating *t* tests of the values grouped together in the four roles (see Appendix I), analysis suggests that the sample tends to most strongly emphasize values aligning with journalism's populist mobilizer and disseminator roles in both mediums. Notably, these values—speed, accuracy, focusing on a wide audience, letting people express views, and motivating readers to get involved among them—are among the key values associated with digital and social media, suggesting that new media platforms have influenced converged newsrooms, both their traditional and nontraditional sides.

The sample less strongly emphasized values aligning with journalism's interpreter and adversarial roles. These values—including discussing policy, serving as an adversary of government and business, and analyzing complex problems—hearken back to journalism's earlier era.

The de-emphasis of such values may be due to the technology and changes in business structure online journalism introduces. Because online news is monetized according to traffic, an emphasis on page visits has altered journalists' coverage

decisions, which may also affect the values they emphasize. For example, a journalist at a newspaper that has built an audience around its national political news may emphasize discussing national policy. One journalist explained that his newsroom, which produces a newspaper and website for a small Alaskan community, rarely covers national and international news:

“...In the '30s, '40s, and '60s, it was all focused on local content; local issues, filling in with national stories. I look back at those old papers in microfilms sometimes and see small meetings, local meetings, and that's the kind of thing that may only appeal to a few dozen people. National and international news is easy to find, and it's cheap. Here on Kodiak Island, we focus on local stories; we rarely cover national or international stories that don't have local effects (pg. 81).”

Another journalist explained that one feature of his paper's website meters the five most frequently read stories online, and that makes him aware of what topics his readers visit the site for, leading him to continue to cover popular items. However, previous research has shown that access to traffic information may cause tension in the newsroom (Thurman and Myllylahti, 2009) and force some journalists to favor statistics over news judgment instincts when making ethical decisions (MacGregor, 2007).

Overall, the sample's single value system supports previous literature that insists that even with technology that shortens the traditional news cycle and praises breaking news, journalists are hesitant to desert the values that legitimize their profession (O'Sullivan & Heinonen, 2008). The traditional values of journalism—including truth and speed—remain part of the newsroom's essence; but while they are relatively universal, this study also shows them to vary in emphasis according to the platforms converged journalists work on.

Converged journalists' values: Print versus online platforms: When asked to rank their emphasis of 15 values in print and online work, respondents rated all but one value (*getting information to the public quickly*) higher in print than in online media. Four of the values, *providing entertainment and relaxation*, *influencing the political agenda*, *letting people express their views*, and *motivating people to get involved*, showed no significant differences between media. Similarly, respondents emphasized the values within three of Weaver and Wilhoit's (2007) four journalistic roles proportionately, but to a lesser extent in the online medium than in print. Populist mobilizer, adversarial and interpreter roles were emphasized as more important in print than online; there was no difference in media for the disseminator role. Finally, when all 15 values were compiled together, the value system as a whole was emphasized more strongly in journalists' print work than their online work.

The study's findings suggests that converged journalists do emphasize the same professional values in different media, but that they emphasize them more strongly in print assignments than online in their work. These findings echo Johnson and Kelly's 2003 study of online editors of print newspapers, which found that although web editors ranked journalistic values similarly to their print counterparts, they emphasized those values less. These findings also confirm Thurman and Myllylahti's (2009) conclusions from an ethnography of a European newsroom; the scholars maintained that while journalism is essentially the same profession whatever the platform, online journalism's different technologies, skills and responsibilities provoke a change in the professional values journalists emphasize.

When asked to choose between two values, the journalists also favored the same values in both media: The sample emphasized accuracy, thoroughness, and balance over speed, drawing a wide audience, and making the story stimulating. There were strong correlations between print and online media, such that when the journalists favored a particular value when working in print, they tended to favor it when working online.

Again looking at the values according to Weaver and Wilhoit's role divisions (see Appendix I), the sample emphasized the values within the populist mobilizer, adversarial and interpreter roles proportionately, but more strongly in print than in online work. Interestingly, analysis suggests no difference in the emphasis of the values within the disseminator role between media. However, assessing the values individually—and recalling the failed factor analysis—reiterates why evaluating roles according to the current four-factor scale is unreliable: First, included in the values that align with the disseminator role is *provide entertainment and relaxation*, which arguably has little to do with a journalist's role as a disseminator. Next, evaluating the values in groups does not account for the subtle and not-so-subtle differences in the rankings of the values within them; analyzing the disseminator role in particular shows a higher emphasis on speed when working online, as well as a higher emphasis on a wide audience in print, which, when combined, even out the “emphasis” of the disseminator role across both media.

Interviews with the respondents reverberated the conclusions from the data. The interview sample agreed that journalism's values are the same. Said one reporter,

“I don't think the values are a whole lot different. We want accurate information, we want to present stories in a fair light, give people a chance to respond. I don't care if you're writing for a magazine that comes out three times a year, or a web story that goes out in 5 minutes, those are the underpinnings of what we do (pg. 76).”

But the journalists also reported leaning on different values when working online versus in print. One journalist explained that because breaking news—which appears on his newspaper’s website first—is usually of interest to everyone, he focuses more on reaching a wide audience in print stories than online. Another journalist reported a conscious change in his emphasis of values throughout a single shift. When working earlier in the day, he emphasizes breaking stories by getting smaller bits of news online as a story develops; later in the day, he focuses on when the publication’s focus turns to the next day’s print edition. Others echoed the concerns found in Thurman and Myllylahti’s (2009) study of a Finnish online news site, in which pressure to maximize traffic and the conflict between publishing complete stories rather than immediate, incomplete ones caused tensions in the newsroom. One interviewed journalist mentioned that news stories like a recent plane crash create pressure to be first with the story online for web traffic reasons. Another said, “Do you publish right away, or wait a few hours? If there are distinctions [in values between print and online], they are drawn by the needs of the medium, but there’s always a foundation of these values.”

These findings support other studies (Johnson and Kelly, 2003; Brill, 2001; Wilhoit et al., 2007) that have found online journalists similar to their traditional counterparts in terms of professional value systems, yet different in terms of how they’re emphasized. In the most recent study between online and traditional journalists—Weaver and Wilhoit’s 2002 sample—online journalists favored speed, analyzing complex problems, investigating government claims, and discussing national and international policy more than print journalists, and they emphasized reaching a wide audience, providing entertainment, influencing the political agenda, and developing cultural

interests less than print journalists. In the present study, journalists favored speed more when working online but emphasized all other values more in print.

These findings suggest not only a noticeable shift in how values are emphasized in the newsroom in the decade since the last American Journalist Survey but also the emergence of a unique dual professional value system for converged journalists. Unconsciously or otherwise, converged journalists professionally operate with two different realms on the job, emphasizing their professional values differently according to the media platform they are working on.

Interviews with the journalists revealed that their shift in value emphasis is a conscious one. The journalists reported that they see their print and online work as two separate, distinct outcomes appearing on two different news products, yet they agree that their overall professional value system is the same. “I probably share the same values in a general sort of way,” said one journalist. “You’re still obligated to tell the truth and do it in a way that’s verifiable. On the Internet, we don’t relax those rules, but we might bend them a little bit, only because, overall, the people reading it are expecting something different.”

The journalists suggest that the shift in value emphasis between platforms is a result of the time constraints and expectations of a competitive, partly digital newsroom. One journalist explained, “When you work with something on the web, you have similar values, but you emphasize them differently. Like our Twitter initiative; it’s the perfect platform to get something on the web first. ...Just saying, ‘We have a reporter on the scene,’ shows the audience that at least our paper is there. But it’s still a different

product; once 5 or 6 at night hits, you transfer your focus to the print product.” Said another journalist,

“There is a slightly different calculation; do you publish right away, or wait a few hours? If there are distinctions, they are drawn by the needs of the medium, but there’s always a foundation of these values. We do have different standards for Twitter and Facebook than our website and print. But this news organization is not going to accuse the mayor of a crime without checking ...and giving them a chance to respond (pg. 76).”

Still, the journalists maintain that their role as journalists hinges on the profession’s traditional values. One journalist commented, “I don’t think the values are a whole lot different [between print and online]. We want accurate information, we want to present stories in a fair light, [and] give people a chance to respond. I don’t care if you’re writing for a magazine that comes out three times a year, or a web story that goes out in 5 minutes; those are the underpinnings of what we do.”

Additional findings: The many faces of convergence: Interviews with seven of the survey respondents reveal that newsrooms are taking many approaches to convergence; that is, combining print and online media platforms. Thus, the changes in value emphasis between media may not occur like the flick of a switch; journalists with a focus on one medium may lean on the values this study suggests tends to be emphasized in that medium, whereas journalists who work squarely in both media may toggle their rankings as they see fit.

Some of the journalists’ newsrooms place online content below their print product, and keep the two quite separate. One journalist said that his newsroom posts non-interactive PDF files of the print newspaper’s contents online several days after the paper has published. Another journalist explained that all of his newsroom’s content is chiefly intended for print: “We’re behind a paywall, so print comes first; web comes

second in consideration. The only exceptions would be something video-based or a web element that didn't translate to print." Yet another journalist explained that while his newsroom placed focus on print, he and his coworkers use the paper's web platform to alert readers what they're working on.

Other journalists reported a more online-focused approach, with their print editions taking on a summary role of the day's events. "Anything we write goes on the web first," said one journalist. "Then it's 11 o'clock go-time; we decide what [of the day's stories] go into print." Another journalist explained, "Our company has three papers, this, our daily paper, has about 8,000 circulation. We post stories on our corporate website for all three papers simultaneously. And we have a central copy desk. So I send the story to the copy desk, and it would go live." From there, the copy desk selects various stories for print. Yet another journalist explained that while he may be assigned stories for print, his awareness that his work will also appear online in part shapes his approach: "We start with the presumption that everything we do for print is going online."

Still others reported a more dynamic synergy between print and online content. One journalist described his newsroom's integrative content management software, through which he and his coworkers do word processing and online publishing; through the same system, his editors pull content for the print edition. "Everyone has gone through multimedia training... Everyone has multimedia projects once a week. Each person has a handheld video camera," he said, adding that his newsroom is also expected to use social networking site Twitter throughout the day.

One journalist acutely explained how he focuses on web and print deadlines, and the values he stresses in working within each medium:

“It all comes down to our print deadline; it’s 1 a.m. If something breaks at noon, it’s going to be on people’s radar, so we have a web-first initiative with breaking news. We have to try to get that breaking news up first; something short, just a paragraph story. Then we update it throughout the day. A lot of times, we’re sitting on more information than we’re posting. Names, we’re sitting on that, because we have to get it verified through the coroner’s office or police station or something. But we still want go get posted to the web the basics, the address. When it comes to print, since our deadline’s about 1 a.m., people are getting the information 10 to 18 hours later, so in print, the main goal is to make sure it’s right (pg. 73).”

The various newsroom models of convergence certainly affect how values are emphasized. In large newsrooms—which may afford each journalist more concentration on one medium or the other—converged journalists tended to stress discussing national and international policy more than their counterparts in smaller newsrooms when working on both media; conversely, the journalists on smaller staffs emphasized letting people express their views and motivating people to get involved more than journalists on larger staffs. This suggests that journalists in smaller newsrooms—who may share the responsibility of maintaining readership with just a few coworkers—may feel that integrating their readership (often within a small physical community that doesn’t otherwise enjoy a large voice in national media) is within their job description, whereas the job of interfacing with and marketing to readers falls to other personnel in larger newsrooms.

An interview with one journalist revealed that the small community his paper covers affects the values he emphasizes:

“The stories we typically handle...for the web first, are breaking—crime, traffic fire, government politics, education and so forth. If it’s a story that needs to go right away, we sort of assume that’s going to be of interest to a

broad audience. ... Stories the big newspaper would consider for A1 won't get anywhere on our website (pg. 75)."

Said another journalist,

"If you look at our most-read stories, it's the police blotter, the police-involved shootings, car accidents. ... Sports, too; we cover a lot of communities that have schools with 500 to 1,000 students—not large for high schools. Everybody knows everybody. People care about other peoples' kids (pg. 73)."

Echoed another journalist, "National and international news takes a backseat to anything local."

Still, for all of the questions online journalism raises, several journalists agreed the platform is often helpful for providing detail and context to stories that would otherwise be impossible due to the constraints of print space. One journalists explained that ultimately, values should remain the same for both print and web work, though there may exist an even greater responsibility of thoroughness online, and that journalists should strive to add hyperlinks, maps and documents to their online work. Echoed another journalist,

"The one thing where the web has come in handy is when you get these documents. We had a meeting where the mayor and some city administrators sat in depositions. They were 2-, 3-, 400 pages. We wrote a story about that, but we put those depositions up so people can go to the source. [The web] gives you immediacy, but also the space you need (pg. 69)."

CHAPTER 6: CONVERGED JOURNALISTS: MORE THAN THEIR PLATFORMS

Five years ago, scholars Friend and Singer (2007) wrote,

“Journalists are journalists whatever the medium, so principles such as truth and independence are universally applicable. But at the same time, the online medium poses particular ethical challenges, rooted both in its technical structure and in the social norms that have taken shape around and because of that structure (pg. 54).”

This thesis supports that statement, finding that while converged journalists maintain a single value system, they stress some values more than others, and emphasize their total value system more strongly when working in print than in their online work.

This thesis investigates the professional values of converged journalists with an online survey. The results reveal that the sample counts all 15 tested values among its professional value system in both platforms. When working in print, the sample most emphasized accuracy, followed by speed and providing analysis of complex problems; online, the sample most emphasized speed, followed by accuracy and letting people express views. When asked to choose between two values, respondents favored accuracy, thoroughness and balance above speed, drawing a wide audience and making the content stimulating, with accuracy receiving the most emphasis. And while speed proved a prominent value, the journalists ultimately ranked accuracy, thoroughness and balance above it. This is a strong indication that, at least in converged newsrooms, professional values have traveled somewhat fluidly from traditional to new media, supporting other studies that have identified that online journalists are hesitant to abandon traditional values, instead holding fast to the values that legitimize the profession (O’Sullivan and Heinonen, 2008).

Still, the thesis also unveiled a difference in the degree to which values are emphasized between the print and online platforms: The sample emphasized their professional value systems proportionately, but much more strongly when working in print than online. The findings suggest not only a noticeable shift in how values are emphasized in the newsroom in the past 10 years since the last American Journalist Survey, but also the emergence of a unique professional value system for converged journalists, in which values are stressed in the print platform and emphasized less online. This confirms literature that has argued that technology challenges journalists' professional values (Friend & Singer, 2007; Arant & Anderson, 2001; Domingo, 2007), and adds to other studies (Weaver et al., 2007; Johnson & Kelly, 2003) that identify two distinct value systems, one for print and one for online journalists. There is indeed a third mechanism at play for converged journalists: Unconsciously or otherwise, converged journalists professionally operate with two different realms on the job, emphasizing different elements of their professional value systems in print and online work.

Interviews with seven of the respondents revealed that convergence is happening in many different ways, leaving the topic of convergence journalism, multi-platform newsrooms and converged journalists' professional values wide open to further research. The sample's unique value rankings—which differ from those of the print-only and online-only journalists studied by Weaver and Wilhoit, and others—suggest that converged journalists are their own breed of journalist, operating differently from that of their traditional and new-media-only counterparts. Scholars Friend and Singer (2007, pg. 211) wrote, “Restructured newsrooms seeking cross-platform content ask journalists to loosen allegiance to their organization in favor of a stronger allegiance to the more

broadly defined profession of journalism.” This thesis argues that instead, converged journalists are not broadening their value system to align with a general definition of journalism, but rather tailoring the emphasis of their values to match the platforms they work on. Instead of balancing journalistic values to broadly fit their work, converged journalists switch professional modes according to the platform they’re working on at the moment, adjusting how they emphasize values between their print and web assignments.

This study supports existing research on online journalists that suggest they emphasize values less than print journalists (Johnson and Kelly, 2003), and extends Weaver and Wilhoit’s landmark studies to converged journalists. At its core, the thesis establishes groundwork for understanding the ethical decision-making and socialization of converged newsrooms, and identifies converged journalists as a unique professional group worthy of further research.

Implications for social learning in converged newsrooms: The results of this study, particularly compared with Weaver and Wilhoit’s (2007) constantly evolving samples of journalists, suggest that value systems are in motion. And because values are learned—and thus, values change—normatively, this study suggests social learning is indeed at work in the converged newsroom.

Interviews with the respondents confirm a presence of social learning in their newsrooms: One respondent mentioned that his high-school newspaper editor “drilled” into him that the primary function of newspapers is to keep the government honest; yet the journalist went on to explain that the function of his small community newspaper and its website have little to do with watching the government. Still, remember the words of his former editor, he emphasizes honesty and accuracy in the topics he does cover, both

online and in print. Said another journalist of her primary (and traditional) professional values:

“We want accurate information, we want to present stories in a fair light, [and to] give people a chance to respond. I don’t care if you’re writing for a magazine that comes out three times a year, or a web story that goes out in five minutes, those are the underpinnings of what we do (pg. 76).”

This study is embedded in social learning theory, the prevailing theory as to how newsroom employees acquire professional value systems. The theory holds that people learn information and behaviors vicariously, by observing others, seeing which behaviors are rewarded, and subsequently imitating those behaviors. That converged journalists emphasize professional values more strongly in print and online work ultimately suggests that social learning is occurring: The current sample—which averages nearly 25 years in the newsroom; far longer than online media has existed—has carried traditional values into digital newsrooms. This is positive news for converged newsrooms: Some scholars have remarked that because values are learned socially, staffs without journalism experience (such as those centered around and online platform) may never be exposed to the profession’s traditional values (Arant & Anderson, 2001; Brill, 2001); this sample, with its decades of experience, is maintaining traditional values’ place in the converged journalist’s value system. Social learning, however, suggests that traditional values’ place in the converged newsroom may not be permanent; as professional systems are shown here to be fluid, it is probable that the values converged journalists emphasize will continue to change as workers who began in print—and carried those traditional values from print-only newsrooms into converged ones—retire. When multi-platform newsrooms are all journalists know, their emphasis of more traditional values may decline.

Social learning theory has shaped studies that suggest that values are influenced by the newsroom's social and organizational culture, as well as technology (Endres, 1985; Singer, 2004; Friend & Singer, 2007; MacGregor, 2007). In the present study, the converged journalists mentioned many elements of technology and digital publishing that they use on a daily basis. Said one journalist, "Everyone has gone through multimedia training. ... We're always saying, 'What did you Tweet today?' Everyone has multimedia projects once a week. Each person has a handheld video camera." So while converged journalists in this study report a value system that is relatively consistent between media, they also report that they emphasize those values more in their print work than in their online assignments; values have spread from print to online, but the socialization of technology may contribute to the sample's lack of value emphasis in the latter.

When leaders of news organizations embrace digital publishing and new technology, they may indirectly endorse the values associated with new media, though the speed at which journalists accept those values and stress them in their work may be slow. The professional values conveyed through ethics codes, education and training slowly make their way into a journalist's reality through workplace communication over time (Donsbach, 2004), but even without training and policy on technology, digital media practices and the values associated with them will permeate the newsroom via "osmosis" (Breed, 1955). Still, this study finds that the normative emphasis of new-media values is already underway: While overall, this study's sample emphasizes a single professional value system (albeit to different degrees, depending on platform), the respondents also stress the new-media-related values of speed and letting the audience express their views more strongly when working online. The notion that while new publishing technologies

are being socialized, new-media values are being emphasized along with them suggests that managers should take an active role in discussing the implications of technology and the demands of digital publishing on the traditional values and expectations of journalism. As new media training happens, so should frank and frequent discussions of how the new work does and should affect the values journalists stress.

Implications for managers and journalists: Brown (1976) argues that value systems are the most critical element of workplace success; she argues that employees and their managers can only avoid conflict when their professional value systems align as closely as possible. And because journalists' professional value systems shape their editorial decisions (Sylvie & Huang, 2008), understanding the value system presented here may allow managers of converged newsrooms to predict their staff's behavior, and allow journalists working together to have a mutual understanding of the values they share. Doing so creates positive results in the workplace; according to Brown (1976), managers' failure to understand ideological differences between themselves and their employees is a major cause of occupational conflict, and such conflict can be avoided or resolved by determining and aligning the values systems of subordinates and superiors. Additionally, comprehending professional values may help managers to hire and shape their staffs appropriately according to the professional values they wish to emphasize.

Knowing that journalists' professional value systems shape their editorial decisions (Sylvie & Huang, 2008)—and also that journalists count their colleagues' behavior and values among the leading sources of their own—it is crucial for converged journalists and their managers to understand the values emphasized in the print-online newsroom. Because professional values are learned socially in the work environment

(Endres, 1985; Plaisance & Skewes, 2003; Friend & Singer, 2007; MacGregor, 2007), journalists and their superiors must be aware of the values they emphasize to understand the ethical decisions made in the newsroom. Converged newsrooms must accept that when one journalist is writing a print story, he is emphasizing different values than his coworker writing a story for the web.

For example, the results of this thesis indicate that converged journalists emphasize speed when working online; the literature tells us that managers cannot simply instruct a journalist to emphasize “providing solutions to complex problems” above speed, because values are communicated socially. But understanding how a journalist ranks values in different mediums should cause a manager to develop policies that stress guidelines for publishing breaking news (such as how much fact-checking must be done before a journalist can publish a story) and assign the length of a breaking story appropriate to the amount of detail available at the time. Managers should clearly instruct journalists as to when a story should be published: In the digital age, journalists are told to publish as fast as possible (and indeed, converged journalists rank speed highly among their values), but managers can be proactive in their direction, telling their employees to publish only when certain criteria are met. Managers must constantly weigh what they ask their employees to write with their ethical expectations and the end results they wish to see.

Therefore, a clearer understanding of converged journalists’ value system and the values they emphasize in print and online may warrant changes in or additions to newsroom ethics codes and policies, given scholars’ assertions that ethics codes are influenced by social newsroom culture, and that they ought to reflect the context and

circumstances of their creation (Wilkins & Brennen, 2004). Certainly, new technology and a value system this research finds to be different from that of both traditional and web-only newsrooms are circumstances that could ignite such change. Newsroom managers and their staffs should measure the values converged journalists are found to emphasize here alongside their existing policies to establish workplace rules that balance speed and accuracy with the publication's goals for coverage and audience growth.

Formal ethics codes have been shown to affect journalists' management and performance (Morin & Giles, 1986), but the literature suggest that codes alone do not influence journalists' work; the socialization and interpersonal interpretation of those codes normalize the workplace emphasis of the codes and the values within them (Boyeink, 1994; Battistoli, 2008). This suggests that when managers tailor codes and establish ethical policies for converged newsrooms, they should also facilitate and encourage their discussion.

Limitations of the research: The thesis attempted only to examine the professional values of converged journalists and how they are emphasized in the newsroom, and not the sources of those values or the balance of values, nor any other element of ethical decision-making beyond the existence of a professional value system. (Future studies may look to Weaver and Wilhoit's (2007) ethics section to explore its decision-making items with a sample of converged journalists.) The proposed research also deals only with professional values, and excludes the personal values that may or may not affect journalistic performance. Finally, it explores only the existence of professional values; the study does not measure how values interact with each other in solving ethical dilemmas. It is important to note that this study measures the emphasis of values as self-

reported by survey respondents, and not their actual emphasis in the newsroom. Subsequent research may seek to study reported emphasis versus actual emphasis on the job.

Social learning theory also presents some limitations, as some elements of the theory cannot be studied here: Bandura tied social learning to the concept of self-efficacy, or a self-confidence with regards to the ability to complete a task (or, one's belief that they are capable of performing the behaviors required to produce a desired outcome) (Bandura, 1982). Bandura holds that self-efficacy is attained through several factors—internal (feelings) and external (past experience, praise from coworkers). Because of limited resources and the constraints of the survey design, this research cannot explore this arm of the theory. (For example, the financial state of the media may affect the motivations of converged journalists and ultimately ethical learning in the newsroom; future studies may attempt to delve into such topics.)

Additionally, Manz & Sims (1980), citing Bandura, explained the element of self-control in social learning:

“Typically, we set certain behavior standards and reward or punish ourselves according to judgments we make of our performance in relation to these standards [Bandura, 1969]...Bandura suggests that individuals who effectively use self-management procedures can serve as models for others to learn self-management. Persons will adopt the standards for self-reinforcement that they observe in exemplary models and then evaluate their own performance according to these standards (pg. 362-363).”

But scholars cannot yet understand how this translates to online journalists who may operate in very small newsrooms or even alone, and may be self-managing based on standards learned from a virtual or other “social” setting. Additionally, we do not know the degree to which interpersonal communication and face-to-face interaction affect

social learning; do journalists working in virtual newsroom learn “socially” over their Internet connections?

The project’s most apparent limitation, however, is its low response rate. Emailed surveys traditionally yield low response rates, and this survey proved no exception. Follow-up emails gained some additional response, but the study’s overall 6% response rate proved disappointing and potentially unfavorable for factor analysis.

Future inquiries into converged newsrooms: Because scholars have not widely addressed the values of converged journalists or how they are emphasized, this thesis provides a foundation on which to develop many areas of study focused on converged newsrooms and the journalists working in them.

The interviews conducted here illustrated that there exist many types and levels of convergence; future studies should investigate converged newsrooms models both quantitatively and ethnographically to gain a broader view of convergence structures in motion. For example, in some converged newsrooms, journalists write one story for print, which is subsequently posted online; others write different (or several) stories for the web. Future studies should examine the volume and types of assignments converged journalists are asked to complete, and look at how professional values interact with varying amounts of work. Some of the journalists interviewed here alluded to an awareness of their websites’ traffic statistics; in other models of convergence, journalists are not privy to those numbers. The literature has examined how single-medium newsrooms use traffic statistics, but subsequent research should also examine the use of such statistics by journalists working in converged newsrooms.

The sources of converged journalists' professional values and how those values are socialized in converged newsrooms is an area for future study. Do these journalists glean their values from the same sources as traditional journalists—ethics codes, journalism education, and past experience among them—or are there sources associated with new media that introduce values? And because technology presents the ability to publish stories remotely, how are professional values learned socially in the converged newsroom? And because professional ethics change in response to age and experience (Endres, 1985; Coleman & Wilkins, 2004), comparing the values of converged newsrooms with older and younger average ages than the present study may yield notable results.

It is also important to learn how converged journalists' professional values are used to make ethical decisions. Many scholars have argued that the speed at which online news is published and the social norms surrounding online journalism affect how professional values are emphasized in journalists' work. Friend and Singer (2007) said fact-checking and thoroughness may be compromised in the rush to publish online. In the present study, however, journalists self-reported that they favor accuracy above speed. Future studies should test accuracy versus speed in action via small-scale studies that observe converged newsrooms and their ethical decisions. And because one study argues that traffic statistics have caused some journalists to rely less on their news judgment instincts and more on statistics (MacGregor, 2007), while another found journalists in an online newsroom who ran comments beneath posts to be more connected to readers, the way journalists balance professional values with reader interaction should also be studied.

It may also be beneficial to investigate how newsroom values correlate with personal technology and social network use. Now that anyone who has a Facebook account can share news instantaneously, scholars may examine how journalists' "personal publishing" habits and their corresponding personal values interact with their professional journalism values, as well as the sources of both types of values. Where does the social networking user end and the journalist begin?

Conclusions: The converged journalists studied here bridge traditional and digital newsrooms with a single, unique value system that embraces 15 surveyed values, emphasized proportionately yet to different degrees in their print and online work. Although they stress speed, the journalists ultimately favor accuracy above all, signaling that while technology has spun journalists' professional value systems into motion, traditional newsroom values are thriving and social learning is alive in the converged newsroom. Convergence journalism's value system, along with its varied, evolving business models, sets the profession apart from its single-platform counterparts, making it a topic worthy of media scholars' attention.

APPENDIX I:
VALUES AND THEIR CORRESPONDING
JOURNALISTIC ROLES

The values this study evaluated are:

1. provide analysis of complex problems (aligns with interpretive role)
2. discuss national policy (aligns with interpretive role)
3. discuss international policy (aligns with interpretive role)
4. investigate government claims (aligns with interpretive role)
5. get information to the public quickly (aligns with disseminator role)
6. avoid stories with unverified content (aligns with disseminator role)
7. concentrate on the widest possible audience (aligns with disseminator role)
8. provide entertainment and relaxation (aligns with disseminator role)
9. develop intellectual/cultural interests (aligns with populist mobilizer role)
10. set the political agenda (aligns with populist mobilizer role)
11. let people express views (aligns with populist mobilizer role)
12. motivate people to get involved (aligns with populist mobilizer role)
13. point to possible solutions (aligns with populist mobilizer role)
14. serve as an adversary of government (aligns with adversarial role)
15. serve as an adversary of business (aligns with adversarial role)

APPENDIX II:
PERSONAL INTERVIEWS

PERSONAL INTERVIEW: RESPONDENT 1

1. One survey question asked how often you know the platforms (web, print or both) on which your work will appear; you answered “all of the time.” How are you made aware where your work will appear?

The beauty is that I’m the publisher. After 46 years as a reporter/editor, I became the publisher about 10 months ago. Our company has three papers, this, our daily paper, has about 8,000 circulation. We post stories on our corporate website for all three papers simultaneously. And we have a central copy desk. So I send the story to the copy desk, and it would go live from there.

2. When working in print, you placed the greatest emphasis on investigating government claims, avoiding unverified content, and letting people express their views. When working for the web, you placed the greatest emphasis on investigating government claims, avoid unverified content, and pointing to possible solutions. Why do you feel those are most important?

In my career, which started out in very small papers and then back to large, there were a couple things drilled into me from the start. My very first editor in high school—I was getting \$100 a week for the Madison, Wyo., paper—that this is the primary function of a newspaper: to keep the government honest. We elect good people, but when they get to office, things change. I got to see a lot of governments run amok working in the Middle East. In war, the first casualty is truth. I would argue in government, the first casualty is

truth. The best example we have is the monthly unemployment statistics. They don't count people whose benefits have run out; we just assume they're working. We have no industry in southwest Florida. If you're not pouring concrete—working in building—you're not working. We had situations where we couldn't fill the little league. It's 8% nationally, but closer to 40% here. I'm a Vietnam veteran, two tours. I don't regret the time I spent there, but an awful lot has come out in the past 30 years; we didn't need to be there. I covered the first Gulf War with a paper, and the second.

3. When working in print, you placed the least emphasis on influencing the political agenda, discussing national and international policy, and critiquing government and business. When working on the web, you also placed a low emphasis on providing entertainment (whereas you ranked that value moderately for print). Why do you feel those are least important?

It's based on two things: One, the fact that I'm appalled that what was said 30 years ago, that pretty soon gossip would replace news as the primary form of entertainment in the country, is now true. There's a lot of places to get entertainment. If you're looking for news that's all we're going to give you. Joe Friday had it right: just the facts. Here are the three W's, and let me move on with my day. On our site, we want to give people only what they need. There are big nationals, big regionals, and community papers. As a community paper, our function is different; we approach things in a different way. What we consider a front-page story, they may not. We may spend more time covering a lack of peanut butter for the food bank's shortage, get a few hundred jars of peanut butter over there, and we all feel great. We don't feel we're in competition with bigger papers.

4. You reported that you spend all of your time on assignments for both print and web. And you've identified that you emphasize different value systems when working on different platforms. Do you do so consciously? Do you think that the different media require different value systems?

I probably share the same values in a general sort of way. You're still obligated to tell the truth and do it in a way that's verifiable. On the Internet, we don't relax those rules, but we might bend them a little bit, only because, overall, the people reading it are expecting something different—like, we might put a point of view in where we wouldn't normally do it. Like on Facebook, we might solicit donations to the Semper Fi fund; we did that, but we wouldn't do it in print.

5. Do you have any other feelings on what we've discussed?

No.

PERSONAL INTERVIEW: RESPONDENT 2

1. One survey question asked how often you know the platforms (web, print or both) on which your work will appear; you answered “all of the time.” How are you made aware where your work will appear?

Anything we write goes on the web first. Then it’s 11 o’clock go-time, we decide what goes into print, in relation to breaking news. If it’s feature-y, it’ll appear on the web again, after print.

2. When working in print, you placed the greatest emphasis on investigating government claims, avoiding unverified content, reaching the widest audience, and developing intellectual/cultural interests. When working for the web, you placed the greatest emphasis on those same values, but getting information to public jumped to first place. Why do you feel those are most important?

The good thing about writing for the web—well, it’s a burden as well as a boon—you’re released from the constraints of space and time. When stories get big enough—we’ve covered a few stories that gained national significance; a guy shot his whole family in April, there was a plane crash in August, a few years ago, some ice rescues on Lake Erie—when you’re covering a story like that, obviously from an SEO standpoint, you want to be out there first, get that recognition, have them come to you and keep coming to you for that story, to get a foothold you can expand.

3. When working in print, you placed the least emphasis on getting information to the public quickly and letting people express views. When working on the web, you placed the least emphasis on discussing policy, developing intellectual/cultural

interests, and motivating people to get involved. Why do you feel those are least important?

Unfortunately, there are certain parameters. For posterity, there is letters to the editor; we get a ton around election time, but don't get many other items of great significance. On the web, we just switched our comments format, and Facebook—just as a consumer of news, I can tell you that social media is where you start to hear it first. When Osama was killed, I didn't hear it on the news, I heard it on Facebook.

4. You reported that you spend 100% of your time working assignments for print and web. And yet you've identified that you emphasize different value systems when working on different platforms. Do you do so consciously? Do you think that the different media require different value systems?

Have you seen "Saving Private Ryan?" Do you remember the beginning, they're on the LSTs, and the one guy yells, "Remember your training and you will survive." If you do it day-in and day-out, it becomes instinctive. As a consumer of media, my attention span to read something online isn't the same as it is to read something in print.

5. Do you have any other feelings on what we've discussed?

The one thing where the web has come in handy is when you get these documents. We had a meeting where the mayor and some city administrators sat in depositions. They were 2-, 3-, 400 pages. We wrote a story about that, but we try to put those depositions up so people can go to the source. It gives you immediacy, but also the space you need.

PERSONAL INTERVIEW: RESPONDENT 3

1. One survey question asked how often you know the platforms (web, print or both) on which your work will appear; you answered “all of the time.” How are you made aware where your work will appear?

How we do it here is, we post PDFs of all of our newspaper pages several days after we print. It started before my time; I’ve been here for about two and a half years. I’ve worked at places where the story posts to the web in different format. You can put links in your story, etc., but given that I’m writing just for print, I put that as the priority.

2. When working in print, you placed the greatest emphasis on avoiding unverified content. Why do you feel those are most important?

Credibility is very important, especially in a small-town community newspaper. If they don’t think the newspaper’s gonna get it right, they won’t talk to you. Avoiding unverified content, even if it proves to be true, gives the impression that you’re not spreading rumors. I prefer to hold a story a day just to get correct information.

3. When working in print, you placed the least emphasis on influencing the political agenda and discussing national and international policy. Why do you feel those are least important?

They’re not unimportant. I do a lot of political reporting. Candidates, if they want to go to western Kansas, they come here. What they want to tell the public about, I want to tell the public about. I try not to exert influence; I want to report on what the public wants to ask, not what I want to ask.

4. Do you think that the different media require different value systems?

It depends on the web media outlet, just as it depends on the print media outlet. Certain websites have their own agendas. But they should generally have the same values, at least with general news outlets. When you get into more complex stuff, like very political websites, they may have different agendas.

5. Do you have any other feelings on what we've discussed?

No, that's it.

PERSONAL INTERVIEW: REPORTER 4

1. One survey question asked how often you know the platforms (web, print or both) on which your work will appear; you answered “all of the time.” How are you made aware where your work will appear?

Its usually pretty simple; we use Engage. We do our word processing in that program, and everything goes onto the web. We're basically a small newspaper, about 16,000 circulation, surrounded by farm and communities. What we're doing is, everyone has gone through multimedia training. We have a very talented photography staff; when you're out shooting this assignment, you can say to them, 'When you're shooting, can you also get a 2-minute video clip?' Then, we're going to a metered website soon; everyone gets 20 page views free, then once you got that, if you want this extra, buy a newspaper off the stand, or if you want to see your kid's basketball game, you have to pay. We're always saying, 'What did you Tweet today?' Everyone has multimedia projects once a week. Each person has a handheld video camera. We just tell the editors, 'This is what we're working on.' Then we put it in Engage, and its live. In print, we just take from there.

When working in print, you placed the greatest emphasis on providing analysis of complex problems, avoiding unverified content, letting people express their views, and motivating people to get involved. When working for the web, you placed the greatest emphasis on those same values, but getting information to public quickly jumped ahead. Why do you feel those are most important?

It all comes down to our print deadline; it's 1 a.m. If something breaks at noon it, it's gonna be on people's radar, so we have a web-first initiative with breaking news. We have to try to get that breaking news up first. Something short, just a paragraph story. Then we update it throughout the day. A lot of times, we're sitting on more information than we're posting. Names, we're sitting on that, because we have to get it verified through the coroner's office or police station or something. But we still want to get posted to the web the basics, the address. When it comes to print, since our deadline's about 1 a.m., our print product, people are getting the information 10 to 18 hours later, so in print, the main goal is to make sure it's right. If within 14 hours or later we couldn't confirm something, we're holding it.

When working in print, you placed the least emphasis on discussing policy and getting information to the public quickly; when working on the web, you placed the least emphasis on discussing policy and providing entertainment. Why do you feel those are least important?

It comes down to our market. If you look at our most-read stories, it's the police blotter, the police-involved shootings, car accidents. We have a top 5 meter on our website; the top 5 are almost always those stories. Sports, too; we cover a lot of communities that have schools with 500 to 1,000 students—not large for high schools. Everybody knows everybody. People care about other peoples' kids. Sports get high ratings.

You reported that you spend 80% time working on print assignments, 10% on web assignments and 10% on assignments for both. And you've identified that you emphasize different value systems when working on different platforms. Do you do so consciously?

It's more conscious than unconscious. We do have two very different platforms. We look at them as different products. We're trying to make that bridge over to the web product, which is why it's such a conscious effort.

Do you think that the different media require different value systems?

When you work with something on the web, you have similar values, but you emphasize them differently. Like our Twitter initiative; it's the perfect platform to get something on the web first. Whenever we update Twitter, it goes on our website. Just very brief updates. Just saying, 'We have a reporter on the scene,' it shows the audience that at least our paper is there and will give us updates. But it's still a different product; once 5 or 6 at night hits, you transfer your focus to the print product. Several of our reporters are well-trained in design, so they put together the pages, too; the last 5 to 6 hours of the night are when page production is at its peak.

Do you have any other feelings on what we've discussed?

No, that's it.

PERSONAL INTERVIEW: RESPONDENT 5

1. One survey question asked how often you know the platforms (web, print or both) on which your work will appear; you answered “all of the time.” How are you made aware where your work will appear?

We start with the presumption that everything we do for print is going online. There may be one or two exceptions, but I couldn't remember the last one. For the web, we know it's going to go to print eventually. There may be, in the course of a month, a brief traffic story or petty crime story that goes online that won't go into print.

2. When working in print, you placed the greatest emphasis on reaching the widest possible audience; when working for the web, you placed the greatest emphasis on getting information to the public quickly and avoiding unverified content. Why do you feel those are most important?

The stories we typically handle, for the stories for the web first, are breaking—crime, traffic fire, government politics, education and so forth. If it's a story that needs to go right away, we sort of assume that's going to be of interest to a broad audience. We assume any story that's breaking is of interest to a wide audience. Stories the big newspaper would consider for A1 won't get anywhere on our website, but our traffic proves this day in and day out, they wanna know where the sirens were. We will often say, “Further information and details were not immediately available.” So that's how those two line up. If a cat falls out of a tree branch, and it's not something were going to rush to put up online.

3. When working in print and on the web, you placed the least emphasis on discussing and critiquing government and business. Why do you feel those are least important?

I'm not sure why I answered that way. That's probably what steered me away from it. I don't really consider it. National and international news takes a backseat to anything local. We have all sorts of critiquing, opportunities for critiquing.

4. You reported that you spend 30% of your time on web assignments and 70% on assignments intended for both print and web. And you've identified that you emphasize different value systems when working on different platforms. Do you do so consciously?

This goes to the underpinnings of the survey; some of my initial responses, given a chance, I may change them. I don't think the values are a whole lot different. We want accurate information, we want to present stories in a fair light, give people a chance to respond. I don't care if you're writing for a magazine that comes out 3 times a year, or a web story that goes out in 5 minutes, those are the underpinnings of what we do.

5. Do you have any other feelings on what we've discussed?

There is a slightly different calculation; do you publish right away, or wait a few hours? If there are distinctions, they are drawn by the needs of the medium, but there's always a foundation of these values. We do have different standards for Twitter and Facebook than our website and print. But this news organization is not going to accuse the mayor of a crime without checking with that person and giving them a chance to respond. There are certain things we'll get a head start on; listening to the scanner, go out and phone in from

the field. I wrote for the AP for 23 years; so with a wire service background, all these online issues are stuff I dealt with AP.

PERSONAL INTERVIEW: RESPONDENT 6

1. One survey question asked whether you know the platforms (web, print or both) on which your work will appear; you answered most of the time. How are you made aware where your work will appear?

Generally, everyone finds out from an editor, who tells them.

2. When working in print, you placed the greatest emphasis on avoiding unverified content. When working for the web, you placed the greatest emphasis on avoiding unverified content and serving as a critic of government. Why do you feel those are the most important?

Journalism is based on truth and accuracy, and without that, you don't have credibility.

You can't print something unless it's verified.

3. When working in print and on the web, you placed the least emphasis on influencing the political agenda. Why do you feel that is the least important?

On the news side, our goal is to report the facts and let readers make their decisions.

There are very clear and strong boundaries between news and editorial. We only report facts and both sides of the story. We're not intending to have an impact on the agenda.

4. You reported that you spend nearly all of your time working on print assignments. And you've identified that you emphasize different value systems when working on different platforms. Do you do so consciously? Do you think that the different media require different value systems?

I think for the most part, they should be identical. If they are different at all, it's on a case-by-case basis. It may still be news, just a different form of delivery.

5. Do you have any other feelings on what we've discussed?

No.

PERSONAL INTERVIEW: RESPONDENT 7

1. One survey question asked how often you know the platforms (web, print or both) on which your work will appear; you answered “always.” How are you made aware where your work will appear?

We have a paywall. We choose what stories go where on the website; we decide. We're a small enough newsroom that we do layout as well as write. So we're able to decide in addition to publishing it all.

2. When working in print, you placed the greatest emphasis on reaching a wide audience, letting people express views, and motivating people to get involved; when working for the web, you placed the greatest emphasis on getting info to the public quickly. Why do you feel those are most important?

With print, my goal is production: to fill up a front page of the paper. To do that, we have to focus on a wide range of topics; we do as much as we can as widely as we can. The more topics we cover, the better, because we get more of a wide interest. We're behind a paywall; print comes first. On the web, it's a faster-reacting communication tool; you don't have to wait for the press to run.

3. When working in print, you placed the least emphasis on discussing national and international policy; when working on the web, you placed the least emphasis on those as well as many other values. Why do you feel those are least important?

We're behind a paywall so print comes first. Web comes second in consideration. The only exceptions would be something video-based or a web element that didn't translate to print. Here on Kodiak Island, we focus on local stories; we rarely cover national or

international stories that don't have local effects. I spent four years in Fairbanks at the second largest paper, and I've also worked in the Florida Keys, and it was similar there.

4. You reported that you spend 67% of your time working on print assignments, 5% on web assignments, and 28% on assignments for both. And you've identified that you emphasize different value systems when working on different platforms. Do you do so consciously? Do you think that the different media require different value systems?

If anything I think the values should be more common with what they were in '30s, '40s, and '60s; it was all focused on local content. Local issues, filling in with national stories.

I look back at those old papers in microfilms sometimes and see small meetings, local meetings, and that's the kind of think that may only appeal to a few dozen people.

National and international news is easy to find, and it's cheap. I think it should be the same, but be aware of adding things like hyperlinks and more documents like on the web.

You can publish the letter to the state senator, more maps.

5. Do you have any other feelings on what we've discussed?

I don't think so.

APPENDIX III:
SURVEY

<<PAGE 1>>

You are invited to participate in a research study that explores the professional values of converged journalists. The study is being conducted by Jessica Pucci of the University of Missouri-Columbia.

Principal researcher: Jessica Pucci
(847) 778-8552
jed3n3@mail.missouri.edu

The purpose of this research study is to investigate the professional values of journalists in converged newsrooms. Your participation in the study will contribute to a clearer understanding of how journalists in the digital age emphasize values on the job. You are free to contact the researcher using the information above to discuss the study. You must be at least 18 years old to participate.

If you agree to participate, you will complete an online survey that will take approximately 15 minutes of your time. At the end of the survey, interested participants may elect to be contacted by the researcher to further discuss their responses.

PARTICIPATION

Your participation in this study is voluntary. You may decline to answer any question, and you may withdraw from participation at any time by ceasing to respond to questions or closing your browser window.

RISKS, BENEFITS & CONFIDENTIALITY

There are no known risks to participating in this study; participants may benefit by contributing to the knowledge of journalists' values. There is no cost to participate. Your name and email address will not be recorded unless you opt to be contacted at the end of the study. Identifying information will be omitted from the data set, all identities will remain confidential, and individual responses will only be analyzed as a whole.

CONTACTS

If you have questions about the study, contact the researcher, Jessica Pucci, at 847-778-8552 or send an email to jed3n3@mail.missouri.edu.

This study has been reviewed by the University of Missouri-Columbia Institutional Review Board. The study number is 1197440. If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Institutional Review Board at:

483 McReynolds
University of Missouri
Columbia, MO 65211

573-882-9585
umcresearchcirb@missouri.edu

If you agree to participate, click “start the survey” at the bottom of this page. By clicking “start the survey,” you are verifying that you are at least 18 years of age. If you do not want to participate, please close this window.

<<PAGE 2>>

PART I

This section examines convergence in your newsroom.

1. What type of print news media organization do you work for?

- Daily newspaper
- Weekly newspaper
- Weekly news magazine
- Monthly magazine
- Other newspaper
- Other magazine

2. In total, what is the size of your organization’s news staff? That is, how many people who work in news are now on your organization’s payroll? Enter the number below.

_____ [enter digit]

3. Estimate the percentage of the time you spend working on assignments for print and online consumption (percentages must total 100).

I spend ___% of my time on assignments intended for print only.

I spend ___% of my time on assignments intended for the web only.

I spend ___% of my time on assignments intended for print at the web.

4. When completing assignments, how often are you aware of the platform(s) (print-only, web-only, or both) on which your work will appear?

- All of the time
- Most of the time
- Some of the time
- Rarely
- Never

5. How long have you worked at your current news organization?

___ years

6. How long have you worked as a paid journalist?

___ years

<<PAGE 3>>

PART II

This section explores the values you emphasize when working for print.

How important are the following values to you when working on a story that will appear in **print**? [values will be listed at random]

[Likert scale anchors: 1=not at all important, 7=extremely important]

Providing analysis of complex problems	<input type="checkbox"/>						
Discussing national policy	<input type="checkbox"/>						
Discussing international policy	<input type="checkbox"/>						
Investigating government claims	<input type="checkbox"/>						
Getting information to the public quickly	<input type="checkbox"/>						
Avoiding the use of unverified content	<input type="checkbox"/>						
Concentrating on the widest possible audience	<input type="checkbox"/>						
Providing entertainment and relaxation	<input type="checkbox"/>						
Developing intellectual/cultural interests	<input type="checkbox"/>						
Influencing the political agenda	<input type="checkbox"/>						
Letting people express their views	<input type="checkbox"/>						
Motivating people to get involved	<input type="checkbox"/>						
Pointing to possible solutions	<input type="checkbox"/>						
Serving as an critic of government	<input type="checkbox"/>						
Serving as an critic of business	<input type="checkbox"/>						

Listed below are sets of some contrasting journalistic values. For each set of values, indicate where you would place yourself when you know you're writing primarily for **print**.

[9-point scale Likert anchors: ; sets will appear randomly]

Be first with the story ... Ensure the story is accurate before submitting

Be first with the story ... Ensure the story is as thorough as possible

Be first with the story ... Frame the story to be as balanced as possible

Frame the story to draw as many readers as possible ... Ensure the story is accurate before submitting

Frame the story to draw as many readers as possible ... Ensure the story is as thorough as possible

Frame the story to draw as many readers as possible ... Frame the story to be as balanced as possible

Make the story as stimulating as possible ... Ensure the story is accurate before submitting

Make the story as stimulating as possible ... Ensure the story is as thorough as possible

Make the story as stimulating as possible ... Frame the story to be as balanced as possible

<<PAGE 4>>

PART III

This section explores the values you emphasize when working for the web.

How important are the following values to you when working on a story that will appear **online**? [values will be listed at random]

[Likert scale anchors: 1=not at all important, 7=extremely important]

Providing analysis of complex problems	<input type="checkbox"/>						
Discussing national policy	<input type="checkbox"/>						
Discussing international policy	<input type="checkbox"/>						
Investigating government claims	<input type="checkbox"/>						
Getting information to the public quickly	<input type="checkbox"/>						
Avoiding the use of unverified content	<input type="checkbox"/>						
Concentrating on the widest possible audience	<input type="checkbox"/>						
Providing entertainment and relaxation	<input type="checkbox"/>						
Developing intellectual/cultural interests	<input type="checkbox"/>						
Influencing the political agenda	<input type="checkbox"/>						
Letting people express their views	<input type="checkbox"/>						
Motivating people to get involved	<input type="checkbox"/>						
Pointing to possible solutions	<input type="checkbox"/>						
Serving as an critic of government	<input type="checkbox"/>						
Serving as an critic of business	<input type="checkbox"/>						

Listed below are sets of some contrasting journalistic values. For each set of values, indicate where you would place yourself when you know you're writing primarily for **the web**.

[9-point scale Likert anchors: ; sets will appear randomly]

Be first with the story ... Ensure the story is accurate before submitting

Be first with the story ... Ensure the story is as thorough as possible

Be first with the story ... Frame the story to be as balanced as possible

Frame the story to draw as many readers as possible ... Ensure the story is accurate before submitting

Frame the story to draw as many readers as possible ... Ensure the story is as thorough as possible

Frame the story to draw as many readers as possible ... Frame the story to be as balanced as possible

Make the story as stimulating as possible ... Ensure the story is accurate before submitting

Make the story as stimulating as possible ... Ensure the story is as thorough as possible

Make the story as stimulating as possible ... Frame the story to be as balanced as possible

<<PAGE 5>>

PART V

This section aims to learn more about you.

1. What is your gender?

- Male
- Female

2. What is your age?

____ years old

3. Which of these categories represents your annual income?

- Under \$15,000
- \$15,000 to \$19,000
- \$20,000 to \$29,000
- \$30,000 to \$39,000
- \$40,000 to \$49,000
- \$50,000 to \$59,000
- \$60,000 to \$69,000
- \$70,000 to \$79,000
- \$80,000 or more

5. What is your ethnicity?

- White or Caucasian, non-Hispanic
- Hispanic, Latino or Spanish
- Black or African-American
- Asian or Pacific Islander
- American Indian
- Other _____ (please explain)

6. What level of education have you completed?

- Did not complete high school
- High school graduate
- Associate's degree
- Bachelor's degree
- Master's degree

- Doctorate degree
- Other _____ (please explain)

7. If you received a bachelor's, master's or doctorate degree, did you major in journalism?

- Yes
- No

8. Which political affiliation most closely matches your views?

- Democrat
- Republican
- Libertarian
- Green
- Independent
- Other _____ (please explain)

9. On a scale of 1 to 7, where 1 is very conservative and 7 is very liberal, where would you place yourself?

[7-point Likert scale anchors: very conservative ... very liberal]

<<PAGE 7>>

This concludes the main survey.

Would you be interested in discussing your responses with the researcher in a brief (about 20 minutes) phone call?

- No, I'm not interested in discussing my responses. (Your responses and any identifying information will remain confidential.)
- Yes, I'm interested in discussing my responses. The researcher may reach me via the following contact information:

NAME:
EMAIL:
PHONE:

Thank you for your time and participation!

Thank you for participating in this research on converged journalists' professional values. The researcher aims to discover whether journalists in converged newsrooms emphasize different values according to media platform. Your participation will help clarify the value systems of journalists in the digital age. If you would like to see the final results of the study, please contact the researcher:

Jessica Pucci, jed3n3@mail.missouri.edu
(847) 778-8552

Table 1*Sample Demographic Characteristics*

Demographic	<i>n (%) / M (SD)</i>
Gender	
Male	92 (64.8%)
Female	50 (35.2%)
Age	47.9 (10.45)
Annual Income	
Under \$15,000	0 (0%)
\$15,000-\$19,000	2 (1.4%)
\$20,000-\$29,000	10 (7.2%)
\$30,000-\$39,000	17 (12.3%)
\$40,000-\$49,000	17 (12.3%)
\$50,000-\$59,000	23 (16.7%)
\$60,000-\$69,000	11 (8.0%)
\$70,000-\$79,000	15 (10.9%)
\$80,000+	43 (31.2%)
Ethnicity	
White or Caucasian, non-Hispanic	136 (95.1%)
Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish	2 (1.4%)
Black or African American	4 (2.8%)
Asian or Pacific Islander	1 (0.7%)
American Indian	0 (0%)
Other	0 (0%)
Education	
Did not complete high school	0 (0.0%)
High school graduate	6 (4.1%)
Associate's degree	8 (5.5%)
Bachelor's degree	101 (69.7%)
Master's degree	21 (14.5%)
Doctorate degree	3 (2.1%)
Other	6 (4.1%)
Journalism Degree	
Yes	86 (66.2%)
No	44 (33.8%)

Table 1 (cont)*Sample Demographic Characteristics*

Demographic	<i>n (%) / M (SD)</i>
<hr/>	
Political Affiliation	
Democrat	36 (26.5%)
Republican	16 (11.8%)
Libertarian	4 (2.9%)
Green	2 (1.5%)
Independent	60 (44.1%)
Other	18 (13.2%)
Conservative-Liberal	4.33 (1.30)

Table 2*Comparative Demographic Characteristics*

Demographic	<i>present study</i>	<i>Weaver & Wilhoit 2002</i>	
		<i>print</i>	<i>online</i>
Gender (percentage in each category)			
Male	64.8%	66.4%	66.0%
Female	35.2%	33.6%	34.0%
Age (median)	50	41	39
Annual Income (median)	\$60,000-\$69,000	\$43,500*	\$64,00
Ethnicity (percentage in each category)			
White or Caucasian, non-Hispanic	95.1%	91.4%	93.5%
Minority	4.9%	8.6%	6.5%

* combined with broadcast journalists

Table 3

Principal Components Analysis With Varimax Rotation: Factor Loadings of 15 Journalistic Values (N = 148)

Value	1	2	3	4	5
Motivating people to get involved	.79				
Serving as a critic of government	.76				
Pointing to possible solutions	.72				
Letting people express their views	.70				
Serving as a critic of business	.60		.50		
Developing intellectual / cultural interests	.54	.48			.46
Providing entertainment / relaxation	.52				
Discussing international policy		.89			
Discussing national policy		.88			
Investigating government claims			.79		
Providing analysis of complex problems			.73		
Getting information to public quickly				.85	
Avoiding use of unverified content					.75
Concentrating on widest possible audience					.48
Influencing the political agenda	.40	.43			-.46

Table 4*Journalistic Values for Print and Online Media*

Value	<i>Min</i>	<i>Max</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
<i>Print</i>				
Providing analysis of complex problems	1.00	7.00	5.62	1.33
Discussing national policy	1.00	7.00	3.23	1.59
Discussing international policy	1.00	7.00	2.46	1.45
Investigating government claims	1.00	7.00	5.23	1.46
Getting information to the public quickly	1.00	7.00	5.79	1.36
Avoiding the use of unverified content	3.00	7.00	6.77	.64
Concentrating on the widest possible audience	2.00	7.00	5.40	1.33
Providing entertainment and relaxation	1.00	7.00	4.49	1.47
Developing intellectual/cultural interests	1.00	7.00	4.36	1.40
Influencing the political agenda	1.00	7.00	2.93	1.80
Letting people express their views	1.00	7.00	5.29	1.49
Motivating people to get involved	1.00	7.00	4.77	1.63
Pointing to possible solutions	1.00	7.00	5.20	1.30
Serving as a critic of government	1.00	7.00	4.69	1.80
Serving as a critic of business	1.00	7.00	3.42	1.65
<i>Online</i>				
Providing analysis of complex problems	1.00	7.00	4.68	1.64
Discussing national policy	1.00	7.00	2.88	1.54
Discussing international policy	1.00	7.00	2.28	1.36
Investigating government claims	1.00	7.00	4.80	1.61
Getting information to the public quickly	3.00	7.00	6.32	.92
Avoiding the use of unverified content	1.00	7.00	6.31	1.26
Concentrating on the widest possible audience	1.00	7.00	4.97	1.55
Providing entertainment and relaxation	1.00	7.00	4.51	1.53
Developing intellectual/cultural interests	1.00	7.00	3.82	1.56
Influencing the political agenda	1.00	7.00	3.03	1.62
Letting people express their views	1.00	7.00	5.44	1.56
Motivating people to get involved	1.00	7.00	4.79	1.72
Pointing to possible solutions	1.00	7.00	4.74	1.42
Serving as a critic of government	1.00	7.00	4.14	1.73
Serving as a critic of business	1.00	7.00	3.13	1.65

Table 5*Paired Samples t Tests: Journalistic Values as a Function of Media (Print vs. Online)*

<i>Value / Media</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t (df)</i>	<i>p</i>
<i>Providing analysis of complex problems</i>				
Print	5.67	1.25	7.40 (140)	<.001*
Online	4.67	1.65		
<i>Discussing national policy</i>				
Print	3.21	1.54	4.00 (141)	<.001*
Online	2.88	1.54		
<i>Discussing international policy</i>				
Print	2.45	1.38	2.41 (139)	.02*
Online	2.28	1.37		
<i>Investigating government claims</i>				
Print	5.25	1.42	3.96 (141)	<.001*
Online	4.81	1.61		
<i>Getting information to the public quickly</i>				
Print	5.78	1.33	-4.29 (141)	<.001*
Online	6.32	0.92		
<i>Avoiding the use of unverified content</i>				
Print	6.77	0.64	5.21 (142)	<.001*
Online	6.31	1.26		
<i>Concentrating on the widest possible audience</i>				
Print	5.34	1.33	3.05 (142)	.003*
Online	4.97	1.55		
<i>Providing entertainment / relaxation</i>				
Print	4.47	1.47	-0.39 (136)	.70
Online	4.51	1.54		
<i>Developing intellectual / cultural interests</i>				
Print	4.36	1.42	5.48 (139)	<.001*
Online	3.82	1.56		

Table 5 (cont)*Paired Samples t Tests: Journalistic Values as a Function of Media (Print vs. Online)*

<i>Value / Media</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t (df)</i>	<i>p</i>
<i>Influencing the political agenda</i>				
Print	2.97	1.77	-0.47 (139)	.64
Online	3.01	1.63		
<i>Letting people express their views</i>				
Print	5.39	1.44	-0.48 (139)	.64
Online	5.44	1.56		
<i>Motivating people to get involved</i>				
Print	4.84	1.61	0.51 (139)	.61
Online	4.79	1.72		
<i>Pointing to possible solutions</i>				
Print	5.25	1.21	5.08 (141)	<.001*
Online	4.74	1.42		
<i>Serving as a critic of government</i>				
Print	4.75	1.71	6.26 (139)	<.001*
Online	4.14	1.73		
<i>Serving as a critic of business</i>				
Print	3.47	1.60	3.94 (139)	<.001*
Online	3.12	1.65		
<i>Interpreter role</i>				
Print	16.55	4.12	6.95 (138)	<.001*
Online	14.72	4.48		
<i>Disseminator role</i>				
Print	22.37	2.81	1.26 (136)	.21
Online	22.08	3.00		
<i>Populist mobilizer role</i>				
Print	22.94	5.27	3.67 (134)	<.001*
Online	21.91	5.52		

Table 5 (cont)*Paired Samples t Tests: Journalistic Values as a Function of Media (Print vs. Online)*

<i>Value / Media</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t (df)</i>	<i>p</i>
<i>Adversarial role</i>				
Print	8.20	2.99	5.82 (137)	<.001*
Online	7.24	3.13		
<i>Journalistic values**</i>				
Print	70.32	10.86	6.51 (124)	<.001*
Online	66.17	12.04		

* denotes significant *p* value ($p < .05$)

** means are summed for all values in each medium

Table 6*Comparative Journalistic Values for Print and Online Media*

Value	Print <i>Med (SIQ)</i>	Online <i>Med (SIQ)</i>
Being first with a story... Ensuring accuracy	9.00 (1.00)	8.00 (1.63)
Being first with a story... Ensuring thoroughness	7.00 (2.00)	5.00 (2.00)
Being first with a story... Ensuring balance	7.00 (2.00)	6.00 (2.50)
Drawing widest possible audience... Ensuring accuracy	9.00 (1.00)	9.00 (1.50)
Drawing widest possible audience... Ensuring thoroughness	7.00 (2.00)	6.00 (2.00)
Drawing widest possible audience... Ensuring balance	7.00 (2.00)	6.50 (2.00)
Making the story stimulating... Ensuring accuracy	9.00 (1.00)	8.50 (1.00)
Making the story stimulating... Ensuring thoroughness	6.00 (2.00)	6.00 (1.50)
Making the story stimulating... Ensuring balance	8.00 (1.50)	7.00 (1.50)

Note. Higher scores reflect the latter value

Table 7*Spearman's Rho Correlations for Forced-Choice Values: Print vs. Online Media*

	<i>Online</i>
<i>Print</i>	
<hr/>	
Being first vs...	
Accuracy	.67*
Thoroughness	.46*
Balance	.42*
Drawing a wide audience vs...	
Accuracy	.74*
Thoroughness	.46*
Balance	.67*
Making stimulating vs...	
Accuracy	.71*
Thoroughness	.57*
Balance	.61*

Note: Numbers reflect correlations between each same forced-choice value decision between print and online media.

* denotes significant *p* value ($p < .05$).

REFERENCES

- Anderson, D. (1987). How managing editors view and deal with ethical issues. *Journalism Quarterly*, 64(2), 341-345.
- Arant, M.D. & Anderson, J.Q. (2001). Newspaper online editors support traditional standards. *Newspaper Research Journal*, 22(4), 57-69.
- Arant, M. D., Meyer, P. (1998). Public journalism and traditional journalism. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, 13(4), 205-218.
- Bandura, A. (1969). Social learning of moral judgments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 11(3), 275-279.
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social Learning Theory*. New York, N.Y.: General Learning Press.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. & McDonald, F.J. (1963). The influence of social reinforcement and the behavior of models in shaping children's moral judgments. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67, 274-281.
- Battistoli, B. (2008). Transmission, translation and transformation: Communication of ethical codes in the newsroom. International Communication Association, conference papers/annual meeting. 1-37.
- Boeyink, D.E. (1994). How effective are codes of ethics? A look at three newsrooms. *Journalism Quarterly*, 71(4), 893-904.
- Brill, A. M. (2001). Online journalists embrace new marketing function. *Newspaper Research Journal*, 22, 28-40.
- Breed, W. (1955). Social control in the newsroom: A functional analysis. *Social Forces*, 33(4), 326-335.
- Brown, M.A. (1976). Values: A necessary but neglected ingredient of motivation on the job. *The Academy of Management Review*, 1(4), 15-23.
- Boudana, S. (2009). On the values guiding the French practice of journalism: Interviews of twelve war correspondents. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the International Communication Association, Montreal, Quebec.

- Cenite, M., Detenber, B.H., Koh, A.W.K., Lim, A.L.H., & Soon, N.E. (2009). Doing the right thing online: a survey of bloggers' ethical beliefs and practices. *New Media & Society*, 11(4), 575-597.
- Christians, C. (2005). Ethical theory in communications research. *Journalism Studies*, 6(1), 3-14.
- Coleman, R. & Wilkins, L. (2004). The moral development of journalists: A comparison with other professions and a model for predicting high quality ethical reasoning. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 81(3), 511-527.
- Domingo, D. (2007). The myth of interactivity in the daily routines of online newsrooms: An ethnographical approach. International Communication Association, conference papers/annual meeting. 1-25.
- Donsbach, W. (2004). Psychology of news decisions: Factors behind journalists' professional behavior. *Journalism*, 5(2), 131-157.
- Endres, F. F. (1985). Influences on the ethical socialization of U.S. newspaper journalists. *Newspaper Research Journal*, 6(3), 47-56.
- Friend, C. & Singer, J.B. (2007). Online journalism ethics, traditions and transitions. Armonk, NY. M.E. Sharpe, Inc.
- Fry, D. (1989). What do our interns know about journalism ethics? *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, 4(2), 186-192.
- Harcup, T. (2005). I'm doing this to change the world: Journalism in alternative and mainstream media. *Journalism Studies*, 6(3), 361-374.
- 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.
- H.R.985, Free Flow of Information Act of 2009
- Indiana University. (2002). American Journalist Survey. Retrieved from <http://www.mediainfocenter.org/journalism/journalists/american.asp>
- Johnson, T. & Kelly, J. (2003). Have new media editors abandoned the old media ideals?: The journalistic values of online newspaper editors. *New Jersey Journal of Communication*, 11(2), 115-134.
- Kamakura, W.A. & Mazzon, J.A. (1991). Value segmentation: A model for the measurement of values and value systems. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 18(2), 208-218.

- Kendal, J. (2004). Review of 'Social learning and imitation. *Interaction Studies*, 7(2), 273-288.
- Klaidman, S. & Beauchamp, T. (1987). *The virtuous journalist*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Lowery, W. (2006). Mapping the journalism-blogging relationship. *Journalism*, 7(4), 477-500.
- MacGregor, P. (2007). Tracking the online audience: Metric data start a subtle revolution. *Journalism Studies*, 8(2), 280-298.
- Manz, C.C. & Sims, H.P. (1980). Self-management as a substitute for leadership: A social learning theory perspective. *The Academy of Management Review*, 5(3), 361-367.
- McLellan, M. & Porter, T. (2007). Newsroom training: Essential, yet too often ignored. *Nieman Reports*, 61(3), 90-91.
- McMane, A. A. (1993). Ethical standards of French and U.S. newspaper journalists. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, 8(4), 207-218.
- Mischel, W. (1973). Toward a cognitive social learning reconceptualization of personality. *Psychological Review*, 80, 252-283.
- Morin, R. & Giles, B. (1986). Newsroom ethics: How tough is enforcement? *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, 2(1) 7-16.
- John O'Sullivan, J. & Heinonen, A. (2008). Old values, new media: Journalism role perceptions in a changing world. *Journalism Practice*, 2(3), 357-371.
- Painter, C. (2009). Standards of objectivity: A comparison between daily and alternative newsweekly papers in three Ohio cities. Thesis, University of Missouri.
- Perlmutter, D.D. & Schoen, M. (2007). "If I break a rule, what do I do, fire myself?" Ethics codes of independent blogs. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, 22(1), 37-48.
- Plaisance, P.L. & Skewes, E.A. (2003). Personal and professional dimensions of news work: Exploring the link between journalists' values, roles and demographic information. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 80(4), 833-848.
- Quandt, T., Loffelholz, M., Weaver, D., Hanitzsch, T., & Altmepfen, K.D. (2006). American and German online journalists at the beginning of the 21st century: A bi-national survey. *Journalism Studies*, 7(2), 171-186.

- Quinn, A. (2007). Moral virtues for journalists. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, 22(2&3), 168-186.
- Rao, S. & Lee, S.T. (2005). Globalizing media ethics? An assessment of universal ethics among international political journalists. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, 20 (2&3), 99-120.
- Reinardy, S. & Moore, J. (2007). When do journalists learn about ethics? An examination of introductory and graduating students' ethical perceptions. *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*, 62(2), 161-175.
- Schultz, I. (2007). Craft and conservation: Features of Danish journalism culture. Presented at the International Communication Association Conference panel "Political Culture and Journalism Culture: Theoretical Approaches," San Francisco.
- Sheehan, Kim B. (2001). Email survey response rates: A review. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 6(2).
- Singer, J.B. (2004) Strange bedfellows? The diffusion of convergence in for news organizations. *Journalism Studies*, 5(1), 3-18.
- Singer, J.B. (2005). The marketplace of ideas—with a vengeance. *Media Ethics*, 16(2), 14-16.
- Smith, C. & Becker, L.B. (1989). Comparison of journalistic values of television reporters and producers. *Journalism Quarterly*, 66(4), 793-800.
- Smith, Michael P. (1996). Values. Culture. Content.: Three keys to journalism in a strategic newspaper. NMC, Chicago, IL.
- South, J. (2004). Ethics in the classroom. *Quill*, 92(6), 10-13.
- Steiner, L. & Okrusch, C.M. (2006). Care as a virtue for journalists. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, 21(2&3), 102-122.
- Sylvie, G., & Huang, J.S. (2008). Value systems and decision-making styles of newspaper front-line editors. *Journalism & Mass Communication Quarterly*, 85(1), 61-82.
- Thurman, N. & Myllylahti, M. (2009). Taking the paper out of news. *Journalism Studies*, 10(5), 691-708.
- Ugland, E. & Henderson, J. (2007). Who is a journalist and why does it matter? Disentangling the legal and ethical arguments. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, 22(4), 241-261.

- Ward, S. J. (2005). Philosophical foundations for global journalism ethics. *Journal of Mass Media Ethics*, 20(1), 3-21.
- Ward, S.J.A. & 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.
- Weaver, D. & Wilhoit, G. (1996). *The American Journalist in the 1990s: U.S. News People at the End of an Era*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Mahwah, NJ.
- Weaver, D.H., Wilhoit, G.C., Beam, R.A., Brownlee, B.J., Voakes, P.S. (2007). *The American journalist in the 21st century: U.S. news people at the dawn of a new millennium*. Mahwah, NJ, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- White, D.M. (1950). The gate keeper: A case study in the selection of news. *Journalism Quarterly*, 27, 383-390.
- Wilkins, L., Brennen, B. (2004). Conflicted interests, contested terrain: Journalism ethics codes then and now. *Journalism Studies*, 5(3), 297-309.
- Wood, R. & Bandura, A. (1989). "Social cognitive theory of organizational management." *The Academy of Management Review*, 14(3), 361-384.